

stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, is to continue in effect beyond May 22, 2018.

Obstacles to the orderly reconstruction of Iraq, the restoration and maintenance of peace and security in the country, and the development of political, administrative, and economic institutions in Iraq continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 18, 2018.

PROTECTING OUR NATION'S VETERANS

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

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, I am honored to fight for the veterans in my district and throughout the Nation. In return for their service and sacrifice, we owe them the best medical care that can be provided.

I am proud that the House of Representatives has passed the VA MISSION Act to address these critical concerns. I commend Chairman ROE, Ranking Member WALZ, and the members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee for their work on this issue over the last year.

This legislation will provide better community-based care without detracting from the outstanding medical services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities, such as the Central Texas Veterans Health Care Center in Temple, Texas, in my district.

While I believe veterans are best served by the VA, there are also those who live too far from a VA facility, cannot afford a long wait period, or have very specific medical services that are best provided outside the VA system.

The VA MISSION Act provides this community-based care option, and it pays for it with discretionary spending, which means Congress has more control, more oversight, and more responsibility.

The VA MISSION Act includes a provision for a bill I authored, the Veterans Transplant Coverage Act, to ensure that no other American hero is denied organ transplant coverage again through the VA.

This was inspired by the Nelson family of Leander, Texas. Mr. NELSON, a veteran, required a transplant. His son was a matching live donor. However, the VA would not cover medical costs

for the donor, Mr. NELSON's son, even though this was a lifesaving transplant for Mr. NELSON. I am sorry to say that Mr. NELSON had to liquidate almost everything he owned to pay for the medical expenses. We could not help Mr. NELSON's family, but his story inspired me to work towards changing the law.

When the VA MISSION Act is enacted, it will ensure future generations of veterans will have their transplant medical expenses, along with the donor's expenses, covered by the VA. We must do the right thing for our veterans who need these lifesaving procedures, and I am honored that the VA MISSION Act includes language I wrote to do just that.

I want to publicly thank several of my colleagues on the committee: Dr. NEAL DUNN, Dr. BRAD WENSTRUP, and GUS BILIRAKIS, my neighbor, all of whom championed transplant care for veterans and worked extremely hard to ensure this language was included in the bill.

The VA MISSION Act is a step forward towards the goal of caring for our veterans. The Senate must pass this legislation, and I urge President Trump to quickly sign it into law. I can think of no better way to celebrate Memorial Day than enact the VA MISSION Act, which will ensure our heroes receive the best medical care available.

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

□ 1245

FARM BILL

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I always appreciate that opportunity.

It is a right and a privilege of any Member of Congress to come down here and address you from this floor about whatever issues might be on our minds, and I have a couple of them on my mind here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. One of them is the circumstance that brought about the loss of the farm bill here on the floor.

I come from the Fourth Congressional District of Iowa, and I will make the case with anyone in this Congress, out of all 435 districts, that we produce more agricultural products in the Fourth District than any other. There are some folks in the San Joaquin Valley who we have an interesting discussion with, and I tip my hat to their progress but still stand in defense of the Fourth District of Iowa.

The corn we raise, the soybeans we raise, the pork that we produce, the eggs that come out of there, all of that sets the standard for the rest of the country. And I am giving the credit to the producers, the families that raised

the farmers that we have today who went off to school and came back with the technology in their brain and developed the technology to bring this kind of crop out of this ground.

I have two ears of corn down in my man cave, Mr. Speaker, and they are beside each other on a nail. I would say half the people in this Congress would guess wrong on which was which. One of them is an open-pollinated variety that they used to plant back in 1848, and the other one is a triple-stack hybrid that came out of the 2015 crop, neither one of them irrigated. God's rainfall raised them.

That one ear that is just as big as the other one and actually has got more rows around it is the open-pollinated from 1848, and it yielded between 15 and 25 bushels to the acre.

Then you look at the 2015 ear. It is roughly the same length, with fewer rows of kernels around it, and that yielded not 15 to 25 bushels, but 232 bushels to the acre, over the scales. That is how far we have come with agriculture technology.

