

economy and, at the same time, provide water for people who live in the cities, improve our water quality, and ensure, at the same time, that we protect the environment.

Those are the goals. It is complicated; it is complex; and it is never easy.

Mark Twain supposedly was credited, over 100 years ago, with saying, having spent some time in the West, that it was clear to him that, when we talk about water and water resources and the incredible demands on those water resources, 100 years ago, supposedly Mark Twain said that, in the West, it was clear to him, "whiskey was made for drinking and water was made for fighting."

We hope that we won't fight over our water resources but that we will work together on a bipartisan basis to solve these problems. That is what we are sent here to do: to work together on a bipartisan basis to solve a whole host of issues that we deal with. But it is very important that we focus, in this instance, on this legislation by passing a bill that makes a great deal of common sense.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is an important day for people who knew and loved the three individuals who were being held improperly by North Korea. They have now been released due to the negotiations with our prior colleague Mike Pompeo—our, now, Secretary of State—and also President Trump.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, for those who have not spent a lot of time studying American history, they have not realized what a benefit it can be to have an American President who is deemed to be a person who cannot be properly accounted for. His actions may be of interest to foreign leaders.

Frankly, I enjoy hearing people in other countries say they are just not sure what to make of President Trump. They are not sure if he is crazy; they are not sure if he might push the button to launch missiles; they are just—he is so unpredictable. But, actually, I think he is very predictable. The man knows how to negotiate.

As I pointed out to him a couple of times, if you look through our history, people who were considered to be the most educated, some said the highest intellect, greatest intellectual ability—you have people like John Quincy Adams, who is a hero of mine because of his dedication to bringing an end to slavery. It didn't happen during his 4 years of being President. It didn't happen during his 16, 17 years in the House of Representatives, but he was so dedicated to his purpose that he materially

affected the young freshmen who sat at the back of the room for 2 years, overlapping about a year with Adams before his fatal stroke on the House floor just down the hall.

John Quincy Adams, when he was President, for all his education, intellectual ability, I mean, the man wrote books in German, loved the French language, read books in other languages like French and German, probably kept the best journal of anyone who was ever elected President, but he really didn't accomplish much of anything at all when he was President. Some of that had to do with the election controversy surrounding that.

Look at people like Woodrow Wilson, a former college president, supposedly high intellectual ability, but, yes, he did get us involved in World War I. He drug his feet. There were things that could have been done, but nobody had any concern worldwide for Woodrow Wilson. He was considered very predictable, and it got us into some trouble because people didn't think he had the nerve to stand up when it was needed.

Jimmy Carter was touted as being some sort of nuclear engineer, went to the Naval Academy, but the fiascos in which he was involved as President showed a man who was a nice man but rather inept when it came to foreign affairs. Obviously, the Iranians had no fear of him. He had such poor judgment that he encouraged the removal of the Shah of Iran. Not a nice man, but he was an ally. And Carter didn't have the foresight to see, kind of like President Obama when he was dealing with Qadhafi—Obama with Qadhafi, Carter with the Shah of Iran, they figure: Well, he is not a nice guy, so we will run him off. We will encourage him being run off.

In the case of Qadhafi, if it weren't for Obama's planes and the missions to take out those defending Qadhafi, Qadhafi would probably still be in charge in Libya, and ISIS and al-Qaida elements would not have gained the incredible foothold they have had. There wouldn't be the chaos there is today in Libya.

President Obama was touted as being of high intellectual capacity, yet just one fiasco after another when it came to foreign affairs as we have seen in the news recently, President Obama's efforts to get \$100 billion to \$150 billion, some of it on pallets with just cash, American dollars on pallets with forklifts, moving those from the United States into the hands of the Ayatollah Khamenei and his bloodthirsty religious zealots in Iran, the biggest supporter of terrorism in the world. So deemed to be an intellectual President Obama was, and yet just incredible malfeasance when it came to foreign relations. People were not afraid of him.

It was interesting to see polls, while President Obama was our Chief Executive Officer, showing that, although nations where Muslims were the majority, they didn't have much respect for

President George W. Bush, but there were polls indicating that they had even less respect for President Obama.

How could that be?

They didn't see him as being very decisive. Indicative of that was, when he drew a line in the sand, had a red line, and Syria crossed that line, he did nothing about it, in essence. So that encouraged our enemies.

I know there are those who said that things that happened at Guantanamo Bay, Abu Ghraib, other places, actually hurt America badly because it inflamed our enemies, whereas, actually, nothing inspires our enemies like the showing of weakness. As President Reagan once said:

Of all the wars that occurred during my lifetime in which America was involved, none of them occurred because America was too strong.

So when other nations perceive weakness, it is provocative, and that is what has happened in our 200-plus-year history. If we are perceived as being weak, it is provocative.

