

**Chapter 1 : House Judiciary Committee**

*Get this from a library! Subcommittee hearings on H.R. to provide for the organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes.*

The approach you are taking to advance H. You abandoned our bipartisan partnership on border security in favor of a partisan approach, as evidenced by the fact that you introduced the bill on Thursday to coincide with its unveiling at the Republican Member Retreat. This approach puts Committee Members, some of whom are new to the Committee and the Congress, in the terrible position of having to vote on a page bill without the benefit of any legislative hearings or input by the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security. However, that is pretty much where the similarities end. For example, your bill would require, among other things - subterranean surveillance and detection technologies and new maritime assets in San Diego, man-portable unmanned aerial vehicles, sensors, and lighter than air ground surveillance in the Tucson Sector, and tower-based surveillance, mobile vehicle surveillance technologies, and ultralight aircraft detection in Yuma. It is evident that you did not consult with the Department in the development of this list. Further, you probably would have avoided being so prescriptive as to force the government to buy technologies that turn out to be ineffective or obsolete. Given your past criticism of those who have thrown money and resources at securing the border, I am surprised and disappointed that your bill takes this approach. Unless there is a border supplemental appropriation in the works, I do not see how the 64 infrastructure projects could be completed within this timeline. On the subject of timelines, experience with the Federal acquisitions process has taught me that when there are expedited timelines in an acquisition, the cost of the acquisition goes up, often significantly. To someone who has not read the bill, it hard to know what to think about it. Sure, it holds the Secretary of Homeland Security responsible for achievement and maintaining of operational control. However, when it comes time to bring down the hammer for non-performance, as is likely to occur given the unpredictability of appropriations and unrealistic standards for performance set in the bill, pretty much all that happens is that political appointees at the Department will not get raises, bonuses, training or be able to travel on government planes. Further, singling out the hardworking DHS employees in this manner is not likely to foster the morale turnaround that, previously, you indicated you would like to work with me to help Secretary Johnson achieve at the Department. I have met with Secretary Johnson and Commissioner Kerlikowske. There is no doubt in my mind that they are committed to bolstering security at the Southwest border. Under Secretary Johnson, an effort has been launched to more effectively coordinate the CBP assets and workforce on the Southwest border with the assets and personnel of U. Immigrations and Customs Enforcement, U. Under the current Administration, there is no question that the Southwest border is getting significant attention. However, in discussions about border security, it is easy to lose sight of the fact that border security is not just security between the ports of entry in Texas and Arizona. Border security is also about protecting Americans on inbound flights from foreign lands, our maritime borders, our Northern border, and our ports of entry. Given the diverse nature of the threats to our Nation, we cannot afford to have tunnel vision when it comes to border security. Adam Comis at Issues:

**Chapter 2 : House Committee on Homeland Security**

*Washington, D.C., November 15, - Today, the Subcommittee on Technology and Innovation held a hearing to evaluate current and future use of technology in securing America's borders from terrorists, drug traffickers and illegal immigration.*

He did not claim his privilege against self-incrimination, but contended that the Subcommittee was without lawful authority to interrogate him, and that its questioning violated his rights under the First Amendment. For refusing to answer, he was convicted of a violation of 2 U. United States, U. On this record, it cannot be said that, in questioning petitioner, the Subcommittee was not pursuing a valid legislative purpose. The question whether petitioner was then a member of the Communist Party was pertinent to a subject under inquiry. Petitioner was clearly apprised of the pertinency of the question when he was directed to answer it. The petitioner was convicted for having unlawfully refused to answer a question pertinent to a matter under inquiry before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities at a hearing in Atlanta, Page U. We granted certiorari, U. For the reasons that follow, we are of the view that the Court of Appeals was correct, and that its judgment must be affirmed. The Committee on Un-American Activities is a standing committee of the House of Representatives, elected at the commencement of each Congress. The extent, character and objects of Communist colonization and infiltration in the textile and other basic industries located in the South, and Communist Party propaganda activities in the South, the legislative purpose being: Entry and dissemination within the United States of foreign Communist Party propaganda, the legislative purpose being to determine the necessity for, and advisability of, amendments to the Foreign Agents Registration Act designed more effectively to counteract the Communist schemes and devices now used in avoiding the prohibitions of the Act. Any other matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee which it, or any subcommittee thereof, appointed to conduct this hearing, may designate. At the opening of the proceedings on that day, the Chairman of the Committee orally summarized the purposes of the hearings. The first witness to appear was Amendo Penha, who testified that he had been a member of the Communist Party from to , having joined the Party at the request of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He stated that he had served as a member of the National Textile Commission of the Party, which, he said, was set up to control and supervise the infiltration and colonization of the textile industry, particularly in the South. He described the "colonizer" system, which, he said, involves sending hard-core Party members into plants in jobs where they have close contact with rank-and-file workers. Penha described in some detail his trips throughout the South in compliance with the instructions of the National Textile Commission, and identified a number of individuals as "colonizers. Several other witnesses were then interrogated, some as to their activities as alleged Communist colonizers, others as to their connection with certain allegedly Communist-controlled publications. A number of these witnesses declined to answer most of the questions put to them. On the following day, the first witness before the subcommittee was Carl Braden. Although interrogated at length, he declined to answer questions relating to alleged Page U. After being sworn and stating his name, he declined to give his residence address, stating that, "As a matter of conscience and personal responsibility, I refuse to answer any questions of this committee. He was then asked the question which was to become the subject of the present indictment and conviction: Wilkinson, are you now a member of the Communist Party? This time he responded as follows: It is my opinion that this committee stands in direct violation, by its mandate and by its practices, of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. It is my belief that Congress had no authority to establish this committee in the first instance, nor to instruct it with the mandate which it has. However, the United States Supreme Court has held that, broad as these powers may be, the Congress cannot investigate into an area where it cannot legislate, and this committee tends, by its mandate and by its practices, to investigate into precisely those areas of free speech, religion, peaceful association and assembly, and the press wherein it cannot legislate, and therefore it cannot investigate. The Staff Director read part of the record of an earlier hearing in California where a witness had testified to knowing the petitioner as a Communist. The petitioner was then asked whether this testimony was true. He refused to answer this and several further