You can divide your 15 or 20 to 25 bushels into the 230. It is almost 10 times. You might make the argument that we have got 10 times the yield today that we had back when the pioneers rolled across the prairie in their covered wagons and began to figure out how to bring crops out of this ground. That is an example of what has taken place.

We have tractors running around out in the field now. No markers. The markers used to always—there used to be planter wire and cross-checked. Then the markers would mark until we came back around, and you lined up on that mark from the last round so that all the rows were nice and beautiful and parallel and straight. Everybody took pride in having fields where they could look down those rows and see that wonderful crop of corn and soybeans and other crops coming out of the ground.

Now there are not markers on a lot of our planters, and some of the planters are running around with the markers folded up because we are being guided by GPS. That is just some of the technology.

We are applying fertilizer differently as the soil types change going across the field. We have got the ability to change and adjust the numbers of corn according to the soil type, too. We are using less fertilizer than we did. We are taking care of the water quality.

Lots of good things are coming up out of the ground, and that means food for America and Americans. This farm bill is designed to stabilize our family farm operations so that they can stay in business. It is not good enough just to be in business next year, but to be in business next generation. This is the center and the heart and soul of America.

This is the American Dream: the family farm on that land looking back through their generations and seeing

they are the fourth generation, the fifth generation family farm, the sixth, the seventh generation.

I stood in a machine shed that has had some pretty good feedlots around it and a lot of good farm ground around it and talked to—well, I guess I saw, because the seventh generation hadn't quite learned to talk yet, seven generations on the family farm. I have watched them also as they stood there together and held hands and cried as the auctioneer sold off their life's work, when we didn't have a program in place that could stabilize their hard work, their smart work, their dedication.

Nobody can do this like a family farm can. There is not a corporation that can go out there and hire people and be vertically integrated and somehow get this thing scaled up to the size that they can be more efficient than what is going on right now with our family farms in America because, when it is in your culture, when it is in your blood, you make hay when the Sun shines.

In fact, the culture is so strong in my neighborhood, we had a case in court. I was sitting in the courtroom in Sac County a number of years ago, and the lawyers were bickering back and forth and the judge was deliberating and maybe dithering a little bit. My lawyer said: Come on. Let's get this done. I have got hay down.

Well, you have got hay down. We know what that means. You have got to get it back up again before it rains. When the weather is there, you have got to move. And if the Sun goes down and you can still go, you keep going because you are looking at the clouds coming on the horizon.

By the way, we have got technology to address that, too. Now we have got the setup with the technology, teamed up with Monsanto and with Google, to put together a corporation that watches the weather report and indexes that in and sends a message off to the farmer's cellphone in a text that says: You are going to get 1½ inches of rain tonight, and you have got 6 hours, 7 hours, or 10 or 12 hours to side-dress 20 pounds of nitrogen.

That is what your crop needs because we have been monitoring it for these years, and we have calculated the Sun days, the heat units, the humidity, and the growth patterns. This is a scientific, now, very sophisticated industry.

And that is just crop farming. Then you have got the livestock side of this as well.

We worked long and hard to put this farm bill together, Mr. Speaker, and all of the hearings that were held on it. The big things that we need to make sure that we sustain and extend are crop insurance, number one, because crop insurance is the number one risk management tool for our producers.

If you don't have an ability to ensure your crop and go to the bank and be able to predict that you have got a rea-

sonable chance of at least servicing your loan and paying your input costs and taking a few dollars out to feed the kids, if you can't do that, the bankers can't stand with you. So Federal crop insurance is an essential component of our family farm operations. It is not something that they can get along without, because we have seen these markets cycle.

We have seen the markets cycle in these ways. For example, January 4, 1980, Jimmy Carter embargoed grain sales to Russia. Excuse me. I am in the modern vernacular. It was the Soviet Union. All the Soviet Union, no U.S. grain goes in there.

They were our number one market at the time, so that embargo shut off that market for our producers in the farms all across this country, and we saw the commodities prices on the Chicago Board of Trade go into a tailspin. It nose-dived down into the gutter.

