

to the Federal Chief Information Officer, and it would require direct reporting of that individual to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. It is very, very important.

Second, it would establish the position of Federal Chief Information Security Officer, who would report to the Federal CIO and assist OMB in the cybersecurity efforts.

Finally, this very important bill would require the Federal CIO to submit a proposal on consolidating IT across Federal agencies, especially smaller agencies, through the use of shared services.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to vote in favor of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman for yielding time to me on this important piece of legislation.

It should come as no surprise to anyone in this Chamber that technology is integrated into every facet of our daily lives. We have come a long way since the bill that established the role of the Federal Chief Information Officer, the E-Government Act, was originally passed.

Less than 50 percent of the U.S. population had home access to the internet in 2001 when this was first passed. Now, nearly every American has access to the internet.

Just 62 percent of Americans had cell phones when the original bill was passed. Now, 95 percent of Americans own cell phones, and 77 percent of those are smartphones.

Mobile apps were nonexistent in 2002. Today, over 2.2 million apps are available to consumers.

This bill recognizes how far technology has come. It codifies the position of the Federal Chief Information Officer and elevates the office to report directly to the head of the Office of Management and Budget.

The bill also establishes the role of the Federal Chief Information Security Officer, FCISO, who reports directly to the Federal CIO and will lead OMB cybersecurity efforts.

Empowering CIOs at the Federal agencies is consistent with the principles of one of the signature pieces of legislation on IT reform, the Federal IT Acquisition and Reform Act. The Federal CIO should be treated no differently. The Federal CIO must have the statutory and organizational authority to succeed, and this bill achieves just that.

The bill does more than just rename the office. It makes a clear statement that the Federal CIO is in charge of coordinating IT policy across the government.

This bill passed the House last Congress by a vote of 391-0, and I want to thank my friends—Representatives

ROBIN KELLY, MARK MEADOWS, and GERRY CONNOLLY—for their continued support for this important initiative. And I would like to thank Chairman CUMMINGS and Ranking Member JORDAN for making sure this important piece of legislation comes to the floor.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I think this piece of legislation is in the spirit of what Congress needs to be doing in terms of updating where we are in dealing with technology and the need for adequate oversight. This bill acknowledges that Federal technology policy has not kept up with the pace of technology integration by our Federal agencies.

This bill codifies the position of Federal CIO, emphasizing the importance of the role to the formation of governmentwide technology policy; and this bill promotes organized, cost-efficient, and secure technology used throughout the Federal Government.

I would like to again thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) for introducing this bill, along with the many bipartisan supporters of it.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, vote for it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to join my colleague, Congresswoman FOXX, in thanking Mr. HURD, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Congresswoman KELLY for all the hard work that they put into this legislation.

So often in our Congress, we are blessed to have somebody like Mr. HURD, who is very, very familiar with these sometimes very complex issues, and he brings just a reasonable approach to coming up with bipartisan solutions to the problems that are facing our country and, just as significant, bringing solutions that will prevent problems from happening. So I want to thank him for working so hard on this, along with our colleagues, Mr. CONNOLLY and Ms. KELLY.

Again, Madam Speaker, I urge all of our Members to vote in favor of this bill. It is a significant piece of legislation.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 247, the Federal CIO Authorization Act of 2019, introduced by my colleague, Congressman WILL HURD. I am happy to co-sponsor this bill, which the House of Representatives passed last year under suspension of the rules.

This bill rebrands the Office of Electronic Government at the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and helps bring it into the 21st century by renaming it the Office of the Federal Chief Information Officer. This new name more appropriately characterizes the important

role the Office plays across the federal government in coordinating federal information technology (IT) policy and providing guidance to agencies. Currently, the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government is informally called the Federal Chief Information Officer (CIO), so it is long overdue for Congress to make this change in statute, as this bill will do. H.R. 247 will also rename the E-Government Fund, the “Federal IT Fund” which better describes the purpose of the account.

More importantly, this bill establishes the Federal Chief Information Security Office (CISO) within the office of the Federal CIO. The Federal CISO (pronounced SISSO) will be appointed by the president and be responsible for carrying out the cybersecurity duties of the OMB Director, including the responsibilities under the Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA). This position was created by President Obama to address the increasing risk of cyberattacks and the need to better protect our government’s data and information across the federal government. However, it was not until a year and half into the Trump Administration that the President named Grant Schneider the permanent Federal CISO. My hope is that this position will foster effective coordination of cybersecurity policy across the federal government, providing agencies with guidance to secure their IT systems and better defend against cyber-attacks.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 247.