questions addressed to him. It is contended that the subcommittee was without authority to interrogate him because its purpose in doing so was to investigate public opposition to the Committee itself and to harass and expose him. It is argued that the petitioner was wrongly convicted because the question which he refused to answer was not pertinent to a question under inquiry by the subcommittee, so that a basic element of the statutory offense was lacking. It is said that, in any event, the pertinency of the question was not made clear to the petitioner at the time he was directed to answer it, so that he was denied due process. Finally, it is urged that the action of the subcommittee in subpoenaing and questioning him violated his rights under the First Amendment to the Constitution. House Rule XI, which confers investigative authority upon the Committee and its subcommittees, is quoted above. Because of the breadth and generality of its language, Rule XI cannot be said to state with adequate precision the subject under inquiry by a subcommittee at any given hearing. This the Court had occasion to point out in *Watkins v. See also Barenblatt v. The Court* in that case said that "[t]he authorizing resolution, the remarks of the chairman or members of the committee, or even the nature of the proceedings themselves" might reveal the subject under inquiry. Here, as in *Barenblatt*, other sources do supply the requisite concreteness. The resolution authorizing the subcommittee hearing in Atlanta was explicit. It clearly set forth three concrete areas of investigation: Communist infiltration into basic industry in the South, Communist Party propaganda in the South, and foreign Communist Party propaganda in the United States. Communist infiltration into basic southern industry, and Communist Party propaganda activities in that area of the country. Second, was the subcommittee pursuing a valid legislative purpose? Third, was the question asked the petitioner pertinent to the subject matter of the investigation? Fourth, was he contemporaneously apprised of the pertinency of the question? The question of basic congressional authorization was clearly decided in *Barenblatt v. The subjects under inquiry here surely fall within "the investigation of Communist activities generally. Nor can we say on this record that the subcommittee was not pursuing a valid legislative purpose. A number of other sources also indicate the presence of a legislative purpose. And the determination that purposes of the kind referred to are unassailably valid was a cornerstone of our decision in Barenblatt, Page U. The existence of such power has never been questioned by this Court, and it is sufficient to say, without particularization, that Congress has enacted or considered in this field a wide range of legislative measures, not a few of which have stemmed from recommendations of the very Committee whose actions have been drawn in question here. In the last analysis, this power rests on the right of self-preservation. As we have noted, a prime purpose of the hearings was to investigate Communist propaganda activities in the South. It therefore was entirely logical for the subcommittee to subpoena the petitioner after he had arrived at the site of the hearings, had registered as a member of a group which the subcommittee believed to be Communist dominated, and had conducted a public campaign against the subcommittee. The fact that the petitioner might not have been summoned to appear had he not come to Atlanta illustrates the very point, for, in that event, he might not have been thought to have been Page U. Moreover, it is not for us to speculate as to the motivations that may have prompted the decision of individual members of the subcommittee to summon the petitioner. As was said in *Watkins, supra*, "a solution to our problem is not to be found in testing the motives of committee members for this purpose. Such is not our function. See also *Barenblatt, supra*, U. It is to be emphasized that the petitioner was not summoned to appear as the result of an indiscriminate dragnet procedure, lacking in probable cause for belief that he possessed information which might be helpful to the subcommittee. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine a preliminary question more pertinent to the topics under investigation than whether petitioner was, in fact, a member of the Communist Party. As was said in *Barenblatt*, "petitioner refused to answer questions as to his own Communist Party affiliations, whose pertinency, of course, was clear beyond doubt. The contention that the pertinency of the question was not made clear to the petitioner at the time he was directed to answer it is equally without foundation. The basic issues which this contention raises were thoroughly canvassed by us in *Barenblatt*. It is sought to differentiate this case upon the basis that "the activities in which petitioner was believed to be participating consisted of public criticism of the Committee and attempts to influence public opinion to petition Congress for redress -- to abolish the Committee. The subcommittee had reasonable ground to suppose that the petitioner was an active Communist Party member, and that, as such, he possessed*