To get back out of that and get those markets put back together again didn't really happen in the way we might anticipate. It was not a bounce back. It was a struggle back. We lost family farm after family farm. I watched farm sale after farm sale.

I went to those sales. We went in some of those building sites that the family farms were pushed off of. Some of them, the acreage was sold off to somebody that had a little cash, and they came in and tried to fix up the place a little bit and tried to live there. It worked for some. In fact, it worked where I live. But it didn't work for everyone.

Some of them were burned. Some were buried. We did a lot of that. I can drive you around the countryside, Mr. Speaker, and I can point to those places now that you just see as dirt, and I can tell you who lived there, the kids' names who were there, where they went off to school—maybe Iowa State, University of Iowa, maybe UNI—also, maybe off to the coast somewhere.

Too many of our children went off to get an education and didn't look back, and now my neighbors, if they are still neighbors, buy a plane ticket to see their grandchildren. That is the result of what happened when we had the grain embargo in 1980 that was brought to us by Jimmy Carter.

We had subsidies that had to be poured into the Midwest in huge amounts. Even today, we would be stunned if I were to say into the Record the amount of money that was put in to try to bail out the disaster that we had in agriculture.

And land change prices. CRP came in, in the pick year of 1983; and with that, land prices tumbled down to, I can say, a third of what they were at their peak.

When government stepped in and put CRP in place, some of it was for conservation; and we preserve a significant amount of it in this farm bill. But, Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers paid for some of those farms a couple of different times

as a result of what happened with the grain embargo in 1980.

Well, today we have a trade circumstance. That trade circumstance started, I believe, not for the negotiations of NAFTA, but the tariff that the President put on steel and aluminum—and that was globally—for all countries that were exporting their steel or aluminum into the United States, a 25 percent tariff on it.

Then, after 2 or 3 days, the President—the Canadians—not as much the Mexicans, but the Mexicans, too—objected to the tariff that went on them. They were negotiating NAFTA. So after 2 or 3 days, the President lifted that tariff off of Canada and Mexico for the countries that are involved in NAFTA.

That, I think, was designed to try to get the Canadians to the table on NAFTA. Perhaps that has been useful, and it worked; but we also knew that a tariff on steel and aluminum coming in out of China was going to bring about retaliatory trade moves on the part of the Chinese, and they acted in a predictable fashion. They slapped a tariff on our U.S. ag products going from the United States into China.

And so here I am, Mr. Speaker, representing the Fourth Congressional District of Iowa, all of northwest Iowa, almost all of north-central Iowa, some of northeast Iowa. And when I look at the map that was put out by Bloomberg that showed the counties in America that went Democrat in blue, the counties in America that went Republican in red—and that would be, of course, the Trump election—and over the top of that they laid out a focus in, I will say, I believe they were yellow dots, that was the production of soybeans, the concentration of the production of soybeans.

It is clear that the dead center, the center of the hub of the middle of the bull's eye, that those tariffs that the Chinese put on soybeans and pork, especially, went right into the Fourth District and right into Iowa. And then it spreads out: Nebraska, Illinois, Indiana.

We all know what the corn belt looks like. The soybean belt is a little different, but that is where most of it is still raised. So we take this hit in our neighborhood, and our producers are holding together pretty well because they understand that our President is a multifaceted, multidimensional trade negotiator.

So the trade negotiations that started with NAFTA and the tariff on steel and aluminum that included the Canadians and the Mexicans in the beginning for 2 or 3 days are part of, also, what has happened with the retaliatory tariffs that the Chinese put on, especially, soybeans and on pork.

That brought the South Koreans to the table, too, and they said: Give us some relief on the tariffs on the steel. The South Koreans are the third largest exporter of steel to the United States.

While they were there, they offered up the invitation for—they had it in their pocket, evidently—President Trump to sit down with Kim Jong Un. The President said: Yes, I will do that. Stuck his head in the press room and told the press: I am going to meet with Kim Jong Un.

