

For too long, our Nation's adversaries have supplied America's allies with energy resources. We cannot let countries like Russia lead in the global energy market when the U.S. has the resources to be able to supply countries in Europe and Asia with affordable and reliable energy.

Last year I called on the administration to examine a project that would allow for the U.S. to send LNG to Asian markets. The proposed Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline would transfer the natural gas from Piceance Basin in western Colorado to the Jordan Cove terminal in Coos Bay, Oregon.

The Jordan Cove terminal is estimated to have the capacity to be able to transport 7.8 million metric tons of LNG annually to the Pacific Northwest and Asia. Unfortunately, under the previous administration, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission denied the application for the Jordan Cove project, citing a lack of global demand. Not long after the application was denied, Jordan Cove procured an agreement for 75 percent of the pipeline's capacity, proving that there is demand for U.S. LNG in Asia.

It is my hope that FERC will soon approve the resubmitted application for the Jordan Cove project and we can bring good-paying jobs to western Colorado and send clean, affordable, and reliable energy to Asia.

As the U.S. works to advance technologies that decrease the environmental footprint of energy production, it cannot be ignored that countries like China and India continue to be some of the world's top polluters. We can responsibly develop U.S. natural gas resources to be able to benefit communities across our Nation and by transporting our energy resources to countries around the globe. The United States can have a measurable impact on the economies and environmental health of communities overseas.

The United States cannot sit back and let other countries lead the world into the energy future. The time for responsible development of natural gas is now and to be able to create jobs here at home.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Colorado for his comments. The gentleman is always welcome here. I thank my friend for pointing out the fact that, we think oil and gas in America, we think the coasts: the Gulf Coast, Pacific Coast, Atlantic Coast.

But my friend enlightened us. It is not just the coasts. It is the heart and soul of America, the interior, States like Colorado, Wyoming, North Dakota. All these States have shale plays. All these States are booming now with American energy production.

I would like to close with a couple comments and maybe take a tour of the world as it stands today.

We started exporting our natural gas less than 2 years ago. Right now, 29 countries have received American liquified natural gas. Those countries are Argentina, the Bahamas, Barbados,

Brazil, Chile, China, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, India, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lithuania, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Russia, South Korea, Spain, Taiwan, Thailand, Turkey, UAE, and the UK.

American energy has touched the entire world. They are feeling our dominance in a very healthy and great way. We are giving them their freedom. Liquid American freedom is on the market right now.

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, I am grateful to my Republican friends for pointing out the advantages of natural gas.

I might add that we had, in the last Congress, a hearing about what was the world's largest solar plant. This wasn't a plant that had solar panels. It had thousands of mirrors pointing to three different towers that would superheat the water, which would turn to steam and would drive turbines to produce electricity.

I have one article here. This was from February 2014. It talked about the Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System, sprawling across roughly 5 square miles of Federal land; that is Mojave Desert area near the California-Nevada border. It had opened, and it was glorified. There was \$1.6 billion in Federal loans, \$600-some-odd million in grants to help them make their payments. Years later they paid 7 million—well, 2 years ago, they had paid back, I think they said, \$7 million of the \$2.2 billion.

Anyway, this article was about the world's largest solar plant scorching birds in the Nevada desert. From testimony we heard, apparently this solar plant, as birds would fly through the superheated sunlight, it would cause them to explode in flames, which is why the locals called them flamers.

Originally, they were not expecting to have to spend a lot of money cleaning mirrors with water. They thought it would just be dust. They didn't anticipate all the flaming bird debris—some of them endangered species, I am quite sure.

In a period of February through June, there were 290 of those flamers that exploded in flames and scattered their bird debris. Anyway, that was the solar side of it.

Since they had a contract to provide all this electricity and they had used up their \$2.2 billion, what do you do when you don't have \$2.2 billion and the ability to burn up endangered species and you don't have that kind of government grant? Well, you take just a little bit of money and you do what they did: you use natural gas—very environmentally friendly.

You can create a natural gas electrical plant very, very cheaply and make up for what the fire, the flaming birds, and all the other things did to slow down this great solar-powered plant. So there is a lot to be said for natural gas.

