

Today, I will remember and keep alive the call to never forget.

□ 1215

# PROTECTING AMERICAN AGRICULTURE FROM FOREIGN ADVERSARIES ACT OF 2024

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1430, I call up the bill (H.R. 9456) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 with respect to foreign investments in United States agriculture, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. D'ESPOSITO). Pursuant to House Resolution 1430, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9456

*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 "Protecting American Agriculture from Foreign Adversaries Act of 2024".

## SEC. 2. INCLUSION OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ON COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN UNITED STATES AND CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL LAND TRANSACTIONS.

(a) INCLUSION ON THE COMMITTEE.—Section 721(k) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4565(k)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(8) INCLUSION OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall be a member of the Committee with respect to a covered transaction that involves—

"(A) agricultural land;

"(B) agriculture biotechnology; or

"(C) the agriculture industry, including agricultural—

"(i) transportation;

"(ii) storage; and

"(iii) processing."

(b) CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL LAND TRANSACTIONS.—Section 721(b)(1) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4565(b)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(I) CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL LAND TRANSACTIONS.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—After receiving notification from the Secretary of Agriculture of a reportable agricultural land transaction, the Committee shall determine—

"(I) whether the transaction is a covered transaction; and

"(II) if the Committee determines that the transaction is a covered transaction, whether the Committee should initiate a review pursuant to subparagraph (D), or take another action authorized under this section, with respect to the reportable agricultural land transaction.

"(ii) REPORTABLE AGRICULTURAL LAND TRANSACTION.—In this subparagraph, the term 'reportable agricultural land transaction' means a transaction—

"(I) that the Secretary of Agriculture has reason to believe is a covered transaction;

"(II) that involves the acquisition of an interest in agricultural land by a foreign person of the People's Republic of China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, or the Islamic Republic of Iran; and

"(III) with respect to which a person is required to submit a report to the Secretary of

Agriculture under section 2(a) of the Agricultural Foreign Investment Disclosure Act of 1978.

"(iii) SUNSET.—The requirements under this subparagraph shall terminate, with respect to a foreign person of the respective foreign country, on the date that the People's Republic of China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, or the Islamic Republic of Iran, as the case may be, is removed from the list of foreign adversaries in section 791.4 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. 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 the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9456, the Protecting American Agriculture from Foreign Adversaries Act of 2024. This important legislation would codify a new set of policies that were enacted under the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2024. H.R. 9456 would make those measures permanent.

I would like to begin by thanking the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for offering this legislation.

The bill is straightforward. It adds the Secretary of Agriculture as a permanent member of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, CFIUS, for any transactions related to the purchase of agricultural land, agricultural biotechnology, or any other transactions related to the U.S. agricultural industry.

The bill also provides a mechanism for USDA to notify CFIUS of particularly sensitive agricultural transactions. Then, the interagency process must determine whether a review is appropriate. This legislation guarantees that the Secretary of Agriculture will have a seat at the table.

Agriculture Secretary Perdue under the Trump administration and Secretary Vilsack under this administration both agree that having a permanent member of CFIUS is necessary. In fact, during the House Committee on Agriculture hearing earlier this Congress, Secretary Vilsack discussed the implications of a permanent placement of the USDA Secretary on CFIUS, saying: "Being a permanent member would allow us . . . to educate the

other members of CFIUS about what to look for and what to be sensitive to when it comes to agriculture and agricultural production."

I agree with the Secretary. USDA has the unique expertise that can benefit the other CFIUS members. That is why this bill is so important.

This bill is the combination of two pieces of legislation that received unanimous recorded votes as part of a Financial Services Committee markup last fall.

My legislation, the inclusion of the Agriculture Secretary as a CFIUS member, and my colleague from Missouri, BLAINE LUETKEMEYER's legislation, the USDA referral system, both enjoyed unanimous bipartisan support. In addition, slightly modified versions of these measures were enacted in the FY24 appropriations in March. I was pleased to see the policies become the law of the land.