Now, we are pretty confident that that is going to happen in Singapore on June 12. All of this is wrapped up together, Mr. Speaker, and much more besides: national defense, national security, the denuclearization of the entire Korean Peninsula. It also plays into the Iranian nuclear agreement that was signed by, I believe, John Kerry, technically, but under the Obama administration.

You put this all together, and I have just given a quick snapshot, Mr. Speaker, on the multiple layers of strategy and negotiations that are part of this President.

Meanwhile, the message that is sent overseas to the Chinese, for example, who are putting pressure on the very producers that need to have stability, that need to have their Federal crop insurance, and those that need to know that we have got an EQIP program and those that need to be able to measure what we are going to do with our CRP program, for example, our conservation programs, all of this is only 20 percent of the overall farm bill, and the other 80 percent goes to nutrition.

When I came to this town, there were 19 million people on food stamps; and we called them food stamps then. Nineteen million. At the peak of the Obama administration, which would be about the seventh year of the Obama administration, those 19 million on food stamps had become 47 million on SNAP; and the cost to the taxpayer grew, of course, proportionally and even faster because of the inflationary aspect of this. So we found ourselves at 2½ times more people on food stamps than there were when I came to this Congress in 2003.

How do we fund that? We are watching our deficits go sky-high: \$20 trillion, on the way to \$21 trillion, in deficit spending.

And where do we get the money to pay the bills that are pushing us into the deficit and running up \$20 trillion in national debt? Not deficit spending, Mr. Speaker.

Where do we get the money to service the national debt, and where do we get the money to pay the bills as we watch our national debt go up over \$20 trillion? Well, the primary places are China, Saudi Arabia. About half of this comes from the American people investing in bonds and securities.

So we are borrowing money from China to buy people food stamps, and all we ask in this bill is that they work.

□ 1300

Now, why should a farmer work and watch the stability underneath him that is the farm bill, that is the Fed-

eral crop insurance piece, that is EQIP, that is a conservation program that has a MAP program on it, the Market Access Program, why should that farmer be out there sweating—sweating bullets sometimes—wondering if he can make it with markets that are 50 percent of what they were just a few years ago when other people aren't working at all? Why should the sweat of the farmer's brow pay for the food of the person that refuses to work?

The American people know this, Mr. Speaker. It is not a complicated thing. If you poll that out there and you ask them, 80 to 90 percent of the American people, they say: Yes, you ought to have to work if you are going to eat. It is Biblical, it is John Smith's rule, and it is the rule within the culture of the American people. It is just a rule that is hard to get passed here on the floor of the House.

We don't force anybody off of food stamps. We only look at the people that are able-bodied, between the ages of, I believe it is, 18 to 59. I know it is not any older than 59. And we say: If you want to get food stamps, then, fine, we will give them to you, but you have to work 20 hours a week or go to school 20 hours a week, or some combination of your own improvement 20 hours a week.

Well, 20 hours a week, is that too much to ask, Mr. Speaker, for someone to put in 20 hours a week in order to eat for free all the other hours of the week? I think it is entirely reasonable. And, furthermore, all work has dignity, all work has honor, all work enhances the character and the work ethic of the people doing it. There is no shame in being productive. There is honor in being productive.

But 20 hours a week, that is only a day's work for a farmer that is in the field that is out there planting corn or planting soybeans or harvesting those beans when you see the weather coming in, or combining corn in the fall. When you go, you go, and there are a lot that put in 20-hour days, and I know because I keep up with them and so do our crews from time to time. When we have to, you do what you need to do.

So, here we are, a bill that has been shot down here on the floor. This is the second time this has happened in the last, I will say, 5 years, a farm bill comes out here to the floor. We just need some Democrats that will support work, and we would have passed this bill here today.

But looking at the roster of those that voted "no," every Democrat voted "no" on this farm bill. And they didn't vote "no" because they didn't like what was in on the ag side. They voted "no" because there were work environments on the food stamp side.

So when I came to this Congress, there were Democrats here that believed in work, and they would vote accordingly. We had about 53 Blue Dog Democrats, moderate Democrats that wanted to get to a balanced budget,

and their agenda was: Let's cut some spending and let's raise some taxes. Let's get to balance. My agenda was: Let's cut some spending and get to balance, but we can do business.