We did have a hearing yesterday, and one of the things I did not get to point out that I had highlighted but just didn't have enough time to ask the inspector general about, since his conclusion was, even though there were hundreds of pages that clearly reflected not just bias, but angry, hateful animus against Donald Trump, Republicans—but certainly Donald Trump—the IG, it seemed very clear to me, with hundreds of pages documenting the overwhelming bias among those who were supposed to be fair and impartial, figuratively depicting justice being blind, well, it was as if IG Horowitz decided: Well, we have got all this overwhelming bias, so that will make the Republicans happy. But I have got so many Democratic friends, I don't want to get them permanently upset with me, so I will just conclude that there is no evidence that bias affected the investigation at all.

Yet, in his own report, IG Horowitz said, and this is in the executive summary, page 9: "Most of the text messages raising such questions pertained to the Russia investigation, and the implication in some of these text messages, particularly Strzok's August 8 text message ('we'll stop' Candidate Trump from being elected) was that Strzok might be willing to take official action to impact a Presidential candidate's electoral prospects. Under these circumstances, we did not have confidence that Strzok's decision to prioritize the Russia investigation over following up on the Midyear"—the Hillary Clinton—"related investigative lead discovered on the Weiner laptop was free from bias."

Boy, is that an understatement. Here it is established beyond any reasonable doubt Strzok not only hated Trump, was trying to impress his mistress, but clearly, things he did showed their bias; and it is IG Horowitz's own words that it was Strzok's decision, heading up this investigation into Hillary Clinton's emails. Here they had tens or hundreds of thousands of emails that were found on the Anthony Weiner laptop, and it was Strzok's decision.

He had the authority to decide, and he did decide: We are not going to really investigate that. We are not going to make that a priority. We are going to push that aside and, instead, go after this so-called Russia investigation involving Trump.

That, even standing alone, is overwhelming evidence of bias that affected the investigation. I know Mr. Horowitz apparently was just trying to keep from making all of his Democratic friends mad, so he threw them this little gift: Clearly, there was all kinds of bias, but I will say in my conclusions that I couldn't find that bias affected

the investigation where clearly it did. He said it in his own words it was Strzok's decision, and he decided not to follow up on that.

In fact, with all of my friends across the aisle who continue to repeat the mantra that Comey's October press conference cost Hillary Clinton the election, despite the evidence that she was not a good candidate, she didn't do what was needed to honestly and openly win an election, when it came to these emails that needed to be investigated, it sounds a whole lot more like what happened was that even Comey calling that October press conference was a cover for Hillary Clinton, because the alternative—kept hearing from sources, I believe, that there were FBI agents who had found all these emails of Hillary Clinton's that were supposed to be gone. They didn't have them. They were destroyed. They were unavailable because she had obstructed justice. She had obstructed justice by destroying evidence.

They thought all these emails were gone, and all of a sudden FBI agents are in possession of these massive number of Clinton emails. And so Comey sat on them.

If Comey had not called that press conference, then it appears what was likely going to happen, you were either going to have FBI agents who learned from Comey how you go about leaking—and we saw the information from IG Horowitz that apparently there were agents at the top who were quite good at leaking information, even getting tickets and different things in return for their leaking, that those agents would have leaked that information.

And when it came out that they knew they had found all these missing Clinton emails and Comey was sitting on it, he was obstructing justice, then that would have doomed the Clinton campaign. She would have lost by a whole lot bigger once it came out that Comey was blocking, obstructing, not allowing them to investigate these newfound—well, they had been found for a month. They were sitting on them.

We found out at the hearing yesterday that, actually, Rosenstein made the decision not to allow Congress to have those for the last month. Who knows how long he may have known about them.

He really does need to be fired. He needs to go. Clearly, he has obstructed Congress' investigation. The question is how much obstruction of justice did Rosenstein do back in 2016. We don't know. But we do know there was obstruction.

Apparently, according to Horowitz, it was Strzok who had the authority to decide are we going to dig into these newly found or month-long found emails from Hillary Clinton or are we just going to set those aside because they might hurt Hillary Clinton's election and, instead, go after this Russia investigation—totally bogus—based on purchases by the Clinton campaign.

