

that help States prepare for and respond to earthquakes.

The National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program Reauthorization Act is a result of bipartisan collaboration and work with the relevant agencies, congressional committees, private sector and State agency stakeholders.

I want to thank Representative ROHRABACHER for his initiative on moving the bill forward and working across the aisle and across the Capitol with Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN to get it across the finish line.

□ 1630

I also want to congratulate him for his 30 years of service to the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee; the Congress; and his constituents. Since joining the committee in 1989, he has been a dedicated advocate for our Nation's space exploration programs, energy research and innovation, and preparing our Nation for natural hazards.

I encourage my colleagues to support S. 1768 and send it to the President's desk.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We Californians know what suffering happens when you are unprepared for a wildfire. We have learned that lesson very tragically just recently. There is no need for us to suffer by being unprepared for the next earthquake. That is what this is all about.

I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and especially thank the chairman for the fact that we have worked together in a way that is really going to have a positive impact on so many people by preventing them from having to suffer what we have seen recently in the wildfires in California.

Mr. Speaker, although there is often disagreement in the people's House, we should never overlook those many areas of concurrence.

There are those who believe that human activity, for example, is causing a cataclysmic jump in the temperature of the planet. Others, however, disagree with this analysis and, thus, oppose policies that restrict human activities and drive up the cost of living a decent life. This issue has been a tumultuous division.

However, there are so many other areas in which we can and will focus on, not just in terms of what our committee does, but on which we have a wide acceptance on where precautionary measures are justified and needed. Research in understanding how buildings, bridges, and other infrastructure react to earthquakes is an example of something that I expect that we all agree on. We can see that even here in this debate.

I will not be here next year, but I wanted to mention just a few other science-related areas where bipartisan action could be effective and where the

costs of prevention are minimal as compared to the potential damage. These are things that we have worked on but have not come to a conclusion. Both the chairman and I won't be here next year, but I thought I would mention them.

For example, I hope there can be real progress made in the next few years when it comes to the protection of our planet from asteroids and comets, which have caused massive damage—even extinction—over the last 250 million years. Although we are searching in space near and far for these objects now, we have not organized or put in place the means to divert them or eliminate a threatening object when it is observed heading in our direction.

Another common ground issue should be protecting our space assets from orbital debris, which is basically a man-made minefield in space. We rely on our space-based assets for defense, science, farming, a huge portion of our commerce, and even for navigating your car to a local market. There are many other plans for new satellite constellations and new expectations for increased numbers of people visiting space.

Thus, we will be expanding, hopefully, observation and monitoring of what is going on with the planet for the benefit of the people of the planet. But none of these uses of space will ever be put to work for bettering our lives unless we deal with the debris issue. If we are not protecting our space-based assets, we are risking our future, our way of life, our security, and our prosperity.

I am sorry we did not get this done. It was a bipartisan effort. We just didn't get that, among all the things we were working on this Congress. But I hope the next Congress will succeed and will focus on those two issues where we can cooperate in a very bipartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the moving forward of S. 1768, the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program Reauthorization Act of 2018.

May we always be prepared to deal with natural disasters, thus protecting our people from needless tragedies. We will always live with the potential of a severe earthquake, but we can minimize the loss and suffering. That is what we are doing here with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the bill being signed into law by the President by the end of the year, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1768, the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program Reauthorization Act. This bill will reauthorize seismological research and warning systems through Fiscal Year 2022.

Congress established the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program (NEHRP) to carry out a longterm, inter-agency earthquake research program. NEHRP focuses on earthquake warning, hazard reduction, and

minimizing loss after earthquakes. Earthquake early warning systems can provide several additional seconds of warning before the strongest ground shaking arrives, enough to save lives and protect critical infrastructure.