Too many of them were forced to vote for ObamaCare. When they did that, they essentially walked the plank. When they voted for ObamaCare, the American people rose up and voted them out of office and put in conservative Republicans instead. Some of those conservative Republicans decided they wanted to leverage this farm bill for a vote on a bill that includes at least two components of amnesty.

I am wondering: Where have we gone, America? Where have we gone that we can't take care of our farmers? Where have we gone that we can't require a little bit of work to go along with a lot of free food? Where have we gone when we say that 20 hours a week to get free food—when you ask a farmer to work 20 hours a day when the weather let's him do that, and to suspend his risk management program at least—it is not suspended here, technically. I mean, it goes on. But the message is to spend it, and the doubt hangs out, and they won't sleep as well tonight, and they won't have as good a weekend.

And the people that are getting food stamps without work, they are probably snickering a little bit. They might be sitting on the couch in their front lawn right now going: You know what, those Republicans aren't going to be able to make me work, and all those Democrats are going to protect me so I don't have to work.

I regret the direction that this culture and civilization is going if work is so disparaged by one party that we can't have a tiny little bit of it plugged into a fully funded welfare program that went from 19 million people on food stamps in 2003, on up to 47 million at its peak, and now down around 45 and change, as I recall.

Forty-five million people on food stamps. And now, another one of these arguments is: Well, we have to bring in workers from overseas. That is one of the bills that some of the folks that voted against the farm bill today, Mr. Speaker, it's one of the bills that they want to bring to the floor. It brings in guest workers.

Well, actually, initially, it won't bring them in. It will amnesty the ones that are here. People that are working illegally here, a lot of them, in fact, I will say it with confidence, with utter confidence, most of them operating on somebody else's Social Security number, guilty of the felony of document fraud, would get a pass to stay in America or do a touchback and come back to America.

And, you know, the only ones that would leave to do a touchback and come back are the ones that will be precertified to have a free pass coming back into the United States, 410,000—410,000 would get that pass in a bill that they want to see come to the floor

maybe next week. And there is another 40,000 that would go into food processing.

So we have not had guest workers come into food processing. That is low-skilled work, as a rule. Now, if you are going to fill the ranks of low-skilled workers, then I suggest that we put Americans to work at that. The highest unemployment rates, the double-digit unemployment that you look at are the lowest skilled workers, and people say: We don't have anybody in America that is willing to do the work.

Well, why not? This is not that complicated an equation. We have between—disagreement here—but nobody thinks there is less than 70 different means-tested Federal welfare programs in this country. Nobody thinks there is less than 70. Some people take that number all the way to 87. But between 70 and 87 means-tested Federal welfare programs exist in this country. Not one person has memorized the names of them yet; let alone, understands how they work, how they interact with each other, how they might motivate or demotivate people that we ought to be asking to go to work.

So, what we are doing is we are bribing Americans. We are paying them not to work with welfare programs. And if we didn't have anybody out there to pay not to work and we didn't have that labor, then I could maybe understand the argument that somebody 1,500 miles away in a foreign country that doesn't speak English, that has a 6th grade education and no skills, should be coming into the United States to do some of that work, but that is not the case.

We did the chart on this, Mr. Speaker, and I believe I have introduced it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it works like this. It is a big pie chart, and it is out on the internet, but there are 326 million Americans, according to the most recent estimate of the U.S. Census Bureau, and out of them, I will ask: What are they doing?

Well, there are 153 million of them that are employed. Now, they might be not fully employed, but they are employed. So 153 million of them working. All right. I take those off to the side. Seven million of them, though, are on unemployment, drawing unemployment checks right now, right, just a hair under 7 million. They ought to be going to work.

Second one is, there are 46 million Americans who are simply not in the workforce. They have opted not to look for a job, not to work, whatever the reason is. Maybe they are already wealthy enough that they don't need to work anymore. They could possibly be in school or enhancing their education, but chances are, a whole lot of them are on some of those 70 to 87 different welfare programs that we have.