H.R. 9456 would permanently authorize them rather than rely on the annual appropriations process.

The bill focuses the government's limited resources on foreign adversaries: the People's Republic of China, Russia, Iran, and North Korea. It is not about closing off the United States from the rest of the world.

For decades, Congress and the executive branch have upheld our country's commitment to an open investment climate. Foreign investment in the United States creates millions of jobs while boosting U.S. exports and expanding R&D budgets.

This legislation is consistent with our core American values and consistent with the unanimous bipartisan legislation passed in the Financial Services Committee.

Since the 1970s, USDA has been responsible for the collection of foreign ownership in U.S. agricultural land. This piece of legislation, as with the bipartisan committee-passed version and the provision currently in law as appropriations language, empowers USDA to flag foreign persons and entities for CFIUS to consider.

To object to this legislation is to object to current law, existing practices, and bipartisan consensus.

CFIUS' mandate remains clear. It must stay focused on national security issues, whether in agriculture or any other sector.

I am hopeful this bill will soon find its way to the President's desk so that the growing cooperation between CFIUS and USDA can continue, allowing CFIUS to take advantage of the subject matter expertise housed at the Department of Agriculture. Food and agricultural security is a critical component of our national security, and this legislation recognizes that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I would like to take a moment to acknowledge

the 23rd anniversary of the September 11 terrorist attacks. Today will serve as a reminder that we should work hard to guard against terrorism and always stand against hate.

Mr. Speaker, moving to the debate on H.R. 9456, I would like to start by noting that Democrats, especially those serving on the Financial Services Committee, have a strong record of working with Republicans to counter threats from the People's Republic of China. In fact, just yesterday, the House passed two bills from our committee.

Unfortunately, H.R. 9456 is not an example of that kind of bipartisanship. In fact, this bill undermines a bipartisan law that we passed just 6 months ago. Yes, it was 6 months ago that the House and Senate worked across the aisle and with the Biden-Harris administration to pass legislation that would protect our national security from adversarial countries like China acquiring critical agricultural land in the United States.

To help review foreign investments involving U.S. agriculture, this bipartisan law added the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture to the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, or CFIUS, which is the interagency committee that determines whether a foreign investment in a United States company or asset could pose a threat to our national security. That law further codified reporting and coordination between the Secretary of Agriculture and CFIUS.

I mention this law, Mr. Speaker, because I think my Republican colleagues have forgotten what we did only 6 months ago. In their rush to pull together bills for the so-called China week, they appear to have brought up a poorly drafted copy of legislation we already passed.

However, in the frenzy to bring this bill to the floor, H.R. 9456 doesn't duplicate the law. Rather, it results in the Secretary of Agriculture having to report countless transactions to the committee that have nothing to do with our national security.

Currently, the law provides to the Secretary of Agriculture the support of the United States intelligence community to identify those transactions that may pose a threat to our national security. Inexplicably, H.R. 9456 removes that intelligence community assistance, leaving the Secretary to guess which transactions might pose a threat to our national security.

Further, unlike the law that was passed just 6 months ago, the bill broadens the scope from "foreign governments and entities of concern" to now include "foreign persons," which means all individuals and entities of China, Russia, Iran, or North Korea. This means anyone with citizenship in those countries, including refugees or people who are here in the United States with green cards or other visas.

The bill's broad-brush approach of targeting individuals from China,

North Korea, Russia, and Iran amounts to racial profiling. This bill's focus is similar to the restrictive, xenophobic real estate laws passed in a number of States, like Florida, where citizens of the same countries are banned from buying property and which has resulted in numerous instances of discrimination.

It is for this reason that this bill is opposed by the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, the National Iranian American Council, Stop AAPI Hate, Asian Americans Advancing Justice, the National Council of Asian Pacific Americans, the Asian American Scholar Forum, and the American Civil Liberties Union.

The Biden-Harris administration has also put out a Statement of Administration Policy, saying that it is inconsistent with CFIUS process and would not be implementable as drafted.