□ 1815

And Strzok—his decision—he decided, I am not going to pursue this evidence that actually blows Hillary Clinton's claims out of the water. Instead, we are going to pursue Trump.

That is one overwhelming piece of evidence where the bias affected the investigation. It could have blown the campaign out of the water where it wouldn't have even been close.

But rather than Comey allowing it to leak out, there were also rumors—and, like I say, I had good sources and others had good sources and indications that we might even have one or more FBI agents resign over Comey and Strzok obstructing the Clinton email being investigated. If FBI agents had either resigned and had a press conference and disclosed how Strzok and Comey were obstructing justice and preventing the investigation into Hillary's emails that had been in their possession for a month, that would have devastated the Clinton campaign far worse.

So Comey, not wanting to hurt the Clinton campaign, preferring to hurt Trump, called a press conference. As I said in some interview back in October when I was asked about whether or not this was a serious investigation, I said: Well, if he comes back in 2 or 3 days and says there is nothing there, then we will know for certain that this was simply an effort to protect Hillary Clinton, because, clearly, they could not properly investigate all of those emails in such a short period of 2 or 3 days.

Sure enough, just a couple of days later, Comey comes out of a press conference: Gee, we have investigated this massive number of emails, and Hillary Clinton is clean.

So, rather than destroying her campaign, Comey's action, it appears—more likely, actually—saved her campaign and allowed it to be closer.

So that is just a little bit of information that I didn't get to yesterday.

Now, it is absolutely incredible what has gone on, not on our southern border—that is amazing enough—but all of the mayhem that has been raised by the media. All of the outrage that has been expressed by Democrats is really extraordinary when we look at the facts about what has been going on since 1997—not new laws, not terribly new laws that this administration is working with. Unlike the Obama administration, this administration has not seen fit to just speak new laws into existence.

Like with DACA, President Obama, like any good totalitarian monarch, spoke that he wanted this law. He didn't even sign the new royal edict; he just spoke it into law. Then Jeh Johnson, head of Homeland Security, drafted some memos to create it. Now, it overruled existing law, overruled law that had been passed by bipartisan efforts here in the House and Senate, signed by people like Bill Clinton and others. But, anyway, he spoke it into law.

Here we have an administration that really does want to follow the law. I had been down on the border all hours of the night and day as well. But during the Obama Presidency, I had been down on our border. I had seen children separated from the adults they were with talking to Border Patrol agents.

We have heard from ICE. Of course, what is being thrown figuratively and literally at ICE agents is really outrageous. What is being hurled in the way of both words and actions toward people simply following the law that even Democrats helped create is really outrageous.

There is an article here by Michelle Mark dated June 19 from Business Insider: "Several former Obama administration officials took to social media and news outlets last month to explain a gallery of years-old photos that showed immigrant children sleeping in shoddy conditions at a government-run holding facility in Arizona."

"The images, which the Associated Press first published in 2014, resurfaced recently for reasons that remain unclear, and quickly prompted viral outrage on Twitter. One particularly disturbing image showed two children sleeping on mattresses on the floor inside what appeared to be a cage."

That was the Obama administration, the very thing that people are going nuts about, screaming and hollering.

"A number of prominent liberals—and even a former Obama administration official—shared the photos, mistakenly believing they depicted the Trump administration's treatment of immigrant children who were forcibly separated from their parents."

Obviously, these former Obama officials did not realize that this was what they did to children. And then to be holier-than-thou with an administration that simply is enforcing the law the Obama administration often violated when they were guilty of actually following the law themselves? They could have made better conditions.

I am happy to report that the conditions I see under the Trump administration down on our southern border are much better than they were under the Obama administration. The facilities for children are much, much better. I mean, there were some really terrible situations that the Obama administration created down on our border during President Obama's terms, especially the second term. It was a bit shocking what was happening to children then.

It has been amazing. There was one child holding on to a fence, and that was used to show how terrible it was for this sweet little child. It turns out that was part of an immigration protest. This kid wasn't in any kind of cage. In fact, the other pictures that have now been discovered show that it was apparently some adult figure who was part of the protest and dragged the kid there, but it certainly was not someone caged by the Trump administration.