President Obama oversaw a number of such weak, provocative incidents. Some weren't weak, they were just foolish, like encouraging the taking out of Qadhafi. He was not a good man, had blood on his hands from back in the 1980s, and yet when President George W. Bush sent troops into Iraq, Qadhafi had an epiphany and invited us to come in and tell him what weapons he could keep and what he had to get rid of because he was afraid that he would be the next nation to be invaded.

When it comes to North Korea, President Clinton, educated in what are considered by some to be quite elite schools, Ivy League schools, and yet he oversaw, as President, negotiations with North Korea. This is just a rather short summary, but basically Madeleine Albright as Secretary of State and President Clinton's approach to North Korea was: Look, we will make sure that you get all the nuclear material you need to make nuclear weapons; we will make sure you get all the technology you need to create nuclear weapons.

□ 1330

We will get you in a better situation as far as the ability to have nukes than you could ever have possibly done on your own. And all we ask in return, in essence, is you sign a document saying that you won't use the technology and the materials to make nuclear weapons.

I can just envision the glee, the celebrations behind the scenes in North Korea over how crazy and foolish American leaders are, during the Clinton administration, because they are going to give us everything we need to have nuclear weapons, and all we have got to do is put a signature on a document.

Then we saw history repeat itself when John Kerry played the role of Madeleine Albright, this time with Iran; and, of course, we did have

Wendy, who was so helpful in getting North Korea what they needed to make nuclear weapons, had her as the lead negotiator, with John Kerry, with Iran, to make sure Iran had an agreement that would enable them to have nuclear weapons.

And if they lived up to every part of the agreement, this disastrous agreement, as President Trump described it repeatedly during the election and since, they would still have nuclear weapons in 10 years from when the agreement started.

We know—and I went down to the SCIF and reviewed things there. It shouldn't have been classified. It should have been available for the whole country to read. Eventually it was available. But it appeared very clear that the agreement that was enabled by Senator CORKER, yes, he is a Republican, but just wasn't familiar enough with the Constitution as he needed to be, because he thought you could take a treaty, which the Iran deal definitely was because it modified other treaty terms, and you can't do that unless it is in a treaty.

The Constitution requires that a treaty is not valid, a deal such as the Iran agreement, until it is confirmed by two-thirds of the Senate. And I am not saying anything that we didn't say back at the time. I was trying to get the Senate to wake up; that you can't ratify a treaty, which the Iran agreement is, unless you have two-thirds of the Senators voting to ratify, confirm the agreement.

Without two-thirds voting in support of the agreement, there is no agreement. All you have is something on paper that might as well be a memo.

But they acted like it was a deal, and that is why President Obama and John Kerry made sure that the Ayatollah, these radical Islamists that want to end America's existence on the planet as a country in which there is self-representation through a Republican form of government—yet they sent \$100 billion to \$150 billion in cash. And my friend STEVE KING from Iowa, DANA ROHRBACHER, it may have been somebody else, but we went and met with the two lead inspectors in Iran from the International Atomic Energy Agency, the IAEA people talk about so much. Oh, yeah, we can be comfortable that the Iran deal is a great deal because those inspectors are carefully inspecting the facilities and any nuclear efforts in Iran.

I even heard one of my friends, whom I have a great deal of respect for, on FOX News this week, saying that: Look, you can't do anything with nuclear material without being detected because there are isotopes that are easily detectable, so the Iranians can't do anything in the way of creating nuclear weapons, moving nuclear material, without us knowing.

I am not sure the source for those comments, but I am sure of the source of my comments. I was asking the two lead inspectors of Iran with the IAEA:

Gee, we just sent \$100 billion or more to Iran. If Iran were to take some of that money, or all of it, and buy ready-made nuclear weapons from Pakistan, which has them, from North Korea, can you guarantee us that they could not get those nuclear weapons into Iran without your knowing?

And the answer was: Of course we cannot guarantee that.

In fact, I was told that the IAEA could set up detection equipment in Iran, say, at an airport or wherever, but they could not set up the detection equipment anywhere without Iran knowing exactly where the detection equipment was; and unless Iran was foolish enough to either bring nuclear material or a nuclear weapon right beside their detection equipment, then no, they would have no way to know whether Iran was bringing nuclear weapons or even nuclear material into Iran.

So I am not sure where this other information comes from, that you can't do anything with nuclear material or weapons without the IAEA knowing, because that is news to the IAEA. They don't know what they don't know, but they know that they don't know if somebody is trying to evade their detection equipment. It is that simple.