Mr. Speaker, these deficiencies, taken together, will divert precious resources from CFIUS' targeted national security reviews. This is a bad bill that harms the bipartisan work we already passed this year and would sow divisions among neighbors across America.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I will vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), who not only understands the security issues because of his involvement as a United States Congressman for the State of Washington, but he is also a farmer from the State of Washington. He understands the impact these issues have on farms and ranches across the country.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, the reality that we face is simple: The CCP, the Chinese Communist Party, is planting roots in our homeland and working around the clock to infiltrate our institutions.

In the last decade, Communist China's investment in U.S. ag land has grown tenfold. That is a dangerous trend that we cannot overstate, but today, we are taking an important step in keeping them out.

My bill to add the Secretary of Agriculture to the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States is critical in keeping the CCP off of American soil.

Mr. Speaker, food security, as you have heard many times, is national security. This legislation strengthens the safety of our supply chains and opens a door to new reporting mechanisms that USDA can use to keep us safe from this threat.

□ 1230

With an already flawed foreign purchase reporting system within USDA, we must be sure our ag land is protected from nefarious actors.

As chairman of the Congressional Western Caucus, I hear from farmers and ranchers across the country who are concerned by the reality that not

only is the CCP in our backyard, but we cannot accurately say where.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, my bill guarantees that the Secretary of Agriculture can accurately monitor and report purchases not just for land, but also for biotechnology, transportation, storage, and processing.

This bill is a first step. It is the beginning of the effort to keep our greatest adversaries from being able to purchase any American farmland because, the way I see it, a group like the CCP, who has made it their goal to cripple the United States, has no business having a hand in our supply chains and critical lands, but, first, we must know exactly how much they already have.

Mr. Speaker, time is not on our side here. Every moment we wait, the CCP tightens their grip on our system, further succeeding in their efforts.

I thank Speaker JOHNSON and Leader SCALISE for bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor. A vote for this bill is a vote for our farmers, our economy, and our national security.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to highlight just how rushed the process for this bill has been. I remind my colleagues that this bill was only introduced 5 days ago, on Friday of last week.

The notice of the Rules Committee hearing for this bill went out the same day that the bill was introduced, and the hearing happened the very next Monday.

That timing didn't give Members and staff so much as a single business day to prepare, let alone for the Treasury Department and outside groups to conduct their own analyses. Needless to say, there hasn't been a single hearing on this bill, nor has it ever been marked up. To top it all off, the rule providing for consideration of the bill gives Members no opportunity for amendment.

Considering we just passed legislation to address the very concerns that this bill purports to tackle, I can see no policy reason as to why we are moving ahead with this bill so hastily. Given the serious defects with this bill, I don't understand why Republican leadership is denying Members the opportunity to properly assess these issues.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have insisted on following regular order again and again, so I would urge them to heed their own calls on this bill and allow this body to properly consider this legislation.

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

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

H.R. 9456 is comprised of two bills that were both marked up and unanimously reported from the Financial Services Committee. The administration did not send any technical assistance when both bills were marked up in

the committee a full year ago. They did not send TA until 2 days before this bill went to Rules. The edits were very technical in nature and open to interpretation.

I repeat again: Both of the underlying bills were marked up and unanimously reported from the committee in September of 2023. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle voted for the language in committee, and the Treasury gave no responses at the time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Nebraska (Mr. FLOOD).

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for introducing this very important and long-overdue piece of legislation.

According to the USDA, as of 2022, foreign individuals held an interest in over 43 million acres of U.S. ag land. For context, 43 million acres is larger than the State of Florida and greater than the total land area of 29 U.S. States.

Between December of 2021 and December of 2022, privately held foreign ag land increased by more than 3 million acres and now accounts for 3.4 percent of all privately held agricultural lands in the U.S.

This is a real problem, and it is growing. Our Nation's land is linked to our national security, our food supply, and energy resources. The rising trend of foreign ownership is highly concerning. The USDA is responsible for collecting data and reporting to Congress on foreign-owned ag land, but that is it. In its own words, the USDA does not have a role in reviewing the purchase or sale of ag land in our country.