But this goes on to say: “Jon Favreau, who worked as a speechwriter for former President Barack Obama, tweeted, ‘This is happening right now, and the only debate that matters is how we force our government to get these kids back to their families as fast as humanly possible.’”

“Favreau said he later deleted the tweet after social media users pointed out that the photos were taken during the Obama administration. But by that point, critics had already rushed to accuse him of concealing Obama’s own harsh immigration tactics while condemning Trump’s.”

“Favreau said in a series of tweets that he made a ‘mistake’ by not checking the date of the photos before sharing them on Twitter. He explained that the photos were taken in 2014, when the Obama administration faced ‘an influx of unaccompanied minors who showed up at the border, fleeing violence from Central America.’”

Well, I can tell you, there were many of these people I saw all hours of the night that weren’t fleeing violence, but they had heard they had opportunities. I have been there when small children were being passed among—well, the Border Patrol is at one end of the group of people that had come in illegally asking questions, and they are shuffling around trying to decide who is going to claim this child. And then, on some occasions, they say: Oh, no, no, no, not with me, not with them. No, they are by themselves.

Well, I watched you just walk up here taking care of this child.

No, they were unaccompanied.

It is also interesting, with all of the outrage about the 12,000 children that were being so well taken care of, 10,000 of the 12,000 came unaccompanied, was the claim, and 40 percent of those coming are teenage males of gang age. We know, it turns out, many of them are gang members.

We know, just recently, there was an MS-13 member claiming a child. It may have been his child. But that child did not need to be with a MS-13 gang member.

We know, during the Obama administration, during the George W. Bush administration, and during the Clinton administration, it was not uncommon to separate children from a parent if they believed the parent might not be in the best interest of the child, may be a threat to the child.

Again, for heaven’s sake, these children, whether accompanied or unaccompanied, were placed by their parents in a position to cross deadly territory, be subjected to sex trafficking themselves, be subjected to becoming drug traffickers. If those things happen in this country, I have seen it as a judge when there were hearings—I didn’t do juvenile law, but I saw it. I had seen hearings.

You have parents, if they let their child here in Texas, in America, do the things that parents from other countries allowed their children to go

through, there is a good chance, at least in Texas, Child Protective Services would have grabbed that child and said: This is an unfit parent to let them go across a desert, to let them be in the hands of gang members, or to let them be subjected to sex trafficking and drug trafficking.

I have also been there when the Border Patrol has asked—it wasn’t on their list—but frequently they would ask: How much do you pay to the gang or the drug cartel to bring you in?

\$5,000, \$6,000, \$7,000, \$8,000.

Where did you get that kind of money? You didn’t have that kind of money.

Often, the final answer, after, \$1,000 or \$1,500 here, or \$2,000 there, or somebody from America sent this: Well, where did you get the rest? Often the final answer was: They are going to let me work that off when I get to where we are going.

Well, how do you work it off?

It is either drug trafficking or sex trafficking is the way that normally got worked off. Any parent that would subject their children to that—like I say, 10,000 out of 12,000 were unaccompanied who are down there right now when they are trying to figure out what is to be done.

The outrage ought to be with parents that would allow that to happen, and the outrage ought to be with a political party or with any political people that would hang out a shiny object of a great life here—free benefits, welfare—if you will just come across a desert, risk sex trafficking, risk drug trafficking, come on.

Now, the border has to be secure. That is the humane thing to do. If we stop the \$80 billion or so in drugs that came across our border, estimated last year by some, then the corruption in Mexico and Central America dries up to next to nothing. Those people would end up with a better economy, a better life, and better jobs. That is what we would do if we were a true caring, loving neighbor. We would make sure that our wall made a good neighbor stop the drug trafficking.

And these poor people who made to be drug mules, made to be drug traffickers, they are poisoning Americans. I mean, it is a matter of national security.

Donald Trump is exactly right to be so concerned and to want a zero-tolerance policy, and so is Jeff Sessions.

□ 1830

We can deal with this issue, but it is a very small percentage that are actual parents that are being separated from children. And there were parents being separated from children in the prior administration, even though the Dallas Morning News obviously either doesn’t want to admit it or wants to remain in total blissful ignorance. So these things have happened, and the Trump administration is trying to fix them and do things correctly.