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.

GRANT REPORTING EFFICIENCY AND AGREEMENTS TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2019

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 150) to modernize Federal grant reporting, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 150

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 “Grant Reporting Efficiency and Agreements Transparency Act of 2019” or the “GREAT Act”.

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) modernize reporting by recipients of Federal grants and cooperative agreements by creating and imposing data standards for the information that grants and cooperative agreement recipients must report to the Federal Government;

(2) implement the recommendation by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, under section 5(b)(6) of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note), which includes the development of a “comprehensive

taxonomy of standard definitions for core data elements required for managing Federal financial assistance awards";

(3) reduce burden and compliance costs of recipients of Federal grants and cooperative agreements by enabling technology solutions, existing or yet to be developed, by both the public and private sectors, to better manage data recipients already provide to the Federal Government; and

(4) to strengthen oversight and management of Federal grants and cooperative agreements by agencies through consolidated collection and display of and access to open data that has been standardized, and where appropriate, transparency to the public.

SEC. 3. DATA STANDARDS FOR GRANT REPORTING.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Subtitle V of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 63 the following new chapter:

“CHAPTER 64—DATA STANDARDS FOR GRANT REPORTING

“SEC. 6401. DEFINITIONS.

“In this chapter:

“(1) AGENCY.—The term ‘agency’ has the meaning given that term in section 552(f) of title 5.

“(2) CORE DATA ELEMENTS.—The term ‘core data elements’ means data elements that are not program-specific in nature and are required by agencies for all or the vast majority of Federal grant and cooperative assistance recipients for purposes of reporting.

“(3) DIRECTOR.—The term ‘Director’ means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

“(4) FEDERAL AWARD.—The term ‘Federal award’—

“(A) means the transfer of anything of value for a public purpose of support or stimulation authorized by a law of the United States, including financial assistance and Government facilities, services, and property;

“(B) includes grants, subgrants, awards, and cooperative agreements; and

“(C) does not include—

“(i) conventional public information services or procurement of property or services for the direct benefit or use of the Government; or

“(ii) an agreement that provides only—

“(I) direct Government cash assistance to an individual;

“(II) a subsidy;

“(III) a loan;

“(IV) a loan guarantee; or

“(V) insurance.

“(5) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the head of the standard-setting agency.

“(6) STANDARD-SETTING AGENCY.—The term ‘standard-setting agency’ means the Executive department designated under section 6402(a)(1).

“(7) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means each State of the United States, the District of Columbia, each commonwealth, territory or possession of the United States, and each federally recognized Indian Tribe.

“SEC. 6402. DATA STANDARDS FOR GRANT REPORTING.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) DESIGNATION OF STANDARD-SETTING AGENCY.—The Director shall designate the Executive department (as defined in section 101 of title 5) that issues the most Federal awards in a calendar year as the standard-setting agency.

“(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this chapter, the Secretary and the Director shall establish Governmentwide data standards for information reported by recipients of Federal awards.

“(3) DATA ELEMENTS.—The data standards established under paragraph (2) shall include, at a minimum—

“(A) standard definitions for data elements required for managing Federal awards; and

“(B) unique identifiers for Federal awards and entities receiving Federal awards that can be consistently applied Governmentwide.

“(b) SCOPE.—The data standards established under subsection (a) shall include core data elements and may cover any information required to be reported to any agency by recipients of Federal awards, including audit-related information reported under chapter 75 of this title.

“(c) REQUIREMENTS.—The data standards required to be established under subsection (a) shall, to the extent reasonable and practicable—

“(1) render information reported by recipients of Federal grant and cooperative agreement awards fully searchable and machine-readable;

“(2) be nonproprietary;

“(3) incorporate standards developed and maintained by voluntary consensus standards bodies;

“(4) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting and reporting principles; and

“(5) incorporate the data standards established under the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note).

“(d) CONSULTATION.—In establishing the data standards under subsection (a), the Secretary and the Director shall consult with, as appropriate—

“(1) the Secretary of the Treasury, to ensure that the data standards incorporate the data standards created under the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note);

“(2) the head of each agency that issues Federal awards;

“(3) recipients of Federal awards and organizations representing recipients of Federal awards;

“(4) private sector experts;

“(5) members of the public, including privacy experts, privacy advocates, and industry stakeholders; and

“(6) State and local governments.