Additionally, the USDA has failed to penalize improper filing of ag land transactions by foreign nationals, further emphasizing its lack of sufficient enforcement authority in this area.

Let me be clear: Foreign ag land ownership is a national security issue, and it should be treated as such. Over the last several years, we have all experienced firsthand the detrimental impact food and energy supply chain disruptions can have on our communities. Therefore, it is simply common sense that we pass this bill to expand CFIUS and better address this ongoing threat.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague is exactly right that the Financial Services Committee passed language that is similar in some respects to Representative NEWHOUSE's bill just 6 months ago in the Consolidated Appropriations Act.

That language reflected bipartisan work done by the Financial Services Committee on two Republican bills that had been marked up by our committee with unanimous votes. We continue to work in a bipartisan manner as well as with the Senate and the Treasury Department to get language that reflected these two bipartisan bills into the appropriations bill, which ultimately got passed into law.

It is simply false to claim that the bill we are considering today is somehow a harmless duplication of what we have already enacted, as I have laid out in detail already.

This bill undermines the bipartisan work that we have done on this issue and raises serious concerns about both national security and racial profiling. We already did the work to strike a reasonable bipartisan compromise on this front, but Republicans are choosing to undermine that bipartisanship with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9456 would expand the kind of transactions that the Secretary of Agriculture is required to report to the Committee on Foreign Investment in the U.S., otherwise known as CFIUS, including any farmland transaction by foreign persons from China, North Korea, Russia, or Iran.

This broad definition of foreign persons would encompass all legal immigrants and refugees from these countries and require the Secretary to report on their agricultural land transactions.

This opens the door to treating immigrants as national security threats solely because of their country of origin and harms Asian-American communities across the board.

I recount that my own family, my father's family, was affected by the alien land laws that were prevalent on the West Coast of the United States. My grandfather, Esal Takano, emigrated to this country through the Port of Tacoma, and he married my American-born grandmother. He was not able to purchase land in his own name. In fact, in the mid-1930s, he purchased five acres of land in my grandmother's name because she was an American citizen. My uncle, who was returning in uniform from the 442nd Infantry, notified the family that there was a lien against the property, and they couldn't pay it in time because they were in internment camps.

It is a terrible chapter in our history that this country passed alien land laws that affected so many of the families that my family knows.

For this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If the House Rules permitted, I would have offered a motion with an important amendment to this bill.

My amendment would add findings regarding the scapegoating of Asian and Iranian Americans as a long part of U.S. history and show instances of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders nationwide who have experienced discrimination and unfair treatment.

We must send this bill back to committee and bring forth thoughtful proposals that help our communities without putting our national security at risk.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of this amendment immediately prior to the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

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

The Agriculture Foreign Investments Disclosure Act of 1978 already requires that all foreign persons and legal entities acquiring or transferring an interest in U.S. agricultural property submit a report to USDA containing the information on the transaction of the parties involved. That is present law.

CFIUS can already use this data when considering potential national security risks in determining whether a transaction is covered by its jurisdiction.

This bill does not change that jurisdiction. What this bill does is formally establish a referral system between USDA's current monitoring of land purchases and CFIUS in order to target our adversaries and avoid unnecessary bureaucracy.

The bill singles out purchases involving the People's Republic of China, Iran, North Korea, and Russia. It is the governments of these nonfree societies that are our threats, and it is their manipulation of their people that are the threats we try to address.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF).

Mr. SELF. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it is no secret that China intends to take over America and become the world's superpower. It is all about control for the Chinese. They want to control our prices and our supplies. For the past few years, they have been on a spending spree, buying farmland across the United States.

Today, one in four pigs raised in the United States is owned by the Chinese, and 18 beef and 12 pork establishments have been given export licenses by the Chinese Government.