So when you have an agreement with people who go out before, after, and during the negotiations and stir up crowds with chants like "Death to America," and you tell people in your country that you want to see America gone, that it is the Great Satan, Israel is the Little Satan, you want them both wiped off the map, wiped off the face of the Earth, you want any evidence that we ever existed eliminated, then you are dealing with a country that cannot be trusted.

Whether you call the radical Islamic leaders in Iran crazy, or just dogmatic jihadists, either way, they are a threat to America. And you send them money, they are likely going to spend it in a way that hurts America, kills Americans, kills Israelis, and makes Iran more dominant in the world.

So all of us who took an oath to support and defend the United States Constitution, if we are sending money to Iran, my opinion, we are grievously violating that oath because they are going to do all they can to subvert our Constitution and, they hope, be able to wipe us out.

Of course, one of their points that was discussed in their Philadelphia meeting over 25 years ago—the FBI had evidence of the meeting and evidence of the things, their goals, what they wanted to accomplish. Well, one of their goals, over 25 years ago, these radical Islamists in America—one of their goals was to subvert the U.S. Constitution to sharia law.

They believed the easiest way to subjugate the U.S. Constitution to their radicalized version of sharia law was to get—either through the courts, through the legislature, or through the U.N., and force countries to adopt what

the U.N. passed as criminal laws in their own countries. There are people here who keep advocating for that. But get a law passed, one way or another, that, in essence, says you cannot say anything negative about radical Islam, and make that a crime, punishable by jail, prison, fine.

So we have been moving that way; that is, in essence, what hate crimes are. Hate crimes, as I said back in 2007, '08, '09, when we were bringing this issue up, I said, really, you don't need a hate crime statute. We were told: Oh, yes, you do, because look at what happened outside of Jasper, Texas. Well, that is just south of my district. None of the people involved were constituents.

But when I heard about what happened, three White men took an African American, had him drug behind their truck, tortured the poor man to death, I wouldn't have a problem if Texas passed a law that said, in a situation like that, somebody is found guilty; then the victim's family, in that case, the Jasper victim, have their family select the manner that the defendant is to be drug and the terrain over which he is to be drug, and who will be dragging him across that terrain.

If we passed a law like that, basically, capital punishment, with a different way of inflicting the capital punishment, I would not object. It is so outrageous what those three defendants did.

But the ridiculous remedy that is proposed here in Congress was: We will fix that situation by providing punishment for hate in somebody's heart, and we will be able to sentence you to life in prison. There is no death penalty for any Federal hate crime.

Actually, this is how ludicrous the law was that was passed here in Congress. If someone were being tried for a hate crime because of the physical assault on someone else, the defendant would be totally, completely exonerated and held not guilty if he raises a reasonable doubt that, no, no, I didn't choose somebody because of their race, gender, any type of group they were part of. No, I just wanted to arbitrarily kill somebody, abuse somebody. I didn't care what group they were part of.

Under the Federal law, that person would have to be acquitted of the Federal hate crime because they chose their victim randomly, or at least raised reasonable doubt that they may have chosen the victim randomly so they are not guilty of this heinous crime.

Whereas, under Texas law, if you harm somebody, it is not nearly as important the feelings you have in your heart as what you did. And under Texas law, the two most culpable defendants in that case, in my opinion, properly got the death penalty, and the least culpable person got life in prison.

So this case, which was heralded as the great poster case for why we need a

Federal hate crime, actually would diminish the punishment that the defendants in a hate crime case would get. They couldn't get the death penalty anymore. Oh, no; they will get life in a Federal prison instead of death under Texas law.

We did not need that hate crime. And as I said years ago when this bill was being pushed, ultimately, what this hate crime bill will be used for is to punish Christians, Christian ministers, for reading verses directly out of the Bible, as has been done in Congress, in the House and Senate since the very beginning of this Nation.

□ 1345

And now we are starting to see it being used as a threat against Christians. We hear more and more people say the biggest hate group threat is Evangelical Christians.

Well, if they are real Christians, they cannot have hate in their heart for others, and yet they are being called the biggest threat as potential hate criminals.

It needs to be changed. We need to punish people for what they do wrong, and not whether or not they had some improper thought in their head.

But I am grateful that countries look at Donald Trump the way they looked at Ronald Reagan, because it is helpful historically.

“Saturday Night Live,” seems like I recall Reagan's character being portrayed as walking around with a finger out wanting to push the red button so he could launch missiles with nuclear weapons on them, and the world said: Wow, this Reagan guy is really crazy.

It is invaluable for foreign leaders to not be sure about the American President, because that gives them more negotiating power.

It is kind of like a great poker player, except that Donald Trump indicates clearly he doesn't bluff. And as he pointed out to North Korea, he is not bluffing. And though he would rather not take the actions that are required, he will take them, and I believe he will, and apparently Kim Jong-un believed he would as well.