Now, it turns out that when our Homeland Security Secretary Nielsen

was at a Mexican restaurant Tuesday night, she had people screaming at her trying to ruin her dinner and accusing her of doing what others in the Obama administration had done. It turns out one of those was an employee at the Department of Justice.

Some would say, but, again, political beliefs shouldn’t adversely affect a job with the government.

Well, it should when that job is enforcing the law. When you work for the Department of Justice and you are going to scream at people because they are following the law, then you should not be at the Department of Justice.

This person that was screaming and becoming a nuisance and creating problems and screaming out in ignorance should not be working at the Department of Justice, just as anybody who is biased for Hillary Clinton or against Hillary Clinton should not have been investigating Hillary Clinton. Anybody biased for or against Donald Trump should not have been investigating Donald Trump. It does matter.

I guarantee you Democratic criminal defense attorneys, even though there was some expressed feigned outrage, if they had a client who had run for office that was on trial for a criminal charge, that criminal defense attorney would want to know which jurors supported their client and which were totally opposed to their client in the last election. They would want to know that. Maybe you do that in chambers, maybe you do that at the bench, but I have a feeling—I have heard those claims from defense attorneys about the right to know about things. Sometimes it is very personal information, but if it tells a defense attorney about someone’s bias or prejudice within a potential juror, that defense attorney really does have a right to know in order to protect their client and to ensure that justice is done by fair and impartial arbiters.

But we have got people at the Justice Department still that are not fair, they are not impartial.

There is a new record here, according to Paul Bedard’s article yesterday from the Washington Examiner, “New Record, 99 Percent of Seized Border Kids From Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador.”

Obama prosecuted nearly half a million illegal aliens. He did. I think in those situations, they were trying to follow the law.

The only reason I bring that up is the feigned outrage. For some people, it is not feigned; they are really outraged, because they really don’t realize what has gone on before. Some of us have seen it.

Now, a 100 percent no-tolerance policy, that is much stricter than the Obama administration. But President Obama and Hillary Clinton are both on video talking about how they were going to do those type of things to discourage people from coming in illegally. And now they really are feigning outrage, and it needs to stop.

Let's work together for a solution.

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

AMERICAN IMMIGRATION IS AN AMERICAN PROBLEM, NOT AN IMMIGRANT PROBLEM

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Kevin Portteus, professor at Hillsdale College, made an interesting observation in his excellent study, "Immigration and the American Founding":

America's immigration problem is not with immigrants, but with Americans. In order for the Founders' policies to be intelligible and effective, America must return to the Founders' principles of justice. If America is not based on those principles, then it is like the other nations, and the idea of America as an asylum becomes muddled and incoherent. If we accept feudal obligation and its modern incarnation, birthright citizenship, then the ideas of government by consent and the right to emigrate become obscured. If we forget that consent is reciprocal and that the purpose of government is to protect the inalienable natural rights of its citizens, then the right and duty to restrict immigration and naturalization becomes nothing but an expression of racism and nativism. If we forget our heritage as a refuge for the virtuous and oppressed of the world, then we lose a significant part of what makes America exceptional.

Mr. Speaker, I am not an immigration expert. I do, however, know and love the history of our great Republic. I speak before America, not as a member of any party, but as an American who has nearly given my life on multiple battlefields in defense of her Constitution. As such, I am disturbed at the abandonment of principle by both sides of the aisle, the acceptance of sound bites in lieu of facts, and the framing of popular, even if opposing sentiments that are used to leverage political power.

In our national immigration debate, we suffer much bitter contention, with political power being used to divide America on her foundations in the hopes that one side may force the other into its will. But what of it? What if we had no respect for the law? What if we closed the door to the poor and wretched masses? What if we had no security on our borders? What if we allowed privileged classes to have distinction in immigration? Either side prevailing on such a course would end the great experiment of liberty and equality among mankind as embodied in the very fabric of our Nation.

And with all the critique about the use of Biblical passages to support various views on immigration, how about this one from Proverbs 29:12 that can be leveled against both sides of our national government:

If a ruler pays attention to lies, all his servants become wicked.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Portteus is correct that America's immigration problem is

not with immigrants, but with Americans. We should take his counsel to examine how a people bound by liberty and equality, rather than birthright and obligation, should govern themselves and accommodate those seeking the same.