Even more alarming, not only do they intend to buy this land for their own benefit, but they also try to use these shell companies to buy land near classified military sites. One of the attempted purchases was in my district.

The Protecting American Agriculture from Foreign Adversaries Act is an important step to stop this from happening. We must pass this legislation to permanently add the Secretary of Agriculture to the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States and to take necessary actions to prohibit the purchase of U.S. agricultural land by foreign adversaries.

If we fail to act now, we risk more than just losing land. We risk the Chinese Communist Party controlling our future.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Several groups have come out in opposition to this bill over concerns of racial discrimination and profiling, including the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, the National Iranian American Council, the Stop AAPI Hate, the Asian Americans Advancing Justice, the National Council of Asian Pacific Americans, the Asian American Scholar Forum, and the American Civil Liberties Union.

□ 1245

For example, according to the American Civil Liberties Union:

This legislation discriminates and targets individuals solely because of their citizenship and tends to conflate individuals from covered countries with their governments. It does this despite the lack of any showing that it is necessary or that passing this bill would do anything to protect U.S. national security interests.

According to the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus:

H.R. 9456 is not an effective way to address national security. It is a continuation of our Nation's shameful history in enacting racist alien land laws from the 19th and 20th century that barred Chinese and Japanese immigrants from purchasing land and which eventually laid the groundwork for mass incarceration of 120,000 Japanese Americans during World War II.

We cannot go back to those shameful parts of our history where we denied equal protections and due process for entire ethnic groups simply because of their ethnic heritage.

The bipartisan language that we already passed into law appropriately tailors reporting from the Secretary of Agriculture to include only those transactions that have a national security nexus, including transactions that involve foreign governments or entities of concern, which is defined to include foreign terrorist organizations or sanctioned entities on the Treasury Department's economic and trade sanctions lists.

The law also provides support to the Secretary of Agriculture from the United States intelligence community to determine which transactions may pose a national security concern.

This bill overturns that bipartisan compromise and would treat refugees and legal immigrants from any of these countries in the same manner as known terrorist groups.

This is outrageous. I hope that both sides of the aisle will do what is right, do what is fair, and recognize the history that we are not proud of as it relates to racial profiling.

I hope that we would do the right thing on this bill. This bill should not be passed. We have already done what was needed in a bipartisan way. I don't know why they would take time to undermine the work that we did, and I certainly want a "no" vote on the bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, before I yield to my colleague from Michigan, I

yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this is a process that combines two good pieces of legislation. This is a process that takes what we successfully did in appropriations, which means an annual process of renewal, and it makes it permanent law.

This is an acknowledgement that Congress recognizes the importance of making this statute permanent, not just a part of annual funding language. It is hard for me to imagine why we wouldn't support this. It is just difficult to imagine.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR).

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Madam Speaker, food security is national security. The Chinese Communist Party understands this.

That is why Xi Jinping has labeled food security a national priority, and CCP-aligned companies have amassed thousands of acres of American farmland.

When the CCP looks at U.S. farmland, it sees a strategic asset. Once acquired, it will be used to enhance Chinese national security and undermine our own.

This is because there is no such thing as a private company in China. Under their national security laws, private companies are required to help the Chinese Government and military upon request. It is certainly not a coincidence that so much of the farmland Chinese companies acquire are next to American military bases or critical infrastructure.

China would never allow U.S. firms to buy land near Chinese military bases. To protect our national security, we need to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support Mr. NEWHOUSE's Protecting American Agriculture from Foreign Adversaries Act to do just that.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleague across the aisle has pointed out that the language that we passed into law as part of the Appropriations Act just 6 months ago may expire along with the appropriations.

While that may be the case, it is simply false to claim that all this bill would do is ensure that the language survives past that expiration. If that were all this bill were doing, I would support it, the same way I supported that language before.

In fact, I would urge Republicans to bring a bill to the floor that would exclusively eliminate any expiration on the bipartisan language that we have already passed so that we can continue to work in a bipartisan manner on this issue, instead of moving this harmful bill that we are considering here today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indi-

ana (Mr. BAIRD), one of my fellow farmers, who understands these issues from the tractor seat and the field.