“SEC. 6403. GUIDANCE APPLYING DATA STANDARDS FOR GRANT REPORTING.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this chapter—

“(1) the Secretary and the Director shall issue guidance to all agencies directing the agencies to apply the data standards established under section 6402 to all applicable reporting by recipients of Federal grant and cooperative agreement awards; and

“(2) the Director shall prescribe guidance applying the data standards to audit-related information reported under chapter 75.

“(b) GUIDANCE.—The guidance issued under this section shall—

“(1) to the extent reasonable and practicable—

“(A) minimize the disruption to existing reporting practices for agencies and for recipients of Federal grant and cooperative agreement awards; and

“(B) explore opportunities to implement modern technologies within Federal award reporting;

“(2) allow the Director to permit exceptions for categories of grants if the Director publishes a list of such exceptions, including exceptions for Indian Tribes and Tribal organizations consistent with the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act; and

“(3) take into consideration the consultation required under section 6402(d).

“SEC. 6404. AGENCY REQUIREMENTS.

“Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this chapter, the head of each agency shall ensure that all of the agency’s grants and cooperative agreements use data standards for all future information collection requests and amend existing information collection requests covered by chapter 35 of title 44 (commonly referred to as the Paperwork Reduction Act) to comply with the data standards established under section 6402, consistent with the guidance issued by the Secretary and the Director under section 6403.”.

“(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for subtitle V of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 63 the following new item:

“64. Data Standards for Grant Reporting 6401”.

“SEC. 4. SINGLE AUDIT ACT.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 7502(h) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting before “to a Federal clearinghouse” the following “in an electronic form consistent with the data standards established under chapter 64.”.

(2) Section 7505 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) Such guidance shall require audit-related information reported under this chapter to be reported in an electronic form consistent with the data standards established under chapter 64.”.

(b) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall issue guidance requiring audit-related information reported under chapter 75 of title 31, United States Code, to be reported in an electronic form consistent with the data standards established under chapter 64 of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 3.

“SEC. 5. CONSOLIDATION OF ASSISTANCE-RELATED INFORMATION; PUBLICATION OF PUBLIC INFORMATION AS OPEN DATA.

(a) COLLECTION OF INFORMATION.—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Director shall enable the collection, public display, and maintenance of Federal award information as a Governmentwide data set, using the data standards established under chapter 64 of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 3, subject to reasonable restrictions established by the Director to ensure protection of personally identifiable and otherwise sensitive information.

(b) PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary and the Director shall require the publication of recipient-reported data collected from all agencies on a single public portal. Information may be published on an existing Governmentwide website as determined appropriate by the Director.

(c) FOIA.—Nothing in this section shall require the disclosure to the public of information that would be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the “Freedom of Information Act”).

“SEC. 6. EVALUATION OF NONPROPRIETARY IDENTIFIERS.

(a) DETERMINATION REQUIRED.—The Director and the Secretary shall determine whether to use nonproprietary identifiers under section 6402(a)(3)(B) of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 3(a).

(b) FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED.—In making the determination required pursuant to subsection (a), the Director and the Secretary shall consider factors such as accessibility and cost to recipients of Federal awards, agencies that issue Federal awards,

private-sector experts, and members of the public, including privacy experts and privacy advocates.

(c) PUBLICATION AND REPORT ON DETERMINATION.—Not later than the earlier of 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act or the date on which the Secretary and Director establish data standards pursuant to section 6402(a)(2) of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 3(a), the Secretary and the Director shall publish and submit to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report explaining the reasoning for the determination made pursuant to subsection (a).

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the terms “agency”, “Director”, “Federal award”, and “Secretary” have the meaning given those terms in section 6401 of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 3(a).

SEC. 8. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall be construed to require the collection of data that is not otherwise required pursuant to any Federal law, rule, or regulation.

SEC. 9. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 150, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1345

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the Grant Reporting Efficiency and Agreements Transparency Act, introduced by Representatives VIRGINIA FOXX and JIMMY GOMEZ, would standardize reporting for recipients of Federal grants and cooperative agreements.

Grant recipients often have to report the same information in different ways because Federal agencies do not use the same forms or even the same terms to describe required information.

Madam Speaker, I have often said that the most important thing that we must do in our lives is to operate in an effective and efficient manner, and that also includes this Congress.

Under this bill, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Secretary of Health and Human Services would be required to establish governmentwide data standards for

grant reporting—again, efficiency and effectiveness.

The bill would encourage OMB and HHS to make the information that grant recipients report fully searchable and machine-readable. This would provide greater transparency into the money spent on the grants because spending data would be more usable.