Our Founders were driven by the premise that all are created equal, endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In that vein, they categorically rejected the notion of obligation to government or servitude to landholders simply by the happenstance of one's birth.

Washington framed it simply, but effectively: "The bosom of America is open to receive not only the opulent and respectable stranger, but the oppressed and persecuted of all nations and religions; whom we shall welcome to a participation of all our rights and privileges, if by decency and propriety of conduct, they appear to merit the enjoyment."

Thomas Jefferson conveyed it along these lines:

If an individual chooses to depart from the regime of his birth and to associate with a new one, he has an inherent right to do so.

Jefferson, in his first address to Congress, put it this way: "Shall we refuse the unhappy fugitives from distress . . . hospitality . . . ? Shall oppressed humanity find no asylum on this globe? . . . Might not the general character and capabilities of a citizen be safely communicated to every one manifesting a bona fide purpose of embarking his life and fortunes permanently with us."

To redress the dilemma of various States creating a patchwork of standards for who should be allowed or not allowed as immigrants, the framers of the Constitution settled the issue by granting Congress the power to "establish a uniform naturalization rule."

Enjoying the fruit of such immigration policy, the French-born immigrant J. Hector St. John de Crevecoeur, in his "Letters from an American Farmer" praised the political liberty and economic prosperity of America, saying: "Europe contains hardly any other distinctions but lords and tenants; this fair country alone is settled by freeholders, the possessors of the soil they cultivate, members of the government they obey, and the framers of their own laws, by means of their representatives . . . It is here that the idle may be employed, the useless become useful, and the poor become rich."

The first Federal naturalization law passed by this Congress under the Constitution required 2 years' residency in the United States, 1 year's residency in the State he was applying for citizenship, an oath of loyalty, and as an indication of the times, rather than many of the framers' expressed wishes, that the applicant be a free white person. Subsequent statutes increased the

length of time to as much as 14 years, but by 1802, Congress settled on the 5-year residency requirement that persists to this day. No other restrictions were imposed. No incentives or encouragements by class were instituted.

Later, Congress abolished the immigration slave trade in 1808 and further eliminated the notion of class structure with the Passenger Act of 1819 to end indentured servitude immigration. It would take another 50 years to secure the rights of all men under the law, but the steady efforts of many were realized without any alteration of the framers' original principles. After the Civil War, the Fourteenth, Fifteenth, and Sixteenth Amendments simply and rightly applied those principles to all Americans, naturally born, freed, or naturalized.

American anathema to class distinction guided her well in the first century, culminating with the Civil War, as all men truly became equal under the law along the framework of the Founders' principles. Rejected was an obligation to government by birth, but rather, the American ideal was to voluntarily consent to government by choice. This ideal in its purist sense was upheld until the 1898 Supreme Court decision *United States v. Wong Kim Ark* which somewhat returned the feudalistic citizenship by birthright contrary to the views of many of the Founders. While doing good in securing certain rights for certain individuals, it also set up the construct to eliminate the rights of those not naturally born who wished to associate as law abiding immigrants by choice.

American immigration historically has largely been driven by world events. Prior to the Great Depression and World War II, annual immigration comprised .64 of 1 percent of the United States population, with spikes as high as 1.61 percent. Immigrants expanded the country, cultivated the fields, spiked the railroads, and laid the cities across the Nation. By the time we entered the First World War in 1917, fully one-third of the Nation's population had been born overseas or had a parent who was an immigrant. A full 20 percent of the doughboys we sent to France in World War I were not even born in the United States, fighting to secure our liberty and also a new place in the world in what became an American century.

Immigration dropped sharply due to economics, fear, and war with the Great Depression and World War II, but migrant workers still came by the hundreds of thousands during the war. Laborers from Mexico and Central America entered the agricultural fields and farms as we fed our armies and ourselves.

An inseparable bond between agriculture and the guest worker resulted in demand for farm workers and industrial labor during the war. The United States Government recognized this with the Bracero accord that allowed for these workers to come annually to