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, when we talk about land for farmers and ranchers, we are really talking about that top eight inches of soil, which for some of you that may not recognize, that we consider that a living, breathing organism because of the organisms there and the complex chemistry that takes place, the nutrient exchange that grow the plants that rise above the surface.

I compliment our farmers and ranchers. We have spent a great deal of time and money and effort for conservation programs to protect that top eight inches of soil.

When we talk about land, we are also referring to a very precious resource. Since we have invested so much time and effort to make sure that we preserve that land, we are not interested in letting our adversaries have access to that.

In that vein, in Indiana, foreign investors own and lease about 400,000 acres of agricultural land. When I talk about agricultural land, I am talking about the land that either produces crops, forestry, pasture forages, and that sort of thing.

Some of them do not pose a real threat; however, foreign adversaries, including Communist China, are buying up farmland. Investors from Cuba, Iran, North Korea, Russia, and Venezuela under the Maduro regime, as I heard our speaker mention a minute ago, hold about 95,000 acres of American agricultural land, but between 2010 and 2021, just the last decade or so, individuals or entities affiliated with the Communist China increased ownership of our agricultural land from 13,000 acres to 383,000 acres. That is a tenfold increase.

We need to be conscious of that, we need to be aware of that, and we don't need to let our adversaries have that.

What is even more concerning is that the Chinese-owned entities have purchased farmland near at least 19 of our military bases. This strategically placed land could be used by the Chinese Communist Party to surveil our military sites. This is a huge national security threat.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HINSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, our adversaries are buying up our farmland. I mentioned that. The U.S. is currently losing 175 acres of farm and ranchland every hour for housing and other industries. The reduction in the amount of land for sale is contributing to the higher prices of land as well as making it harder for young farmers to access quality land.

We cannot keep burning the candle at both ends and allow our adversaries to purchase land when the American

farmers are struggling to do so. Ultimately, food security, as has already been mentioned, is national security. We must ensure a resource as precious as our farmland cannot be exploited or purchased by our adversaries.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I laid out in my opening remarks, this bill confusingly duplicates and conflicts with existing law.

To be clear, this bill would add new language rather than amending the existing language that is already in law. Having two conflicting laws creates significant legal ambiguity as to how to interpret these competing texts.

It would undoubtedly result in litigation as agencies struggle to determine what their legal obligations are, tying up limited resources at both CFIUS and the Department of Agriculture.

This hastily written text does not appear to have appropriately taken into account the resulting legal ambiguities, and I would urge all of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to, at the very least, take the time to address these legal ambiguities and provide a clear mandate.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentlewoman from Iowa, I will simply note that like all legislative processes with the signature of the President on this piece of legislation, it will supersede the appropriated law. It will be straightforward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. HINSON).

Mrs. HINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Protecting the American Agriculture from Foreign Adversaries Act. I thank Representative NEWHOUSE for his continued leadership on this issue. I am proud to have helped introduce this important piece of legislation to protect our food supply from foreign adversaries like Communist China.

China does continue to buy up American farmland at an alarming rate. They are aiming to gain control of our food and fuel supply chains, stealing American intellectual property, and strategically purchasing land near sensitive sites.

China doesn't even allow its own citizens to own land, but we have allowed China to purchase nearly 350,000 acres of our agriculture land.

Our adversaries will stop at nothing to disrupt critical industries like agriculture, and this bill will help us to block transactions that are a threat to our national security.

By ensuring that the Secretary of Agriculture has a seat at the table at CFIUS, foreign transactions involving agricultural assets will receive proper oversight so that we can prevent our adversaries from continuing to undermine our food supply and national security.

In Iowa, we know our land is sacred. Iowa farmers truly do feed and fuel the

world, so we cannot allow the CCP to continue buying up our most valuable resource.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this good piece of legislation.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

H.R. 9456 undercuts not only a bipartisan accomplishment from 6 months ago, but also our government's ability to stop adversarial countries like China and Russia from acquiring companies, technology, and land that are critical to our national security.