So they are drawing down some combination of that. Maybe they are working in the black market for cash somewhere, and they don't show up on the record, 46 million of them.

Then there is another 14 million. They are starting to get a little bit older now, but some of them do want to work and can. That is those between the ages of 65 and 74. Walmart hires at 74, unemployment gets paid at 74, so we put that in there to calculate also, Mr. Speaker.

And then there are 23 million Americans on disability. And I can't believe, when I see double-amputee wounded warriors roll themselves to work every day, that all 23 million of those that are on disability payment, that none of them can work. Some can, and we ought to go back and take another look at them.

By the time I add all of this up—there is a couple of other lesser categories there—by the time I add all of this up, there are 107 million Americans of working age who are simply not in the workforce, and they are in categories that we can hire from every one of those categories. We just can't hire everyone from any of those categories, but starting with unemployment, then the 46 million, and on down the line.

So I say to people: If you need one worker, can you find him out of 107 million? If you need 100 workers, can't you find them out of 107 million? If you need 1,000 workers, can't you find them out of 107 million? And, of course, that answer is: Yes, we can.

But somehow we have the employment force, or the employer force in America that has convinced themselves that they don't want the American worker, and they are not willing to come to this Congress and work with us to tighten down this welfare system. This welfare system was created to be a safety net, not a hammock, and because of these additions to the welfare systems, going up to the 70 to 87 of them, and the benefits coming out of there, people that have the safety net has been ratcheted up and up and up till it has become a hammock. We have tens of millions of Americans that are lying in the hammock. They might be the third generation that has not worked.

There was a study that was done, Mr. Speaker, in Milwaukee that carved out a 36-square-block residential area of Milwaukee, six blocks by six blocks, and they went in and interviewed each one of those residents in those households. Now, these are people that came up from the Gulf Coast when they lifted prohibition in the 1930s to take on the good brewery jobs that were formed in Milwaukee. And, by the way, the GDP of the beer in Wisconsin today is over \$7 billion, so it is a huge industry. But they came up to work there three generations ago.

The company that went in to survey those, every home in those 36 square blocks, came to this conclusion: There wasn't a single employed male head of household in any of those homes in 36 square blocks in Milwaukee—third generation.

Why not? They moved up there for the jobs. The story lamented that we

couldn't bring jobs to them. I read it and thought: If their grandfathers could move up there for jobs, why can't they go to where the jobs are? There are plenty of jobs in America.

And the reason they can't is because they are rooted in the home. The home may be paid for or partially paid for, and they have established themselves a comfort zone on a welfare system and supplemented however they need to to get to that place where they are in a comfort place.

We don't need to have policies that encourage that. We don't need to have people that haven't worked in three generations. We need to have the industrious can-do American spirit driving an economy and free enterprise and being rewarded for the work they do.

I don't any longer put out any statements that say: Hardworking Americans; hardworking Iowans. There are a lot of hardworking Americans and hardworking Iowans, Mr. Speaker, but it is also important to work smart. I want to see smart working, hardworking people all over this country, and our job needs to be to increase the per capita GDP, the average per capita GDP of our people, and that comes about by starting with work on food stamps and taking that philosophy, make it a success, and move it over into many of the other welfare programs.

Another one is: You can take all those welfare programs, the 70 to 87 of them that are there, converge them all into one committee here in Congress, and then start dropping off the ones that aren't working and measuring them and shake it all down to about five different programs, instead of 70 or 87 of them. Those things will work.

We are here today with a farm bill that went down on this floor. It went down because no Democrat supports work. It went down because some Republicans wanted to leverage this farm bill in order to get a bill out on the floor to vote on that has within it two components of amnesty.

And I oppose amnesty because it destroys the rule of law. When Ronald Reagan signed the Amnesty Act in 1986—he only let me down two times in 8 years, and I revere that man in his legacy. But I believed that as the debate went on in the House and the Senate, that Ronald Reagan would see with utter principled clarity that if you reward lawbreakers, you are destroying the rule of law, and there will be another amnesty and another and another and more people will come for it.