information that would substantially aid it in its legislative investigation.

**Chapter 3 : Hearings and Markups - Committee on Foreign Affairs**

*Subcommittee on Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection Meeting Date: Friday, June 22, AM RHOB (Status: Scheduled).*

The subcommittee held a legislative hearing on May 24th, Congressman McClintock delivered the following opening statement: Fort Ontario was first established in to defend Americans during the French and Indian Wars – really the first time our nation dealt with organized terrorism. It played a role in the American Revolutionary War and the War of 1812 and served our country as hospital and training facilities and as a refugee center in the First and Second World Wars. In 1949, after nearly 75 years of active military use, Fort Ontario was transferred to the State of New York, that has operated and maintained it ever since. Dating back even farther is Fort Frederica, established by James Oglethorpe in 1733 to protect the southern boundary of the colony of Georgia from the Spanish – a reminder of the commitment of earlier generations to defend our Southern border. In keeping with our pledge to restore the Federal Government as a good neighbor to the surrounding communities, this bill comes to us with the unanimous support of the local governments and civic associations in the vicinity. The next measure involves the U.S. Marine Corps. It includes the iconic image of U.S. Marines raising the flag at Iwo Jima. The law establishing the memorial forbids any structures in proximity to the memorial which creates a fairly straight-forward mathematical problem. One million visitors a year. That disaster made dam safety the sine qua non of dam construction and contributed to the engineering safety that is central to our modern dams. This memorial, in the Los Padres National Forest, would be created entirely through private donations. The bill would create a 100-acre national monument encompassing the area devastated in the resulting flood. In keeping with our determination to restore public access to the public lands, it would protect existing road access and grazing permits that are already allowed within the proposed monument and would protect an area that has experienced significant theft and vandalism in recent years. Congressman Knight has worked with local officials and others in the community in developing this bill. In considering these bills, we need to be mindful of the enormous maintenance backlog that now confronts the National Park Service, and to minimize new commitments until that backlog is addressed. With that, I look forward to hearing from the members of Congress who have joined us to testify on their legislation, as well as our other witnesses. I now recognize the ranking member for her statement.

**Chapter 4 : Legislative Hearing on H.R. - House Committee on Natural Resources**

*H.R. 399, the Secure Our Borders First Act of Full Committee; Border and Maritime Security; View bill on calendrieldelascience.com To require the Secretary of Homeland Security to gain and maintain operational control of the international borders of the United States, and for other purposes.*

**Chapter 5 : Military Personnel (116th Congress) | Armed Services Republicans**

*H.R. 399 prescribes in painful detail fencing and road construction projects to be completed on an arbitrary timeline of 18 months. Unless there is a border supplemental appropriation in the works, I do not see how the 64 infrastructure projects could be completed within this timeline.*

**Chapter 6 : H.R. 399, The Horseracing Integrity Act of 2019 - Energy and Commerce Committee**

*Subcommittee Vote on H.R. 399, H.R. 399, H.R. 399, H.R. 399, Strengthening the Health Care Fraud Prevention Task Force Act of 2019, H.R. 399, To amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act and title XVIII of the Social Security Act, and H.R. 399.*

**Chapter 7 : Wilkinson v. United States :: U.S. ( ) :: Justia US Supreme Court Center**

*Legislative Hearing on: H.R. (Rep. John Curtis), To create the first Tribally managed national monument, and for other purposes. "Shash JĀja National Monument and Indian Creek National Monument Act".*

#### **Chapter 8 : Markup Statement of Ranking Member Thompson - H.R. | Committee on Homeland Security**

*I know there is no commitment more important to our country than the solemn vow we have made to the men and women in our armed forces.-Chairman Phil Roe, M.D.*

#### **Chapter 9 : Readiness (th Congress) | Armed Services Republicans**

*The Committee will meet to consider the following measures, or for other purposes: H.R. , Advancing America's Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act of Passed by a voice vote Amendment , offered by Rep. Hall (R-TX) - Approved by a voice vote.*