The bill also would require that data collected from grant recipients be published on a single public portal.

Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman, Ms. FOXX, for working with Representative CONNOLY last Congress on the use of nonproprietary identifiers for grants and grantees. She, too, has worked in a hard, bipartisan way to bring solutions to problems, to bring practical solutions to problems.

The bill before us would allow this issue to be carefully considered to ensure it is workable.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate very much the comments made by my colleague from Maryland and appreciate particularly the emphasis this afternoon that has been placed on bipartisan bills and efficiency and effectiveness in the Federal Government. Those are values that should not be assigned to any particular party. They are important for our country. They are important for what we do.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE), who has been waiting patiently to speak on this bill.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 150, the Grant Reporting Efficiency and Agreements Transparency Act.

Madam Speaker, in 1788, Patrick Henry spoke at the Virginia Constitutional Convention, where he said: “The liberties of a people never were, nor ever will be, secure when the transactions of their rulers may be concealed from them.”

Transparency in government is an important principle for the preservation of our Republic, and it has been a priority for me during my tenure in the Virginia House of Delegates, where I was proud to sponsor legislation to put the entire State budget in a searchable online database.

In a similar vein, H.R. 150 would require that data on more than \$600 billion in Federal grants be standardized and published on a single online portal.

This is bipartisan legislation that would modernize the way the Federal Government does business by simplifying grant reporting information into a searchable, more manageable system.

Nonprofit, State and local governments, and small businesses will no longer be forced to spend meaningful work hours on filling out duplicative paperwork.

In return, this will not only make the grant reporting process more transparent but will make it more efficient and accessible to everyday Americans, thus saving taxpayer dollars and helping to fulfill the vision of another Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, who in his first inaugural said: “A wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government.”

Madam Speaker, I support this bill and urge its passage.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, we have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Virginia sharing his comments with us, and I would like to continue my remarks by thanking Representative JIMMY GOMEZ for helping author this piece of legislation, the Grant Reporting Efficiency and Agreements Transparency Act, or GREAT Act.

Representative GOMEZ has been an outstanding partner on this bipartisan bill to create more transparency, efficiency, and accountability in the Federal grant reporting process, and I thank him for his hard work.

Madam Speaker, in 2017, the Federal Government awarded \$662.7 billion in grants funding to State agencies, local and Tribal governments, agencies, nonprofits, universities, and organizations. This is a lot of hardworking tax dollars, even in terms of Washington-speak.

Within our Federal Government, there are 26 agencies awarding Federal grants, and all of them continue to rely on outdated, burdensome, document-based forms to collect and track grant dollars. Society has moved into a new age of information and technology, and it is time that our government follows suit.

The GREAT Act represents bipartisan legislation to modernize the Federal grant reporting process. It does so by mandating a standardized data structure for information that recipients report to Federal agencies.

Unless the reporting requirements for Federal grants are searchable, the auditing process will continue to yield waste and inefficiency at best, and potentially fraud and abuse at worst.

Adopting a governmentwide open data structure for all the information grantees report will alleviate compliance burdens; provide instant insights for grantor agencies and Congress; and enable easy access to data for oversight, analytics, and program evaluation.

Digitizing and, therefore, automating the reporting process would have a twofold effect. First, it allows grantees to maximize every dollar they receive

from the taxpayers to ensure it goes back into communities, supporting local businesses, organizations, and education.

Lastly, the GREAT Act has received broad support from an array of good government groups. The coalition endorsing the GREAT Act includes the Bipartisan Policy Center, American Association of Law Libraries, American Library Association, Association of Government Accountants, Association of Research Libraries, Data Coalition, Demand Progress, Government Accountability Project, Government Information Watch, Grant Professionals Association, National Grants Management Association, National Taxpayers Union, Native American Finance Officers Association, the Project on Government Oversight, R Street Institute, Senior Executives Association, and the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition.

In order to fix the way Federal grants are reported, we must move from a document-centric reporting system to a data superhighway. I urge my colleagues in the House and Senate to support the GREAT Act and bring grant reporting into the 21st century.

Madam Speaker, again, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this bill is intended to reduce the burden on applicants for Federal grants by enabling a more streamlined electronic process for completing grant applications. It would require HHS and OMB to develop uniform data standards for common application elements, such as the name and address of the organization and the name of the grant.

This will, hopefully, lead to the development of a uniform grant application that could be used across all Federal agencies. That would improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the grant application process immensely.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to support this measure, and I hope that the Senate will quickly pass it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, we have no further speakers.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues again, along with Mr. CUMMINGS, to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I again thank Ms. Foxx for this very important legislation and all of the bipartisan efforts that made it happen.