This bill will also cause financial harm to lawful, permanent residents and other immigrants based solely on an investor's citizenship.

Members of this body considered this issue just 6 months ago, passing bipartisan legislation to add the expertise of the Secretary of the USDA to CFIUS and improving the process by which agricultural land transactions are shared with and reviewed by the government.

□ 1300

That bill was drafted in coordination with the Biden-Harris administration as well as Democrats and Republicans in the House and Senate. It was passed into law through the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2024. There is no need to rewrite this law.

H.R. 9456 is a rush job by the House Republican leadership, and it shows how harmful this bill is to both our national security and the people who we serve.

I would just say to my colleagues that if you are really concerned about security, if you really want to support ag and the farmers, why did you just pull the continuing resolution that we were supposed to take up to continue government functioning?

Now, I guess you don't have the votes, and you are doing nothing to protect the very people who you purport to want to protect. Wow.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would note, as I conclude with my comments and yield back also, there have been many occasions when the good lady, the ranking member of the full committee, and I have battled over issues, and there have been occasions when we have been in the same trenches, fighting in the same direction on policy. I would say that she is always a very worthwhile adversary and just a pretty viciously effective ally on those rare occasions, but today, we disagree. We disagree.

I believe Americans have long recognized that a resilient food supply is essential to national security, which is why the rise of foreign investments in our Nation's farmlands deserves increased scrutiny.

We have seen our geopolitical adversaries, China in particular, are eager to exploit vulnerabilities in critical supply chains. Investment from China

poses a unique risk to the American economy, and the Chinese Communist Party exercises immense control and influence over Chinese-owned companies operating abroad.

This bill recognizes that a national security framework that excludes agriculture is incomplete.

In my own State of Oklahoma, foreign land ownership has been against the law for decades and decades, but my State officials tell me that with the web of LLCs and trusts and a variety of other legal mechanisms, they have a difficult time in enforcing that.

This piece of legislation today is one of many pieces of the puzzle to bring this to a focus. If you care about the security of this great Nation and if you care about building on actions that we have taken in this Congress before, then I urge you to vote for this bill. Make permanent law what is now an annual appropriation-type process. I think it is the right thing to do.

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this discriminatory and unnecessary legislation.

The Committee on Foreign Investment in the U.S. (CFIUS) is currently empowered to examine foreign investments related to agriculture.

This legislation would continue to exacerbate anti-Asian hate and xenophobia. This legislation mirrors the discriminatory real-estate laws proposed in many States, including my home State of Texas.

As a staunch opponent of invidious discrimination, I have introduced legislation, H.R. 3697—Preemption of Real Property Discrimination Act, which would preempt these unacceptable State laws that seek to deny foreign citizens the opportunity to acquire real property in the United States.

Congress must reject all attempts to exacerbate the already intolerable levels of xenophobia in our Nation.

Diversity is a benefit, not a detriment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VAN DREW). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1430, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Tanko of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 9456 to the Committee on Financial Services.

The material previously referred to by Mr. TAKANO is as follows:

Mr. Takano moves to recommit the bill H.R. 9456 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Insert after section 1 the following:

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The scapegoating of Asian and Iranian Americans for our nation's problems has long been part of U.S. history—and history has shown us that heightened xenophobia creates a cycle which leads to violence. Since the 19th century, Asian Americans have been unjustly targeted through the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, the “Yellow Peril” era lynchings of Chinese immigrants, exclusionary alien land laws, the incarceration of 120,000 innocent Japanese Americans during World War II, the murder of Vincent Chin, the mass surveillance of Muslim, Middle Eastern, Arab, Sikh, and South Asian communities in the aftermath of 9/11, and the racial profiling of Chinese American scientists under the China Initiative.

(2) Today, nearly half (49%) of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders nationwide have experienced discrimination or unfair treatment that may be illegal.