So if you look historically, Teddy Roosevelt has his Navy go around the world. People are going: This guy is crazy. Look, he just sent his Navy around the world. You don't know what this guy is going to do. Run up San Juan Hill? Who knows? This guy is a little bit crazy. And it always was helpful in foreign relations.

Now, Khrushchev took the measure of John F. Kennedy, very intelligent man, who wanted to protect America, but he was not decisive in his early days. Khrushchev scared him out of following through on his promise to provide air cover to those going into Cuba to try to eliminate Castro. Scared him off. Backed him off of his promise to provide him air support. So people were killed who were relying on President Kennedy's promise.

President Kennedy gave a speech and said, in essence: We are not going to let

anybody build a wall and wall off part of Germany, Eastern Europe. And it was just, as I recall, a couple of weeks or so before Khrushchev ensured that the bricks were being laid and the wall was started.

They had a meeting in Vienna, and President Kennedy told people he didn't do well in the negotiating, that Khrushchev scared him and he didn't represent America well.

Well, that is not going to happen to Donald Trump. He is not going to go to into a negotiation with Kim Jong-un or the Ayatollah or anybody else and go in and come back out as President Kennedy did and confide: Wow, I really showed weakness. I didn't do a good job. He scared me. That is not going to be our problem under President Donald Trump, and our country is going to be better off because of it.

So I applaud President Trump for rightfully taking the step to discount and discontinue the farce that was the Iran treaty. It was not properly ratified.

And even though I wish we had had President Trump in place to stop the hundred-plus billion dollars that President Obama and John Kerry sent to the biggest suppliers of terrorism, no doubt that money will be used or has been used to kill Americans, but there is a new sheriff in town, and President Trump is going to make sure that doesn't happen again. God bless him for stopping the Iranian farce.

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

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2019 BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, section 30104 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018, Public Law 115–123, requires the chairs of the House and Senate Budget Committees to submit for printing in the Congressional Record committee allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels for fiscal year 2019.

Pursuant to section 30104 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record: (1) an allocation for fiscal year 2019 for the House Committee on Appropriations, (2) committee allocations for fiscal year 2019 and for the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2028 for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, and (3) aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2019 and aggregate revenue levels for fiscal year 2019 and for the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2028.

In the case of allocations for committees other than the Committee on Appropriations and for the spending and revenue aggregates, the levels shall be consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's most recent baseline, adjusted to account for any legislation enacted since the date the most recent baseline was issued.

This filing is made for technical purposes as required by section 30104 the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018. Associated tables are attached. These committee allocations, aggregate

gates, and other budgetary levels are made for the purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other budgetary enforcement provisions.

If there are any questions on these committee allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels please contact Brad Watson or Mary Popadiuk of the Budget Committee staff.

FISCAL YEAR 2019 BUDGET TOTALS

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal Year 2019	Fiscal Years 2019–2028
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	3,747,016	n.a.
Outlays	3,551,514	n.a.
Revenues	2,590,496	33,273,213

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2020 through 2028 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(In millions of dollars)

		2019
Base Discretionary Action:	BA OT	1,244,000 1,296,937
Current Law Mandatory:	BA OT	955,283 949,351

SPENDING AUTHORITY FOR HOUSE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES

(On-budget amounts in millions of dollars)

		2019	2019–2028
Agriculture:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA OT	79,138 75,363	798,019 789,258
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA OT	0 0	0 0
Total	BA OT	79,138 75,363	798,019 789,258
Armed Services:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA OT	168,445 168,196	1,726,658 1,731,206
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA OT	0 0	0 0
Total	BA OT	168,445 168,196	1,726,658 1,731,206
Financial Services:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA OT	10,945 1,309	93,416 –15,600
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA OT	0 0	0 0
Total	BA OT	10,945 1,309	93,416 –15,600
Education & Workforce:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA OT	5,533 –1,272	101,151 60,439
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA OT	0 0	0 0
Total	BA OT	5,533 –1,272	101,151 60,439
Energy & Commerce:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA OT	503,196 491,423	6,933,428 6,843,460
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA OT	0 0	0 0
Total	BA OT	503,196 491,423	6,933,428 6,843,460
Foreign Affairs:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA OT	43,383 36,211	380,040 362,848
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA OT	0 0	0 0
Total	BA OT	43,383 36,211	380,040 362,848
Oversight & Government Reform:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA OT	123,611 121,472	1,424,908 1,386,092
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA OT	0 0	0 0
Total	BA OT	123,611 121,472	1,424,908 1,386,092
Homeland Security:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA OT	2,325 2,404	26,861 27,608
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation	BA OT	0 0	0 0
Total	BA OT	2,325 2,404	26,861 27,608
House Administration:			
April 2018 Baseline	BA	23	170