This bill and the others that we have dealt with today, where there was such great bipartisanship to get it done, I hope that we will take these as a model of what this Congress can do.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 150.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

REJECTING WHITE NATIONALISM AND WHITE SUPREMACY

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 41) rejecting White nationalism and White supremacy.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 41

Whereas, on January 10, 2019, Representative Steve King was quoted as asking, “White nationalist, white supremacist, Western civilization—how did that language become offensive?”;

Whereas a 2006 Federal Bureau of Intelligence (FBI) assessment defined a White supremacist as follows: “White supremacists believe that the white race is superior to all other races and was created to rule them. They view non-whites as subhuman and usually refer to them in derogatory terms”;

Whereas the same 2006 FBI intelligence assessment defined a White nationalist as follows: “To be a white nationalist is to be pro-white. The domestic white nationalist movement seeks to promote, honor, and defend the white race. They believe the white race is under attack from Jewish interests that dominate the government (referred to as the Zionist Occupied Government, or ZOG), the media, banking, and entertainment industries and act to the detriment of the white race. White nationalists view multiculturalism, diversity, and illegal immigration as direct assaults on the white race and race-mixing as akin to white genocide. They hope to appeal to mainstream whites, believing that the majority of white people do not understand the imminent or long-term threat to their race. Many contend that a race war, often referred to as RAHOWA, or Racial Holy War, is a certainty”;

Whereas White supremacy and White nationalism are contrary to the ideals of the United States of America, which was established according to the principle stated in the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal, a principle that was updated in 1848 in Seneca Falls, New York, to include all people;

Whereas while our country has often fallen short of these ideals, patriotic Americans have sought to form a more perfect Union by rejecting White nationalism and White supremacy, embracing inclusive patriotism, and welcoming immigrants from across the globe who have continuously enriched our Nation;

Whereas Abraham Lincoln in an 1858 speech said of the Founders, “Wise statesmen as they were, they knew the tendency of

prosperity to breed tyrants, and so they established these great self-evident truths, that when in the distant future some man, some faction, some interest, should set up the doctrine that none but rich men, or none but white men, were entitled to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began—so that truth, and justice, and mercy, and all the humane and Christian virtues might not be extinguished from the land; so that no man would hereafter dare to limit and circumscribe the great principles on which the temple of liberty was being built”;

Whereas Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., while recognizing that “no other nation can mean to us what our nation means”, condemned “nationalism perverted into chauvinism and isolationism” as “preached by . . . the advocates of white supremacy” and asked, “Will we continue to serve the false god of racial prejudice or will we serve the God who made of one blood all men to dwell upon the face of the earth?”;

Whereas President Reagan observed in a 1988 speech, “Anyone, from any corner of the Earth, can come to live in America and become an American . . . This, I believe, is one of the most important sources of America’s greatness. We lead the world because, unique among nations, we draw our people—our strength—from every country and every corner of the world. And by doing so we continuously renew and enrich our nation. While other countries cling to the stale past, here in America we breathe life into dreams. We create the future, and the world follows us into tomorrow. Thanks to each wave of new arrivals to this land of opportunity, we’re a nation forever young, forever bursting with energy and new ideas, and always on the cutting edge, always leading the world to the next frontier. This quality is vital to our future as a nation. If we ever closed the door to new Americans, our leadership in the world would soon be lost”;

Whereas according to FBI statistics, hate crimes nationwide increased in 2015, 2016, and 2017, the three most recent years for which data is available;

Whereas the perpetrator of the shooting that killed 9 African-American worshippers at Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina, on June 17, 2015, was motivated by White supremacy and White nationalism to carry out this act of terrorism, and stated that he would “be rescued by white nationalists after they took over the government”;

Whereas the perpetrator of the shooting that killed 11 Jewish worshippers at Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, on October 27, 2018, accused Jews of “waging a propaganda war against Western civilization” and “committing genocide” against Whites by promoting immigration and refugee resettlement, and accused the President of being “a globalist, not a nationalist” because of the “infestation” of Jews; and

Whereas Public Law 115-58, a joint resolution signed into law on September 14, 2017, rejects “white nationalism, white supremacists, the Ku Klux Klan, neo-Nazis, and other hate groups”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives once again rejects White nationalism and White supremacy as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contradictory to the values that define the people of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ADAMS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) each will control 20 minutes.