(3) Since March 2020, over 11,500 anti-Asian hate crimes and incidents have been reported to Stop AAPI Hate.

(4) 58% of Asian American adults say they have experienced racial discrimination or been treated unfairly because of their race or ethnicity.

(5) 78% of Asian adults have been treated as a foreigner in some way, even if they are U.S. born.

(6) A majority of Iranian Americans say that they or someone they are close to has experienced discrimination.

(7) Six in 10 Iranian Americans are concerned about increasing discrimination against and the personal safety of Iranian Americans.

(8) It has been widely reported that implementation of laws restricting or prohibiting foreign persons from China, Russia, North Korea, and Iran, including refugees and green card holders, from purchasing property and land in 22 States across the country have contributed to racial profiling, xenophobia and discrimination lawsuits.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that racial profiling and xenophobia have no place in America, that hate crimes against the Iranian American, Asian American, and Pacific Islander communities have increased, and that Congress should not pass laws that codify or perpetuate discrimination.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. 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 question will be postponed.

**RECESS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIFFANY). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1316

**AFTER RECESS**

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TIFFANY) at 1 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.

**NO WHO PANDEMIC PREPAREDNESS TREATY WITHOUT SENATE APPROVAL ACT****GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. 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. 1425.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1430 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1425.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1317

**IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1425) to require any convention, agreement, or other international instrument on pandemic prevention, preparedness, and response reached by the World Health Assembly to be subject to Senate ratification, with Mr. VAN DREW in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1425, Congressman TOM TIFFANY's No World Health Organization Pandemic Preparedness Treaty Without Senate Approval Act.

This bill ensures that the Biden-Harris administration does not circumvent Congress, and it requires that any international instrument on pandemic prevention, preparedness, and response as agreed to by the World Health Assembly must be considered by the Senate as a treaty.

When it comes to imposing binding international obligations on Ameri-

cans, the executive branch cannot go it alone. In our Constitution, in our republican system of government, the people's elected Representatives in Congress must give their approval.

An international treaty that cannot command the support of two-thirds of the Senate is not actually a treaty. While one administration may submit to it, it certainly does not bind our Nation or future administrations.

This proposed World Health Organization Pandemic Agreement is no exception. In fact, that potentially expansive agreement especially needs proper review and debate by the American people's elected Representatives.

Article 19 of the WHO Constitution states that such agreements must be submitted to each member state for review “in accordance with its constitutional processes.” Our constitutional process requires ratification by the Senate for something to be considered a treaty before it may come into force.

Likewise, during the World Health Assembly in May, the World Health Organization Director-General promised that any agreement “will go to parliaments for consideration and ratification.” We don't have a parliament. In our body, it would go to the Senate.

It isn't being sent there by the Biden-Harris administration. Why does the administration not want this to go to the Senate? That is an important question to ask. They certainly have not kept the drafting and negotiations transparent or accountable to the American people.

Now that negotiations are supposed to conclude by early 2025, there remains a distinct possibility that the World Health Assembly will try to call an emergency vote on a final draft treaty before a new U.S. administration takes office.

Far too little attention has been paid to what this treaty would mean for health policy in the United States and elsewhere. The latest draft is limitless in scope and contains overly broad language that can be read to support abortion and radical left ideology. It claims to impose undefined financial obligations. It grants more authority to the WHO, potentially infringing on our sovereignty. It threatens both intellectual property and free speech rights. It provides zero accountability for China.

The pandemic treaty would give more U.S. taxpayer dollars to the WHO bureaucrats to manage, even though the U.S. has already spent billions on pandemic preparedness. In total, the U.S. has spent around \$2.2 billion toward global health security which, along with the Pandemic Fund donations, goes toward strengthening global health systems, supply chains, healthcare workforces, and international laboratories.

In addition, the International Health Regulations have been in place since 2005 as a mechanism to address infectious disease outbreaks around the world. They were just updated this past May to include a new financial mechanism. Why do we need yet another