In Northwest Oregon, it is not a question of if, but when, an earthquake along the Cascadia Subduction Zone will hit our state. The U.S. Geological Survey, in collaboration with the University of Oregon, the University of Washington, Caltech, and University of California, Berkeley, developed ShakeAlert, an early earthquake warning system. The technology has been tested and is proven to work effectively. Federal investments in these programs are critical. Although it is difficult if not impossible to know when and where the next large earthquake will occur, we must do everything that we can to prepare ourselves and our communities to mitigate destruction and save lives. Reauthorizing NEHRP is an important step in recognizing the science behind earthquakes and other natural disasters such as tsunamis and landslides.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1768.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REDESIGNATING A FACILITY OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 3389) to redesignate a facility of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3389

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REDESIGNATION OF NASA INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION FACILITY.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—The National Aeronautics and Space Administration Independent Verification and Validation Facility in Fairmont, West Virginia, is hereby redesignated as the “Katherine Johnson Independent Verification and Validation Facility”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Katherine Johnson Independent Verification and Validation Facility”.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLOBAL FRAGILITY AND VIOLENCE REDUCTION ACT OF 2018

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5273) to reduce global fragility and violence by improving the capacity of the United States to reduce and address the causes of violence, violent conflict, and fragility in pilot countries, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5273

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Global Fragility and Violence Reduction Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) According to the United Nations, an unprecedented 68.5 million people around the world, the highest level ever recorded, are currently forcibly displaced from their homes.

(2) According to the World Bank, violence and violent conflict are now the leading causes of displacement and food insecurity worldwide, driving 80 percent of humanitarian needs, with the same conflicts accounting for the majority of forcibly displaced persons every year since 1991.

(3) According to the World Health Organization, preventable forms of violence kill at least 1.4 million people each year. According to the Institute for Economics and Peace, violence containment costs the global economy \$14.76 trillion a year, or 12.4 percent of the world’s GDP. If violence were to decrease uniformly across the world by just 10 percent, the global economy would gain \$1.48 trillion each year.

(4) Violence and violent conflict underpin many of the United States Government’s key national security challenges. Notably, violent conflicts allow for environments in which terrorist organizations recruit and thrive, while the combination of violence, corruption, poverty, poor governance, and underdevelopment often enables transnational gangs and criminal networks to wreak havoc and commit atrocities worldwide.

(5) According to new research by the University of Maryland and University of Pittsburgh, exposure to violence increases support for violence and violent extremism. Research increasingly finds exposure to violence as a predictor of future participation in violence, including violent extremism.

(6) United States foreign policy and assistance efforts in highly violent and fragile states remain governed by an outdated patchwork of authorities that prioritize responding to immediate needs rather than solving the problems that cause them.

(7) Lessons learned over the past 20 years, documented by the 2013 Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction Lessons Learned Study, the 2016 Fragility Study Group report, and the 2018 Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Lessons Learned Study on Stabilization, show that effective, sustained United States efforts to reduce violence and stabilize fragile and violence-affected states require clearly defined goals and strategies, adequate long-term funding, rigorous and iterative conflict analysis, coordination across the United States Government, including strong civil-military coordination, and integration with national and sub-national partners, including local civil society organizations, local justice systems, and local governance structures.

(8) The “Stabilization Assistance Review” released in 2018 by the Departments of State and Defense and the United States Agency for International Development states, “The United States has strong national security and economic interests in reducing levels of violence and promoting stability in areas affected by armed conflict.” The Review further states, “Stabilization is an inherently political endeavor that requires aligning U.S. Government efforts—diplomatic engagement, foreign assistance, and defense—toward supporting locally legitimate authorities and systems to peaceably manage conflict and prevent violence.”

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to—

(1) ensure that all relevant Federal departments and agencies coordinate to achieve coherent, long-term goals for programs designed to prevent violence, stabilize conflict-affected areas, and address the long-term causes of violence and fragility, including when implementing the Global Fragility and Violence Reduction Initiative described in section 5(a);

(2) seek to improve global, regional, and local coordination of relevant international and multilateral development and donor organizations regarding efforts to prevent violence, stabilize conflict-affected areas, and address the long-term causes of violence and fragility in fragile and violence-affected countries, and, where practicable and appropriate, align such efforts with multilateral goals and indicators;

(3) expand and enhance the effectiveness of United States foreign assistance programs and activities to prevent violence, stabilize conflict-affected areas, and address the long-term causes of violence and fragility, including programs intended to improve the indicators described in section 5(d)(1);

(4) support the research and development of effective approaches to prevent violence, stabilize conflict-affected areas, and address the long-term causes of violence and fragility; and

(5) improve the monitoring, evaluation, learning, and adaptation tools and authorities for relevant Federal departments and agencies working to prevent violence, stabilize conflict-affected areas, and address the long-term causes of violence and fragility.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ASSISTANCE FOR THE GLOBAL FRAGILITY AND VIOLENCE REDUCTION INITIATIVE.

It is the sense of Congress that the President, the Secretary of State, the Administrator of USAID, the Secretary of Defense, and the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, should work with Congress to provide sufficient types and levels of funding to—

(1) allow for more adaptive program planning and implementation under the initiative and priority country or regional plans required under section 5, including through exemptions from specific and minimum funding levels when such exemptions would make programs better able to respond to monitoring and evaluation or changed circumstances in relevant countries;

(2) better integrate conflict and violence reduction activities into other program areas where appropriate; and

(3) contribute to the creation of transparent and accountable multilateral funds, initiatives, and strategies to enhance and better coordinate both private and public efforts to prevent violence, stabilize conflict-affected areas, and address the long-term causes of violence and fragility.

SEC. 5. GLOBAL INITIATIVE TO REDUCE FRAGILITY AND VIOLENCE.

(a) INITIATIVE.—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of the

United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the Secretary of Defense, and the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, shall establish an interagency initiative, to be referred to as the “Global Initiative to Reduce Fragility and Violence”, to prevent violence, stabilize conflict-affected areas, and address the long-term causes of violence and fragility.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of USAID, the Secretary of Defense, and the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, shall develop and submit to the appropriate congressional committees an interagency implementation plan for the Global Initiative to Reduce Fragility and Violence established pursuant to subsection (a) that includes the following:

(1) Descriptions of the overall goals, objectives, criteria, and metrics guiding the implementation, including with respect to prioritizing countries and measuring progress.

(2) A list of the priority countries and regions selected pursuant to subsection (d)(2).

(3) Identification of the roles and responsibilities of each participating Federal department or agency, while ensuring that with respect to activities relating to stabilization—

(A) the Department of State shall be the overall lead for establishing United States foreign policy and advancing diplomatic and political efforts;

(B) USAID shall be the lead implementing agency for development, humanitarian, and related non-security programs;

(C) the Department of Defense shall support the activities of the Department of State and USAID as appropriate, including by providing requisite security and reinforcing civilian efforts, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and Administrator of USAID; and

(D) other Federal departments and agencies shall support the activities of the Department of State and USAID as appropriate, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and Administrator of USAID.

(4) Identification of the authorities, staffing, and other resource requirements needed to effectively implement the initiative.

(5) Descriptions of the organizational steps the Department of State, USAID, the Department of Defense, and each other relevant Federal department or agency will take to improve planning, coordination, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, adaptive management, and iterative learning with respect to the programs under such initiative.

(6) Descriptions of the steps each relevant Federal department or agency will take to improve coordination and collaboration under such initiative with international development organizations, international donors, multilateral organizations, and the private sector.

(7) Descriptions of potential areas of improved public and private sector research and development, including with academic, philanthropic, and civil society organizations, on more effective approaches to preventing violence, stabilizing conflict-affected areas, and addressing the long-term causes of violence and fragility.

(8) Plans for regularly evaluating and updating, on an iterative basis—

(A) the Global Initiative to Reduce Fragility and Violence;

(B) the interagency implementation plan described in this subsection; and

(C) the priority country and regional plans described in subsection (c).