And they have, and there have been six minor amnesties since that period of time. But this is the big one sitting here: Amnesty for people that are in America illegally; amnesty for DACA recipients. They say they came here when they were 3 years old; their mother led them across the Rio Grande River.

I actually have seen the data. I don't know of any other Member of Congress,

I don't believe, has seen the data. We have been digging it out for months on end, and I think I will soon be able to make it public. Some of them were brought here at 3 years old. Some of them were girls at that age. Some of them, it was their mother. But that doesn't represent that universe of DACA recipients.

And what I do know is, of those large numbers, especially of males that came here illegally, they were 14, 15, 16, and been more years old, that they knew what they were doing and they were responsible for what they were doing. I want to restore the rule of law, pass the farm bill, and I want to get people back to work, and I want to have allies on this floor that support work, whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

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

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF WEDNESDAY, MAY 16, 2018 AT PAGE H4137

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 5840. A bill to state the policy of the United States with respect to the extended nuclear deterrence posture of the United States in support of NATO and to direct the Secretary of Defense to provide Congress a briefing on such posture; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 35. An act to transfer administrative jurisdiction over certain Bureau of Land Management land from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for inclusion in the Black Hills National Cemetery, and for other purposes.

S. 1285. An act to allow the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, the Confederated Tribes of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, the Klamath Tribes, and the Burns Paiute Tribes to lease or transfer certain lands.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3562. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish assistance for adaptations of residences of veterans in rehabilitation programs under chapter 31 of such title, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4009. An act to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to

plan, design, and construct a central parking facility on National Zoological Park property in the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 21, 2018, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4911. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-17-0051; SC17-966-1 FR] received May 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4912. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's affirmation of interim rule as final rule — Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines and Pummelos Grown in Florida and Imported Grapefruit; Change of Size Requirements for Grapefruit [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-17-0063; SC17-905-1 FIR] received May 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4913. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pistachios Grown in California, Arizona, and New Mexico; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-17-0048; SC17-983-2 FIR] received May 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4914. A letter from the Director, Defense Pricing/Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Statement of Purpose for Department of Defense Acquisition (DFARS Case 2018-D005) [Docket: DARS-2018-0017] (RIN: 0750-AJ69) received April 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4915. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendments to Forms and Schedules to Remove Provision of Certain Personally Identifiable Information [Release Nos.: 33-10486; 34-83097; IC-33077] (RIN: 3235-AM37) received May 9, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4916. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.624(g) of the Commission's Rules Regarding Submission of FCC Form 2100, Schedule G, Used to Report TV Stations' Ancillary or Supplementary Services [MB Docket No.: 17-264]; Modernization of Media Regulation Initiative [MB Docket No.: 17-105] received May 15,

2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4917. A letter from the Division Chief, Competition Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Rural Call Completion [WC Docket No.: 13-39] received May 9, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4918. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revised Critical Infrastructure Protection Reliability Standard CIP-003-7 — Cyber Security — Security Management Controls [Docket No.: RM17-11-000] (Order No.: 843) received May 10, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4919. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Uplift Cost Allocation and Transparency in Markets Operated by Regional Transmission Organizations and Independent System Operators [Docket No.: RM17-2-000, Order No.: 844] received May 9, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4920. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Nuclear Agency (DNA) Freedom of Information Act Program [Docket ID: DOD-2017-OS-0021] (RIN: 0790-AJ62) received May 15, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4921. A letter from the Program Coordinator, Duck Stamp Office, Migratory Bird Program, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp (Duck Stamp) Contest Regulations [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2015-0161; FXMB 1233090000/189//FF09M13200] (RIN: 1018-BB23) received April 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4922. A letter from the Chief Administrative Counsel, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Filing of Claims Under the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act [Docket No.: FCSC 101] received April 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4923. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Straits of Mackinac, Mackinaw City, MI [Docket Number: USCG-2018-0397] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 16, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4924. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Volvo Ocean Race Newport; East Passage, Narragansett Bay, RI [Docket Number: USCG-2018-0118] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 16, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4925. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland