



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 2017

No. 112

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

June 29, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JODY B. HICE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

GOP HEALTHCARE BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, Members on both sides of the aisle have offered their share of passionate words about the GOP healthcare bill.

And as can happen, the debate has been deeply polarized here, leaving Americans to wonder sometimes whether the facts get obstructed by the politics of the day.

So I want to take a minute and share what some experts have had to say

about the Republican healthcare proposal. These are not politicians; far from it. These words come from folks who operate outside the walls of Washington's halls and have dedicated themselves to fighting for those struggling with mental illness.

According to the National Alliance on Mental Illness, the Republican healthcare plan will "force people with mental illness out of work, onto the streets, and into jails and emergency rooms."

The legislation "shows dangerous disregard for the well-being of people with substance use disorders and their families and erases decades of progress," says the Association for Addiction Professionals.

Mental Health America tells us that this bill "will ultimately do significant harm to people with all chronic conditions, including mental illness, while increasing the cost of healthcare to everyone."

The National Association for Rural Mental Health agrees, saying, "these actions will leave millions of Americans with serious mental health and substance use conditions without life-sustaining and essential health insurance coverage, especially at a time when the Nation is suffering from the largest opioid epidemic in history."

In short, this bill would be, according to the American Psychiatric Association, "particularly devastating to the millions of Americans in need of mental health and substance use treatment."

Mr. Speaker, these groups are not political organizations. They are doctors; they are healthcare professionals; they are patients; they are advocates who have dedicated their lives day and night to filling the gaps of a badly broken mental health system. Take it from them.

This is what TrumpCare is offering our country. This is what they are trying to sell us at a time when we are

losing nearly 100 Americans a day to an opioid epidemic. This is what is being negotiated behind closed doors as we speak while the rest of us read reports that tell us that the death toll from opioids could reach well over half a million people in the next decade.

So let me be clear: You cannot advocate for comprehensive mental health reform and then stand on the opposite side of nearly every major mental health organization in this country. You cannot claim to be a champion for those suffering from mental illness and then support a bill that guts funding for Medicaid, which is the largest payer of mental healthcare in this country.

You cannot say that you are committed to addressing the opioid epidemic and then stand behind a piece of legislation that gives insurance companies cover to deny those patients addiction treatment and to tell those in the grips of addiction to summon just a little more will.

You have to choose: With these families or with this bill? Which side are you on?

JULY AS PARKS AND RECREATION MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a resolution with Congresswoman NIKI TSONGAS to designate July as Parks and Recreation Month. It is a fitting time to celebrate our Federal, State, and local parks and recreation systems as so many start this summer season by visiting these facilities that are available within our communities or even a short commute.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 406 recognizes the important role that public parks, recreation facilities, and activities plays in the lives of Americans and the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5299

contributions of employees and volunteers who work daily to maintain public parks across the Nation.

As a lifelong resident of rural Pennsylvania and an avid outdoorsman, I strongly support our Nation's parks and recreation facilities. Our parks provide countless recreational and educational opportunities for individuals and families to engage in the outdoors.

This resolution simply recognizes and supports Parks and Recreation Month and the many benefits, including health benefits, that a healthy active lifestyle contributes in our park settings that is provided to all Americans.

Our parks generate opportunities for people to come together and experience a sense of community. They pay dividends to communities by attracting businesses and jobs and increasing housing values.

In the United States, public park operations and capital spending generates nearly \$140 million in economic activity annually.

Ninety percent of people in the United States agree that public park recreation activities and facilities are important government services, a figure that displays a base of support that spans across all people in the country regardless of race, income, gender, or political party affiliation.

Nearly 75 percent of Americans agree that it is important to ensure all members of their community have equitable access to public parks and recreation facilities. The most economically sound communities are those with ample and healthy public parks and recreation facilities and activities. In fact, a key factor in business expansion and location decisions is the quality of life for employees, with a premium placed on adequate and accessible public parks and open space.

Mr. Speaker, public parks and recreation facilities foster a variety of activity that also contribute to a healthier society. People who use public parks and open spaces are three times more likely to achieve recommended levels of physical activity than nonusers.

Americans living within a 10-minute walk of a park have a higher level of physical activity and lower rates of obesity.

Recreation programs at public parks provide children with a safe place to play, access to healthy foods, opportunities to be physically active, and enrichment facilities that help prevent at-risk behavior such as drug abuse and gang involvement.

Mr. Speaker, as our Nation celebrates Independence Day next week, scores of Americans will visit public parks and recreation facilities to spend time outdoors with family, friends, and neighbors. We are blessed with beautiful outdoor facilities. I wish everyone a safe and happy Fourth of July. Get out and enjoy the parks in your area.

CUTS TO MEDICAID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of children and adults living with disabilities across the United States.

The cuts to Medicaid outlined in the dangerous Senate healthcare repeal bill will not only result in the loss of healthcare access for millions of Americans, but will also significantly reduce funding for In-Home Supportive Services in my home State of California.

Medicaid covers 50 percent of the program costs for In-Home Supportive Services. These funds provide care for an estimated 531,000 disabled children and seniors throughout California, which permits them to continue to live with dignity in their own home.

The \$772 billion cut to Medicaid outlined in this bill will have a devastating impact on seniors and people with disabilities who rely on Medicaid as their safety net for necessary long-term care services.

These cuts will directly affect the lives of my constituents, including 15-year-old Crystal from Santa Maria, California, in my district. Crystal was born with spina bifida, weighing in at just 2 pounds. She has survived under the dedicated care of her mother and grandmother, who are her primary caretakers. Crystal is covered by Medicaid, which allows her to receive specialized medical attention, adaptive medical equipment, physical therapy, and pharmaceuticals. Crystal's condition requires 24-hour care, a need that is fulfilled by the In-Home Supportive Services program. Her life is contingent upon this program.

I call upon my colleagues in the Senate to vote against this cruel healthcare repeal, also known as TrumpCare, for Crystal and the millions of our constituents like her who are at risk of losing their quality of life.

PLAYER OF THE YEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Logan Aleshire, a senior at St. Cloud Tech High School, on recently being named the Minnesota High School Class AAA Baseball Player of the Year by the Minnesota State High School Baseball Coaches Association.

Logan is a star athlete, and due to his leadership and skills as a pitcher and shortstop, he helped lead his team to an undefeated season in this year's State tournament.

Logan excelled on the field this year, but we have known about him for a while. In fact, he has been a three-time All-Central Lakes Conference pick, and just last year he was a Times Baseball All-Area Team selection.

While his high school baseball career is coming to a close, I have no doubt we will see great things from this young man both athletically and scholastically in the future. We look forward to seeing what he will accomplish next.

A FARM FAMILY TO CELEBRATE

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Kreitlow and Ford family on being recently named the 2017 Farm Family of the Year.

Built in 1898, the Kreitlow farm has been passed from generation to generation for more than a century, with each generation teaching the next about hard work and successful farming. Today, the Kreitlow farm is successfully operated by Willard Kreitlow, his daughter Marianne, and her husband Jerry Ford.

The farm was once a dairy operation, but since 1990, the farm has mainly become a vegetable and pasture operation. However, the work the Kreitlow and Ford family has accomplished goes far beyond the fresh produce they harvest. In fact, this hardworking family goes above and beyond by striving to educate others through their work with the Sustainable Farming Association of Minnesota.

I want to thank the Kreitlow and Ford family for not only providing quality food for Minnesotans, but also for educating others about the benefits of sustainable farming and giving back to their community. Our State is a healthier place because of their dedicated work.

50 YEARS OF GIVING BACK

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the United Way of Central Minnesota for helping families throughout our communities escape poverty for an incredible 50 years.

Over the past half century, the United Way of Central Minnesota has raised more than \$100 million, allowing them to help fund other nonprofits who provide services that help Minnesota families in need.

It is largely because of the generous contributions from the United Way of Central Minnesota that the Boys and Girls Club of Central Minnesota was able to get off the ground in the 1970s and to be able to grow into what it is today.

Thankfully, the United Way of Central Minnesota continues to grow strong. In fact, they recently announced their latest partnership with the St. Cloud School District to create neighborhood resource centers for students and their families. It is inspiring to see an organization solely devoted to helping others. Sometimes when someone is down on their luck, all it takes is a helping hand to get them back on their feet.

On behalf of thousands of Minnesotans, I would like to thank the United Way of Central Minnesota for being that helping hand for the past 50 years, and we look forward to many successful years to come.

□ 1015

GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the 4 years that I have been privileged to represent the remarkable people and amazing communities of Illinois' Second Congressional District, I have come to this floor many times to urge action.

I have called for a budget that invests in jobs, farmers, and rural communities. I have called for action to address the trillion-dollar student debt crisis. I have called for real solutions that make healthcare affordable for all American families. I have spoken on many issues facing this House, but nothing I have spoken on is more important than protecting American lives.

I have begged for commonsense reforms that prevent children from being shot while playing at a playground. I have begged; I have pleaded; I have screamed; I have cried; and I have even ground the people's House to a halt with last year's historic sit-in.

What answer was I given? Was I given answers to take home to grieving mothers and police widows? Was I able to tell them that their loved one's death wasn't in vain and that we were going to do something to save the next life? No. I was met with silence, and worse, an active effort to silence my voice and the voice of millions of Americans.

So I ask myself: Why? What is the issue? Why can't I, an elected Representative of the American people who draws my authority directly from the United States Constitution, get something done to save lives? Why can't we get a vote on commonsense, lifesaving legislation that is supported by 90 percent of Americans and more than 70 percent of NRA members?

Mr. Speaker, tragically, the answer is simple. It is greed.

Mr. Speaker, what is the cost of your inaction? It seems that \$5,950 you took from the NRA matters more to you than the 7,490 Americans we have already lost this year to gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to know that just 79 cents for an American life is the cost of your silence and inaction.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it might be easy for you to ignore the connection between those dollars and the lives lost, but I cannot—and I will not—ignore it. I will not let you ignore or forget it either.

I am going to stand here and remind you, remind the people of Wisconsin's First District, and remind all Americans that money matters more to you than these American lives. One dollar—one name. One dollar—one grieving family. One dollar—one lost American:

One dollar—Xavier Joy, 23, was a success story. He was playing football at Morehouse, was an AmeriCorps volun-

teer, and wanted to change Chicago for the better;

Two dollars—Blair Holt, 16, was killed shielding his friend on a CTA bus;

Three dollars—Hadiya Pendleton, 15, killed just weeks after performing at President Obama's inauguration.

While Chicago might make headlines, gun violence is killing people in every community, in every city, and in every town, including Wisconsin's First District.

Four dollars—Paramjit Kaur, 41, killed while trying to pray;

Five dollars—Satwant Singh Kaleka, 65, killed at the temple he founded;

Six dollars—Prakash Singh, 39, a reader at his temple;

Seven dollars—Sita Singh, 41, killed by a White nationalist for wearing a turban;

Eight dollars—Ranjit Singh, 49, murdered at his church;

Nine dollars—Suveg Singh, 84, killed while expressing his love for his God;

10 dollars—Harry Canady, Jr., 20, killed sitting on a porch in Racine;

11 dollars—Sean Bialas, 23, of Kenosha, shot and killed while physically unable to defend himself;

12 dollars—David Bauspies, 36, of McHenry, accidentally shot and killed in East Troy;

13 dollars—Jose Torres, 36, murdered on the 1600 block of Holmes Avenue in Racine;

14 dollars—Nicholas Chaulkin, 17, of Racine, killed by a domestic abuser, likely while defending his mother;

15 dollars—David Tilton, 37, of Janesville;

16 dollars—James Norris, 37, was killed at his job as a restaurant delivery driver in Racine;

17 dollars—Jeremy Trawitzki, 38, killed in Muskego;

18 dollars—Thomas Kruse, 41, killed in Muskego;

19 dollars—Joseph Hensel, 27, killed in Elkhorn;

20 dollars—Andrew Jones, Jr., 27, also killed by his friend in Racine;

21 dollars—Maurice Carter was shot and killed in a Racine County robbery;

22 dollars—Carl Nichols, 26, shot and killed by a friend in Kenosha.

AMERICA: LAND OF OPPORTUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one thing that we can all agree on is that America is the land of opportunity. Our beautiful country has remarkable stories about those young and old, who, through adversity, have gone on to achieve great things. Those human stories are often the best way for us to demonstrate why our country is so special. I would like to share two stories with you this morning.

Emily Torchiana recently visited my office while she was here in Washington, D.C., after being chosen for a

Jefferson Award for community service. Just last week, she was also awarded the Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis Award for Public Service. Emily is from Colledgeville, in my congressional district, and, after her own experience with severe cyberbullying led to a suicide attempt, she began telling her story.

Emily found people would reach out to her after each speech to share their own experiences and thank her for being so open with her journey. She is now the founder of a nonprofit focused on mental health advocacy, awareness, and services.

Emily's nonprofit supports mental health workshops in schools as well as workshops for parents and teachers so adults can learn how to support children and young adults suffering from mental illness. The mission statement of Emily's nonprofit includes working to reduce the stigma surrounding mental health, something I believe is a critical aspect for us all as we continue to develop and advance solutions for those facing mental illness.

Quoting from Emily's nonprofit website, she writes: "My hope is that the more people who will open up about their struggles, the more others will feel comfortable reaching out for help. . . . Unlike physical illnesses, these mental illnesses are not seen, but that does not mean they are not there. I hope this will give us all the opportunity to walk briefly in the shoes of the fellow human beings we come across every day."

Emily's work is an inspiration to us all.

Congratulations, Emily, for being recognized for your outstanding service to communities across our country, and we wish you the best of luck with your career.

Ammar Al-Rubaiay is another young adult who has an inspiring and remarkable story. A reporter in my congressional district recently shared Ammar's story with me, and I want to take a moment to share a story about opportunity, hard work, and a young man fulfilling his dreams.

A native of Baghdad, Iraq, Ammar became a naturalized U.S. citizen in 2015. He was participating in a youth exchange program that transferred him to West Vincent Township, in Pennsylvania's Sixth Congressional District, where he attended Owen J. Roberts High School and ultimately attended Westtown School.

Ammar came face to face with al-Qaida before his move. In a column in 2009, journalist Michael Rellahan remembered reading Ammar's college essay.

Mr. Rellahan wrote: "In striking detail, Ammar recalled the day in June 2007 when he sat in his classroom at the Gifted Students School in his native Baghdad and a teacher came in to announce simply that: 'They are here—al-Qaida.'"

Ammar wrote in his journal: "At that time, I felt like I was a few minutes away from death, getting closer

every second. I was scared, but not because I thought that I was going to die. I was scared because I was thinking about what might happen to my family when they heard that I got killed. My dad always told me, 'Don't go to school; your life is more important than your education,' but I never listened, and I always argued with him because I believe that my education was important enough to take the risky chance."

The gunman entered the room, looked around, and went away. They stole some cars, but left everyone alive. Ammar recalled: "Those seconds felt like years; they were the longest seconds in my life."

Here is the great part of the story: It is not a story; it is real life. Ammar was granted political asylum, and in 2013, he graduated from Bard College and has since completed medical school, moving on to a career to help others and improve their healthy lives.

We should be proud of him and the thousands of other young men and young women every day who are fighting through adversity to achieve, who will go on to make this a greater country than it already is; and it is a reminder to all of us in what is, at times, a very divisive political environment that the reason that we do these jobs is to make sure that we are providing opportunity for the next generation, and it is they who will make our country an even greater place. It is their achievements that are the cornerstone of our country and a great reminder to all of us that we are a special country with special people doing great things every single day.

GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the comments and remarks of the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) with regard to being mindful of the deaths from gun violence that plague our communities all across the country, and particularly as the summer has begun, these deaths will continue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak today about another kind of gun violence that makes our streets and homes unsafe, and that is the deadly encounters between civilians and police officers.

Mr. Speaker, I have wracked my brain trying to understand these deaths. I have grieved with the mothers who have lost their children. I have met with experts and attended roundtables on how to find a way to mitigate these fatal police encounters.

Let me tell you, I think I can propose a solution that we can all support, and that is H.R. 3060, the Preventing Tragedies Between Police and Communities Act, which would link law enforcement training on deescalation techniques to receipt of Federal Byrne JAG funds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I certainly wish that I could take full credit for this concept because I think that this legislation would both save civilian lives and police lives; however, this idea is rooted in the Police Executive Research Forum report which both Republicans and Democrats have cited. It was written by police officer peers and by police officer experts.

Mr. Speaker, what they found is that police academies require 58 hours of training on how to use a firearm and another 49 hours on other defensive tactics. While they don't require, they offer 8 voluntary—1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8—8 voluntary hours on how to employ deescalation tactics in crisis intervention. We need to require this deescalation training.

This deescalation training curriculum would be to use verbal and physical tactics to avoid escalating the situation, use the lowest level of force as possible and a safe response to identified threats, and be aware of mental health and substance abuse issues and crisis intervention strategies in order to appropriately respond. This training would provide police with the tools they need to prevent violent interactions and save not only their lives, but the lives of civilians, too.

We know that kids are out of school and that the tensions in our streets are high. Police are on alert, and far too many of us are distrustful of the police due to the painful and frightful memories of how many deadly encounters have dominated headlines—close to 1,000 in 1 year.

How can this Congress recess for the summer and not take up this bill? Yes, the Affordable Care Act is a big issue here before us in Congress, but if you live in communities of color around the country, the immediate healthcare issue for you is being shot by a police officer who has been sworn to protect you.

□ 1030

If you die at age 12, like Tamir Rice, who was shot by police for playing with his sister on a playground in Cleveland, how can you be concerned with Medicaid?

If you are killed at 31 years old, like Dontre Hamilton, who was shot 14 times by police for resting on a park bench in Milwaukee, nursing home care is not your priority. You won't have the good fortune of living that long.

I ask my colleagues to prioritize preserving lives by supporting this legislation.

RECOGNIZING RETIRED COLONEL ROBERT A. ATOR, II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize one of Arkansas' finest, Colonel Robert A. Ator, II, of Little Rock.

A veteran of the United States Air Force, Colonel Ator retired on June 3,

2017, after proudly serving our country for 28 years. Before joining the Arkansas National Guard, Colonel Ator served 11 years on Active Duty with the United States Air Force. He is a veteran of several major combat operations, including Operation Desert Shield, Operation Desert Storm, Operation Provide Comfort, Operation Provide Promise, Operation Joint Forge, and Operation Noble Eagle.

Ator is a graduate of the U.S. Air Force Academy, where he married Michelle, his wife of 28 years, just 3 days after graduation. Today, his son, Cadet Third Class Robert A. Ator, III, is a sophomore.

Colonel Ator is the recipient of numerous awards and medals, including the Legion of Merit, the Meritorious Service Medal with two oak leaf clusters, the Air Medal, the Aerial Achievement Medal with one oak leaf cluster, and the Air Force Commendation Medal with one oak leaf cluster.

Colonel Ator is an example that all Arkansans and Americans can admire. I wish him and his family the very best in their future endeavors.

SALINE COUNTY CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION CENTER

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the proposed plans for a career and technical education center in my district.

Lamont Cornwell of the Saline County Economic Development Corporation presented detailed plans to the Arkansas Economic Development Commission on June 8 for a center that is specifically aimed at training our State's skilled workforce community.

The center would allow students to enroll in science and technology career preparatory classes, careers that will only become more invaluable as our Nation moves forward.

The center will impact parents and children of all socioeconomic statuses and positively change our technical career education environment in central Arkansas.

As co-chair of the Congressional Skilled American Workforce Caucus, I was encouraged to see the recent passage of H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education Act. I am encouraged to see leaders in Saline County step up and embrace a passion for our skilled workforce community.

HONORING FOSTER PARENTS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the importance of foster families around Arkansas and the organizations dedicated to their recruitment.

According to recent Arkansas data, the number of foster youths has outpaced the number of spaces available in foster homes by 1,283. Many families have already stepped up to the plate to provide a loving home for children in the foster system.

One such family, Andrew and Amy Baker of Searcy, Arkansas, was recently named Foster Family of the Year by our State's Division of Children and Family Services for their

dedicated efforts to reunify foster children with their biological parents.

In addition, there are organizations around our State that have been at the forefront of recruitment efforts for foster families, including 50 families in the month of April alone.

One such organization is entitled The CALL, locally directed by Lauri Currier, who notes that a stable, loving home can make a huge difference in a child's life, specifically with regard to escaping the grasp of neglect and abuse.

Today I want to emphasize Ms. Currier's statement that if one family from each of the 6,000 churches around Arkansas came forward to adopt, no more children would ever be waiting for a forever family.

FISHING WITH A HERO SUMMER PROGRAM

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a hands-on mentorship program in my district created through a partnership between the Bryant Police Department and the Boys and Girls Clubs of Bryant.

The summer program entitled "Fishing with a Hero" pairs Boys and Girls Clubs students with local police heroes to bond over the longstanding, joyful pastime of fishing.

Through a 2-day fishing instruction program, local police officers are able to build quality mentoring relationships with students in traditionally underserved or impoverished communities.

Along with being one of the students' favorite programs, the established relationships aid in creating long-term bonds between our law enforcement officers and local youth.

The stability and prosperity of our local communities hinges on mutual respect between our citizens and our law enforcement officers. The creation of genuine relationships at a young age ensures the longevity of that important respect.

HONORING ROBIN CREOLE AND DANNY REVIS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the recent selfless actions of two extraordinary individuals in the Second Congressional District of Arkansas, Robin Creole and Danny Revis. Both men work tirelessly in the Benton School District transportation program.

MEDICAID IS A LIFELINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, how many of us here have had an aging parent, a grandparent, an aunt or uncle who could no longer stay in their home alone? Seniors with Alzheimer's, dementia, and other special needs, someone to watch over them at home so they don't get lost or injure themselves or leave the stove on and injure others? Seniors with Parkinson's who need help to walk, to move, to get out of their chair, seniors too frail to care for

themselves, or need long-term rehabilitation after a fall and an injured hip or an injured femur?

How many of us have worried about where they would live and how they would get the care that they need? And oftentimes, the real question is: How are they going to pay for that care?

Most people work their entire lives, save for retirement, pay into the system, yet still find themselves struggling to afford the care that they need. Both parents in middle class families have to work to barely make ends meet; no money and nobody home to care for their parents or grandparents.

I understand the tough decision. You want to keep your loved one close, you want to care for them yourself, but you have to work and make ends meet to barely keep going. That is why most of the 1.4 million people across the country living in nursing homes rely on Medicaid.

For Americans in nursing homes, Medicaid is a lifeline. That is why TrumpCare's Medicaid cuts would devastate our Nation's seniors, leaving the 64 percent of nursing home residents who depend on Medicaid out in the cold. In fact, nursing homes account for 42 percent of Medicaid spending.

Under TrumpCare, many seniors will lose their nursing home care, grandmothers with disabilities would find it harder to be cared for, harder to walk, harder to eat, harder to bathe. Nursing homes give patients a safe and caring place to recuperate when they are weakened by disabilities but don't need to be in a hospital, and they provide families peace of mind knowing that their loved one has a safe and caring place to get around-the-clock care.

That is why we must stop TrumpCare. We cannot allow these deep cuts to Medicaid threaten the health of our seniors. We cannot rip these services away from the most vulnerable among us.

We must put seniors first. We must give voice to vulnerable seniors. Let's put people above partisanship, and solutions above ideology.

I oppose TrumpCare, and I will continue to fight to protect care for seniors and for all Americans.

RECOGNIZING RON AND DIANE WITHEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two lifelong servants from the State of Nebraska, former Speaker of Legislature Ron Withem and his wife, Diane.

Speaker Withem is retiring this month from 2 decades with the University of Nebraska, where he has served as the associate vice president for university affairs and the director of governmental relations.

As we see the end of one's historic career, we are reminded of the positive impact one person can have on so

many. Ron and Diane Withem have selflessly dedicated their lives to the State of Nebraska both in educating our youth as well as through the legislative process. The impact they have made on the entire State of Nebraska is evident all around us in Nebraska.

The story of the Withems is one full of many accomplishments. After moving to Papillion, Ron and Diane both became respected teachers in our local school district. Prior to entering politics, Ron was a teacher of history. Diane spent nearly 4 decades teaching in the Papillion-LaVista schools and prepared many students for college and success, including my own chief of staff, Mark Dreiling.

As leaders in our Democratic Party, Diane and Ron's political journey began in 1976, when they campaigned for Hess Dyas during the U.S. Senate primary. Later that year, they both worked for another former Second District Congressman, John Cavanagh, in the general election. Following Congressman Cavanagh's victory, Ron served as a congressional aide in his local office.

By the 1980s, Ron was a member of the Papillion-LaVista School Board and was a member of the Papillion Planning Commission. When the legislative seat in District 14 became vacant in 1983, Ron was tapped by Governor Bob Kerry to serve out the term. And serve he did.

Ron Withem dedicated 14 years of his life in our legislature, serving as the chairperson of the Urban Affairs Committee, the chairperson of the Education Committee, and the high mark being his election as the first Democratic speaker since 1970, which happened in a Republican-majority body of our officially nonpartisan legislature.

During that time, he rose to become one of the most well-respected voices in our unicameral, proudly working on issues that he was passionate about and that would have had a profound impact on our State.

Some of his accomplishments are easily visible, such as the Harrison Street Interstate Exchange. Working alongside local elected officials and business leaders, Ron's strong advocacy paved the way for what is now one of our most vibrant areas in the district.

A leader among leaders, Ron was instrumental in sponsoring and guiding many other important pieces of legislation into law. He negotiated the State's first major reform in K-12 educational funding, sponsored legislation granting tuition waivers for veterans' dependents, led efforts to improve accessibility and the transparency of our elections, and he worked to create Nebraska's first bone marrow drive system.

Through his years in public office, he was well-respected by both his colleagues as well as his constituents. Ron was known for his uncanny ability to remember bill numbers, the year a bill was discussed, and even the most

minute details surrounding the debate. As his former aide, Michelle Waite, said: "He might be a donkey, but Ron had the memory of an elephant for sure." He was considered a master legislative strategist who knew how to pull together a coalition from both parties to get the people's business done.

After 14 years of serving in the legislature, Ron went to work for the University of Nebraska. During his tenure, he made a tremendous impact on our State by leading the university's legislative relations strategy. He also was the force behind the Building a Healthier Nebraska legislative initiative. The result of this initiative was a new cancer center, veterinary diagnostic center, and a health sciences center facility.

Ron was one of the architects behind the compromise that transferred the Nebraska State fairgrounds to the University of Nebraska for the development of the Nebraska Innovation Campus. This public-private partnership leverages university research for economic benefit, all the while preserving some of the history of our State fairgrounds.

His colleagues at the university talk about their tremendous respect for Ron. He was known for building quality relationships with others and his ability to meet daily challenges with positivity. Ron once said: "My goal is to communicate to policymakers the enormous value the University of Nebraska brings to the State and its people."

His passion for the university and the success of Nebraska's youth motivated him to work in higher education State relations. His achievements in higher education State relations did not go unnoticed. At the Higher Education Government Relations Conference in 2013, Ron was awarded the Marvin D. "Swede" Johnson Achievement Award, a very prestigious national level award.

As a fellow citizen of Papillion, I want to thank both Ron and Diane Wither for their positive impact that they have made serving our community and our State.

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the incredible work of the Anti-Defamation League, or ADL.

The founder of this uplifting organization, Sigmund Livingston, envisioned an America where we all are created and treated equally. This is an objective that remains ever-relevant in today's America. Through programming in schools, the ADL creates dialogue to educate and prepare students to fight back against hate and confront discrimination wherever it may exist. In addition, the ADL works to bring individuals together to build understanding.

□ 1045

I have had the pleasure of meeting a special person, Rabbi Gruenberg, a leader in Congregation Beth El, in my community, as well as the Philadelphia ADL, earlier this year. I am proud to stand with my neighbors, advocates, and elected officials of every stripe to reaffirm that there is no room for hate or discrimination in any of our communities.

The work of the Anti-Defamation League must continue and expand, because the only way we can end senseless hate is by building bridges and engaging with people we may perceive as being different from ourselves.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the ADL for the incredibly important work they are doing. I stand with them, as should everyone in this Chamber.

SANCTUARY CITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, finally, this week, we are taking up two pieces of legislation that will address a huge problem in my home State of California for a long time.

As California moves more and more towards becoming a sanctuary State, already having several sanctuary cities, H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 move in the right direction toward law and order and what people expect from their government in providing for the public safety.

We go back to the story of two Californians I can think of off the top of my head immediately, Kate Steinle and Jamiel Shaw, Jr., taken needlessly by people who shouldn't have even been in the country. They were illegal immigrants who were allowed to slip through the system and cause the death of both of those fine young people in California.

Juan Sanchez was an illegal immigrant with a record of seven felonies. He had been caught and deported not once, not twice, by five times. He should not have been on the streets of California. But on July 1, he was roaming around free in San Francisco. He stole a gun out of a Federal officer's car, fired shots in public, and shot Kate Steinle in the back. San Francisco is a so-called sanctuary city, but it was not a sanctuary city for Kate Steinle.

By shielding illegal immigrants from Federal authorities, sanctuary cities are disobeying the law. These actions have fatal consequences, as Kate Steinle and her family found out.

Action we take this week on H.R. 3004, Kate's Law, will toughen the punishment for illegal immigrants who re-enter the country. The second bill, H.R. 3003, No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, cracks down on sanctuary cities, protects the public from dangerous criminals, and sends a message that if

you are not with us in enforcing the law, then you are not going to receive funding or other help from the Federal Government.

I think that is finally the right message coming out of Washington, D.C., for those who don't uphold the laws and see to the first duty of government, which is to protect and stand up for the safety of its citizens.

HONORING AL ST. LAWRENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Savannah-Chatham Metro Police Department's construction of its newest training facility, which memorializes long-time Sheriff Al St. Lawrence.

After 21 years of service as an officer, St. Lawrence ran for Chatham County Sheriff in 1992. Because of his outstanding service to our community, his constituents reelected him five times. He held this position until he passed away on November 25, 2015.

Sheriff St. Lawrence was also responsible for overseeing the significant renovation of the county jail, which ultimately added an additional 400,000 square feet to the facility and doubled inmate occupancy.

Remembering Sheriff St. Lawrence's dedication to training personnel, the Chatham County Police Department developed the Al St. Lawrence Recruitment and Training Range. This range will not only provide effective training resources to officers but will also house the Sheriff's Office Internal Affairs Division and the U.S. Marshals Service.

The facility is located on 10 acres of property at the Chatham County Sheriff's Office and includes several training ranges, including cable ranges, steel target ranges, and a Rogers Range, which improves an officer's aim when discharging a firearm.

Twice a month, the facility will also host a civilian gun class, which is open to the public. Educating the public on firearm safety will reduce the risk of accidental deaths from the misuse of guns.

Sheriff St. Lawrence's enduring service will forever be etched in the history of Chatham County, and his contributions will ensure that Chatham County will remain a safe, thriving community for years to come.

LINEMAN APPRECIATION

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor our electric linemen, the men and women who ensure our lights stay shining every day.

In Georgia, electric utility companies have started a movement to recognize the hard work linemen do every day. Companies such as Georgia Power and MEAG Power celebrate their workers, who make modern living possible.

Without linemen, we would not have many of the things we have grown accustomed to using. Air conditioning, refrigerators, warm showers, entertainment devices, and plenty more, are all

things we would have to learn to live without. It is easy to take these services for granted, but it is important to remember the people who make it all possible.

Earlier this year, we witnessed the valuable and honorable service these individuals provide when severe thunderstorms and tornadoes tore through Georgia over 3 days. Homes and businesses were destroyed and thousands of citizens were left in the dark. Crews of linemen all across the State joined together and selflessly worked for 2 weeks until every light was back on.

It is our duty not to overlook the workers and services that make our lives easier. I want to take this time and sincerely thank not just linemen in Georgia, but all linemen across the Nation, for powering the life inside our homes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Bishop Stephen E. Blaire, Diocese of Stockton, Stockton, California, offered the following prayer:

O God, in this House, many words are spoken just as in our houses of worship.

Grant us, O Lord, the wisdom to speak words that will always be edifying—to build up our Nation as a people.

Let our words not only denounce war, violence, and injustices, but promote all that is necessary for building genuine peace through right relationships.

Let our words not only condemn exploitation, racism, and abuses of wealth, but demonstrate that the cries of the poor and excluded have been heard. Let our words promote building just systems that ensure the common good and protect the inherent dignity of every human life.

Let our words not only lament environmental degradation but promote all that is necessary for respecting the Earth as our common home.

Lord God, grant that our words will always build "one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's pro-

ceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING BISHOP STEPHEN E. BLAIRE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to be joined by a special guest from my district, Bishop Stephen Blaire, who had the privilege of leading us in our opening prayer. Bishop Blaire oversees the Diocese of Stockton, and he was appointed by Pope John Paul II in 1999, becoming the fifth Bishop of Stockton.

Throughout his career, he has been a staunch advocate for workers' rights, commonsense legislation to reduce gun violence, and has promoted and worked towards social justice gains. As a newly appointed bishop, he followed in the footsteps of his predecessor, continuing to address the needs of Spanish-speaking parishioners by bringing more Spanish-speaking priests to the diocese and maintaining the ministry to migrant workers.

I want to leave Members with some words of wisdom from Bishop Blaire that I believe we can all take to heart as we head into the Fourth of July holiday. When he was appointed Bishop of Stockton, he said that his vision was to build a church that was strong in faith but also strong in service to the community. As we head home to celebrate the birth of our Nation, let us remember that, as Members of Congress, our job is to build a government the American people have faith in because of our commitment to serving their needs.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

ACA'S ONGOING COLLAPSE

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, every day there are more stories about the

Affordable Care Act's, or ObamaCare's, ongoing collapse.

Insurers have been dropping out of the ACA's markets for 3 years now. It is estimated that two out of every five, or 40 percent, of all counties in the country will have only one insurer on the exchanges, and many markets may soon have none at all.

The House passed compromise legislation to provide the American people, especially those in the individual market, with more flexibility and choice and fewer Washington mandates, all while putting Medicaid, a critical safety net program, on a sustainable path.

Critics of this legislation have responded with hyperbolic, irresponsible rhetoric, and no solutions, other than higher taxes, more spending, and more Washington control.

Some ACA defenders are actually calling for a single-payer system, which would result in unbearably high taxes, even tighter grips from Washington, and unsustainable spending. It would destroy innovation, create scarcity, degrade quality, and drive up costs. Even the liberal California legislator seems to have abandoned the single-payer fantasy this week.

Instead of careening toward single payer, let's keep the promises we made to repeal and replace ObamaCare and meet the expectations of those who sent us here.

DEMOCRACY AND AUTONOMY FOR HONG KONG

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 1997, Britain transferred sovereignty over Hong Kong to China. Under a "one country, two systems" arrangement with London, Beijing promised to allow universal suffrage as an ultimate aim, along with other freedoms.

But 20 years later, that promise remains unfulfilled. Last March, a new chief executive was elected, not by the people of Hong Kong, but by a committee whose members have close ties to the Chinese Government. Human rights groups have documented an erosion of press freedom and growing threats to judicial independence. Hong Kong's freedoms are at grave risk.

This Saturday, Chinese President Xi Jinping will visit Hong Kong to mark the 20th anniversary of the handover. Some protesters have already been detained, including Joshua Wong, who I have met, and newly elected legislator, Nathan Law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of this Chamber to hold China to its word and speak out in support of democracy and autonomy for Hong Kong.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

(Mr. DESJARLAIS asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, today I want to address illegal immigration and what House Republicans are doing to ensure Americans' safety. This week, we voted to defund sanctuary cities that harbor criminals like the man who murdered Kate Steinle in San Francisco.

My heart goes out to her parents and families around the country who have lost loved ones to foreign nationals who should have never been in this country in the first place.

We passed Kate's Law to increase penalties on previously deported illegal immigrants. Also, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act would defund sanctuary cities and prevent lawsuits against local governments that follow Federal law.

Shockingly, Nashville, in my home State of Tennessee, has been considering a sanctuary bill, even though murders this year already outnumber last year's total.

Some on the city council want Nashville to become a magnet for violent gangs that transport drugs and human beings. Sanctuary policies endanger not only San Francisco or Nashville but the entire U.S.

President Trump is cracking down on immigration crime. Illegal border crossings are down, and arrests and deportations of criminal aliens are up, just as Americans demanded last November.

Here in the House, we are keeping our promises and our country safe.

COMMUNITY-BASED POLICING EFFORTS VITAL TO PUBLIC SAFETY

(Mr. BROWN of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3003, a partisan bill that seeks to punish so-called sanctuary cities, strikes at the heart of community-based policing efforts vital to public safety.

Under this bill, States and counties where local police focus on community priorities rather than immigration enforcement would be punished, losing millions of dollars that could be used to build up communities, improve our Nation's infrastructure, and strengthen local government.

Moreover, this bill would jeopardize public safety by discouraging people from trusting law enforcement, sharing information, or reporting crime.

Across the country, most police chiefs have expressed serious concerns about policies that may lead to racial profiling or requiring their officers to break up families.

They have said that immigration enforcement should remain a Federal responsibility. Instead of forcing local police to act as immigration officers, we should work on passing comprehen-

sive immigration reform that includes a pathway to citizenship for aspiring Americans.

And if we truly want to make the streets of America safer, Congress should act to strengthen bonds between community and police, invest in mental health and substance abuse services, reduce gun violence, and reform the criminal justice system.

TRIBUTE TO STAFF SERGEANT HENRY J. NYKAMP

(Mr. LANCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Staff Sergeant Henry J. Nykamp of Milford, New Jersey. This July, Sergeant Nykamp will be awarded the French Legion of Honour, normally reserved for French nationals. However, other nationals who have aided France or promoted its ideals can receive the recognition as well.

Due to Sergeant Nykamp's tremendous dedication to the allied cause in World War II, from June of 1943 to October of 1945, there is no one more deserving of the honor.

During World War II, Sergeant Nykamp was stationed in Hardwick, England, where he flew 35 missions as a B-25 nose gunner. Some of Sergeant Nykamp's most important operations involved low-level flying in support of ground forces during the Battle of the Bulge. He was awarded four Bronze Stars and five Air Medals.

Sergeant Nykamp's is a story of great sacrifice and courage. Mission after mission, flight after flight, he answered the call of duty. He entered World War II at one of the world's darkest hours and did not rest until the struggle was over and the forces of right had prevailed.

I am pleased that France is recognizing Sergeant Nykamp for his role in its liberation, and I also thank him for his tremendous service not only to the United States but to the allied cause.

IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT IS RESPONSIBILITY OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3003. This bill before the Chamber today, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, is another attack on the immigration communities and communities of color in my home State of Texas and communities throughout the country.

This misguided legislation would strip critical Federal funding for our local police agencies, such as COPS grants, that do not comply with Federal immigration detainers. Doing so would only undermine the public safety in our communities in Houston and Harris County.

Our local law enforcement officers for Houston Police Department and Harris County sheriffs are responsible for protecting the people of our great city and county and upholding our local laws.

They are not, nor should they be, de facto Federal immigration agents. The U.S. Constitution is clear that immigration enforcement is the responsibility of the Federal Government and not the States or local governments. To require local police officers to enforce Federal immigration law would not only violate our 200-year tradition of federalism but will tear apart the local trust our police and sheriffs have built with the immigrant community and communities of color over the years.

I ask my colleagues to let our local law enforcement protect our families and our homes and not be immigration agents.

SANCTUARY CITIES UNDERMINE FEDERAL LAW

(Mr. BUCSHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. So-called sanctuary cities have become a safe haven for illegal immigrants who have committed crimes. They undermine Federal law and put the safety of law-abiding citizens at risk.

Kate Steinle was murdered in San Francisco by an illegal immigrant who had seven felonies and had been deported five times. Where was Kate's sanctuary?

We are a country of laws, and we must enforce them and hold accountable anyone who violates them.

Sarah Root was killed by an illegal immigrant, street racing drunk. Grant Ronnebeck was murdered in cold blood by working the nightshift at a convenience store.

Mr. Speaker, no family should ever have to go through what these families have faced.

Kate's Law and the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act will help protect our communities and help protect families from these senseless and preventable tragedies.

COMBATING ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, most Americans get it. Frankly, it is just common sense. We can't continue to reward folks who come to our country illegally while those who work hard and play by the rules struggle to get ahead.

It is way past time to fix our broken immigration policies in America.

Today, the House is considering two commonsense reforms to combat illegal immigration, restore rule of law, and protect public safety.

The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act defunds sanctuary cities and cracks down on dangerous sanctuary city policies that shield criminal investigations from Federal immigration enforcement and puts American citizens at risk.

Kate's Law increases penalties for deported felons who return to America and commit further crimes.

Kate's Law was named after a young woman who was tragically gunned down by a five-time deported felon nearly 2 years ago to this day. It is outrageous.

The Federal Government's first duty is to protect its citizens. I urge my colleagues to support these much-needed reforms and then do more to stop illegal immigration in the United States.

□ 1215

HONORING THE LIFE OF EMIL FRANZI

(Ms. MCSALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Emil Franzi, a dear friend and a legend in our southern Arizona community.

Born on the Fourth of July, Emil Franzi was a patriot and outspoken conservative commentator, political strategist, columnist, and talk show host who had an encyclopedic knowledge of local politics. Franzi's radio career spanned three decades, and he was host for the "Inside Track." His passing marks the end of an era.

Franzi loved classical opera, guns, and the old west. He worked to preserve local western heritage through his "Voices of the West" radio show.

Underneath his curmudgeonly exterior was a soft and charitable heart. Not only did he raise three successful daughters, he also took in a number of youth as a foster parent with his wife, Kathy. Franzi also adopted many stray animals. One of them, here, he named after me: Martha, this 6-month-old puppy—one of the highest honors I have received as a fellow dog lover.

Emil Franzi passed away on June 7 after battling cancer. He was 78. He left an indelible mark on southern Arizona. I am deeply grateful for Emil's friendship, advice, and his faithful support. He will be sorely missed.

POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the month of June as National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month.

Millions of our Nation's heroes experience post-traumatic stress upon returning home from their service. Invisible wounds like PTS are just as impor-

tant and worthy of treatment as physical injuries. Seeking help for PTS is not a sign of weakness or defeat, but a show of strength and commitment to a full and healthy life.

Treating PTS is not a one-size-fits-all process either. Our veterans need options to find the treatments that work best for their unique needs. That is why I am proud my legislation, the COVER Act, has been signed into law and will help increase access to evidence-based alternative therapies at the VA.

For National PTS Awareness Month, I stand committed to serving our Nation's heroes and improving their treatment options.

HONORING THE ARKANSAS FARM FAMILY OF THE YEAR

(Mr. WESTERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is an extreme honor to note the accomplishment of a hardworking Arkansas Fourth District family. Mark and Shay Morgan and their daughter, Kate, of Clarksville, were named last December as the 2016 Arkansas Farm Family of the Year, and will compete this coming October among nine other State winners to be the 2017 Southeastern Farmer of the Year.

The Morgans' diverse farm is best known for its Peach Pickin' Paradise which consists of 3,500 peach and nectarine trees on 17 acres. I was fortunate to visit Peach Pickin' Paradise last fall and sample some of their produce. With peaches making up 60 percent of the farm's operation, it also consists of 600 acres of hay used for their 300 head of beef cattle.

Beyond their hard work on the family farm, the Morgans are a vital part of their local community, participating in a number of organizations that display the hard work ethic they live by.

Congratulations to Mark, Shay, and Kate Morgan as they have exhibited exemplary testimony to the American Dream and to the Fourth District of Arkansas.

RECOGNIZING RAY HECKLER, A TRUE AMERICAN HERO

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a true American hero, Ray Heckler, who is being laid to rest in Arlington today with full military honors.

Ray began his service to his country as a private in the Army, and retired after 40 years as a command sergeant major in the Illinois National Guard in Urbana. During his time in the Army, he served in Germany, Berlin, Japan, Paris, Africa, Morocco, Casablanca, and Marcel in France. He was awarded

the Bronze Star in France for his heroic and praiseworthy service on the field of battle.

Remembered by those closest to him as being a helping hand whenever needed, Ray spent time with his community by working to construct and rehabilitate homes through Habitat for Humanity.

It is my honor to recognize Mr. Heckler and his devotion to our country. My thoughts and prayers are with his family as they mourn the loss of a truly courageous and selfless man.

Rest in peace, Ray Heckler.

HONORING THE LIFE OF WILLIAM "RYAN" OWENS

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 2017, U.S. Navy Chief Special Warfare Operator William "Ryan" Owens was killed during a raid in Yemen. At the age of 36, he gave the ultimate sacrifice in order to protect our great Nation. He is survived by his wife and three young children.

This week I introduced a bill which would rename the Chillicothe, Illinois, post office in honor of Ryan's life and service as a Navy SEAL. My office and I worked closely with the U.S. Postal Service, the U.S. Navy Congressional Liaison Office, Central Illinois Gold Star Families, and, most importantly, Ryan's family. All of us were determined to make sure we got this right. His wife ultimately made the decision to name the post office after Ryan in Chillicothe, a town in my district, where Ryan graduated high school.

This effort has the backing and bipartisan support of the entire Illinois delegation, and it is our hope that the post office will forever remind the community of their hometown hero and his commitment to serving our country.

While we can never fully repay Chief Owens and his family for the sacrifices he made, renaming the post office in his honor is a small effort to thank him for his service and his dedication to protecting America.

He and his family are forever in our hearts and prayers.

WELCOMING SOUTH KOREAN PRESIDENT MOON JAE-IN TO WASHINGTON

(Mr. YOHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to rise to welcome Moon Jae-in of the Republic of Korea to the United States on the occasion of his first visit as President.

The United States and the Republic of Korea share a longstanding pivotal defense alliance, and we are bound together as fellow democracies who share common values.

The U.S.-Korea relationship has been a growing partnership, and now they are the United State's sixth largest trading partner. It is Florida's third largest export market, and we have over 1,700 Korean Americans in my district.

Korea is one of only five U.S. mutual defense allies in Asia, one of only three nations in the region to have completed a bilateral trade agreement with the United States, and hosts a U.S. military presence of nearly 38,000 Americans.

The Republic of Korea is our foundational partner in facing the gravest threats to the world's peace and security, and that is the rogue nuclear regime of Kim Jong-un. We will continue to stand together to address this grave threat and maintain our close bilateral relationship.

I give my most sincere congratulations to President Moon Jae-in on his first electoral victory, and I welcome him warmly to Washington during such an important time.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 29, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 29, 2017, at 9:11 am.:

Appointments:
Board of Visitors of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

Western Hemisphere Drug Policy Commission.

Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3004, KATE'S LAW, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JULY 3, 2017, THROUGH JULY 10, 2017

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 415 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 415

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3004) to amend section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to reentry of removed aliens. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous

question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from July 3, 2017, through July 10, 2017—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment during the month of July, 2017.

SEC. 5. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Thursday, July 6, 2017, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018.

SEC. 6. The Committee on Armed Services may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Thursday, July 6, 2017, file a report to accompany H.R. 2810.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my dear friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. This rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3004, also known as Kate's Law.

It should be instructive, also, Mr. Speaker, to recognize that H.R. 3004 had a companion bill that we debated on the rule yesterday—not voted on, we will vote on these today—that was a companion bill to this that is a very important bill. These are both effective law enforcement tools that need to be made available not only to protect the people of the United States, but, in particular, people who live in many of the jurisdictions that are being denied that support by effective law enforcement because of political policies that are being instructed by city councils and mayors across the country.

Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 2015, Juan Francisco Lopez-Sanchez shot and killed Kate Steinle at Pier 14 in San Francisco, California, while she was

walking with her father. Mr. Lopez-Sanchez claims that he does not fully recall the murder, as he took strong sleeping pills prior to the incident.

Mr. Speaker, this senseless and cowardly murder should never have happened. Mr. Lopez-Sanchez is and was an unlawful criminal alien who had previously been deported five times from the United States of America.

□ 1230

He had numerous felony convictions in the United States of America, including for the possession of heroin and the manufacturing of narcotics in the United States of America.

Despite his lengthy history of criminal acts dating back to 1991, Mr. Sanchez was able to illegally reenter the United States again and again and again with minimal consequences, showcasing serious fault lines in one of our systems of deterrence: our border.

For years, the lack of immigration enforcement and the spread of dangerous sanctuary policies have failed the American people and cost lives. The death of innocent Americans, such as Kate, Sarah Root, Grant Roanebeck, and too many others across this country, is simply unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we are here today. The American people have had enough. And I believe Congress has heard from the people, and we have heard enough and had enough.

The bottom line is we now have a President, Donald J. Trump, who not only heard this same story as he went around the country running for President, but had a different answer, because I assure you, the major candidates running for President on the Republican and Democratic ticket heard this same content. One person stepped up to the plate. He is now our President: Donald J. Trump.

The American people are sick and tired of turning on their TVs or radios or newspapers and seeing yet another senseless murder committed by a previously deported criminal alien. Their deaths are especially devastating since I believe they could have been prevented if our immigration laws had been carefully enforced or we had, really, what I call the national deterrent: the will to stop these senseless acts. Kate's Law gets close to doing just that.

The underlying legislation that the House will be able to vote on in this rule and in the legislation today enhances the current maximum sentences for illegal reentry. The bill raises the maximum sentence for criminal aliens who reenter the United States to between 10 and 25 years in Federal prison, depending upon the criminal's history.

For all those who are attempting to politicize this legislation—and, yes, they are—I would encourage them to read the bill. Mr. Speaker, I have that bill in front of me as we speak, and it is really not too much of a lift. It is half of a page and four other pages.

Members of Congress do have time to read the bill. Members of Congress do

have time to understand why we are here today. And it is more than just that is just the way it is. It is, in fact, a reality that has become all too known by every single American, and especially moms and dads, moms and dads and uncles and grandparents who hurt when our children are hurt.

So regardless of your position on general immigration reform, I would hope that you would join us today, join us today in agreeing that we should do everything we can to discourage murderers and criminal aliens.

Disagreeing one way or another on immigration policy is not what this is about. This is about where even there is the slightest potential that there could be citizens who would be harmed, we need a second look, a second opportunity, and a chance to address the issue.

The American people, I believe, need and deserve stronger deterrence of those who have come here illegally and have already proven that they are willing to break our Nation's most serious laws.

These are not huddled masses yearning to be free or families attempting to come here for a better life. These are bad people, and we call them criminals. They have violated the criminal conduct code here in the United States of America. They are people who we know are capable of terrible crimes, who, via their own criminal actions, have made sure that they have taken away the right that others had and, in doing so, have harmed the lives of our citizens.

The American people spoke clearly in November. President Donald J. Trump understood that. This is a criminal matter; this is not a politics issue; and the time of letting the worst criminals back in our country over and over and over again must stop. The process begins again today.

Mr. Speaker, that is just the way it is, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, all of us mourn the death of Kate Steinle, tragically shot and killed in San Francisco in 2015. Indeed, there isn't a parent anywhere who doesn't worry constantly about the well-being and the health and the safety of a child. And we all know, even though we may not have lost our own, we have deep sympathy with those who do. But as the Cato Institute has outlined, the legislation before us today would not have prevented that tragedy.

As the Cato Institute has said, the alleged shooter "did not end up in San Francisco due to lax border security, and the case actually shows the opposite. In recent years, Border Patrol caught him each time he attempted to cross."

He was only in the city because the U.S. Justice Department failed to do its job, and that is why Cato has called

this bill, "a waste of Federal resources." Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker, that these are the words of the Cato Institute, a group founded by the well-known conservative Charles Koch. Cato could not have been more clear when they said it this week: "Kate's Law would not have helped Kate."

Now, our country has listened as President Donald J. Trump called Mexican immigrants "criminals, drug dealers, and rapists." The public has watched him promote the formation of a deportation force to tear apart immigrants from their families and sign an executive order directing Federal resources toward the construction of a wall along the border between the U.S. and Mexico, where there is one mostly already that has not done that much deterring, but that is despite the fact that Federal spending on border security over the last few years has been at the highest level that our country has ever seen. It seems the majority has now taken a page from the President's playbook, apparently trying to turn his dangerous rhetoric into law.

It is shameful that they are prioritizing a bill that is completely unnecessary, since current law already imposes adequately severe penalties for illegal reentry, including enhanced penalties for criminal offenses. It is already covered, Mr. Speaker, but we do have something we need to fill the afternoon since the health bill failed. All the while, the majority is ignoring the many, many, many major issues facing the Nation today.

Now, I know, and we all know, that the bill wasn't the only thing they were hoping to ram through here before we adjourned for the district work period. They also hoped to pass their healthcare repeal bill so quickly before leaving town that the American people wouldn't notice; but, frankly, even as I say that, they have noticed, as I understand now, that the approval rating for that bill is 12 percent. They have noticed. I think what they have noticed is that they are going to kill Medicaid.

The reason they wanted to do this in a hurry, repeal healthcare first, was in order to fulfill their tax bill promise of corporate tax cuts as well as tax cuts for the richest people in the United States. They wanted to take from the health bill, the expanded Medicare money, \$80 billion to pay for tax cuts. The devastation that that would create, I think most American people understand it.

If they have a loved one in a nursing home, that means that, since 64 percent of the cost of nursing care is borne by Medicaid, that they would very likely have to bring the person home.

It means that 22 million people would lose their health insurance. You know, we just say that, "22 million people." Let me put that number in some perspective. That number, 22 million, is more than the population of Alaska, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, New Hampshire, New Mexico,

Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, Washington, D.C., West Virginia, and Wyoming combined. That is pretty impressive, isn't it?

In February, our President Trump said: "Nobody knew healthcare could be so complicated." Well, Mr. Speaker and Mr. President, those of us on our side who worked for more than a year to craft the Affordable Care Act knew that very well. I was chair of the Rules Committee at the time, and just the Rules Committee heard from 46 different Members of Congress over the course of three meetings which, together, lasted more than 20 hours, one of them a full Saturday of hearings.

So, together with the work done by the other committees of jurisdiction, the healthcare reform law received such a thorough vetting—and I want to get this on the record because I hear all the time it was written behind closed doors and strange people and nobody knew what it was and that we were all surprised. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Bill Kristol proclaimed on FOX News: "This is the most thoroughly debated piece of legislation in my memory in Washington."

I feel like I need to say that again, but I won't take the time, but how important it is. But those of us who were there knew it. We knew how many committee meetings were held on this legislation.

On the bill you are talking about from your side, the majority side, not a single committee has heard it. I wager that the vast majority of the Republicans—who deserve to see it—have not even seen that bill, and that is a tragedy. We do not operate the United States of America that way.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is no comparison between the open, the transparent, and lengthy process that we went through to craft the Affordable Care Act—which, by the way, was written by experts—and what the majority is trying to do with this disastrous repeal bill.

And while I am at it, so many times when I was doing the rule on the repeal bills—and, you know, repeal and replace, repeal and replace. We know now that all those 7 years and those more than 60 votes that we paid for while we are running the House, that all this time there was no replacement. They still don't have a replacement. If that wasn't a hoax on the American people, I don't know what was. But the process we are seeing now is defined by backroom deals and secrecy and a complete disregard for regular order.

And I understand that, between now and tomorrow afternoon, there will be a lot of big deals changing hands so that we won't know next week what is there anyway, but we wait to see the new CBO score and see what that says.

Nearly every President since Theodore Roosevelt tried to enact healthcare reform. That is a long time. Teddy Roosevelt tried it and many

Presidents after him. But after decades of failed attempts and false starts, President Obama, working with a Democratic Congress, was finally able to deliver.

The majority should work with us again. We are willing to do that. And what we would really like to see you do is take the ACA and the problems that it has and let's work together and improve that law, which has already been in effect now for a number of years, since 2014, and we could just move ahead and get on with things that are terribly important to us.

We wish that you would do that instead of trying to dismantle it. If it were dismantled, it would disrupt the markets. It would harm the sick and disproportionately impact those in nursing homes.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a distinguished Member of this body.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, Kate's Law, the bill that this rule brings to the floor, is very personal to the people of my district because of two other names that we will never forget.

□ 1245

On October 24, 2014, Sacramento County Sheriff's Deputy Danny Oliver and Placer County Detective Michael Davis were brutally gunned down in one of the most cold-blooded rampages in the history of either county.

It began when Deputy Oliver approached a car in a parking lot to ask if he could help a couple who seemed to be lost. He was shot dead.

A bystander who was too slow turning over his car keys became the next victim. Miraculously, he survived a gunshot wound to the head but vividly remembers the smile on the gunman's face as he pulled the trigger.

The next victim was Detective Michael Davis. His father, a Riverside County Sheriff's deputy, had lost his life in the line of duty on the very same day 26 years earlier.

These crimes should never have happened. Their assailant had repeatedly entered this country illegally. While here, he had been apprehended for committing other crimes and repeatedly deported, only to easily recross the border without being challenged.

I have heard it said there is no evidence that illegal immigrants commit crimes at any higher rate than the general population. Well, that is just not true. It is true that crime statistics don't aggregate by legal status. Some States, like California, no longer even report the legal status of inmates. They can tell us by race, gender, age, background, and jurisdiction who stole a car last year, but they won't tell us how many illegal immigrants did.

By painstakingly piecing together all of the available fragmented data in

2015, FOX News concluded that illegal immigrants are three times more likely to be convicted of murder than the legal population.

According to this report, illegals account for 3.7 percent of the population but are convicted of 13.6 percent of all crimes, including 12 percent of all murders, 20 percent of all kidnappings, and 16 percent of drug trafficking. Each year, 900,000 illegal immigrants are arrested for crimes.

Citing the GAO, FOX reported that 55,000 illegal immigrants were in Federal prison and 296,000 in State and local jails in 2011. The real tragedy is that there should be zero crimes committed by illegal immigrants because there should be zero illegal immigrants in this country.

For 16 years, two Presidents—one Republican and one Democrat—ignored their constitutional responsibility to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. Well, thank God, we finally have a President who takes that responsibility seriously.

This rule brings a bill to the floor that increases penalties for those who return to our country after they have been deported. The other to be debated today adds long-overdue sanctions to local jurisdictions that refuse to protect their own citizens, and I rise in strong support of that bill as well.

It is too late for Officers Davis and Oliver. It is too late for Kate Steinle. It is too late for thousands of other Americans killed by illegal immigrants. But perhaps it is just in time for your neighbor, your family member, or yourself.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday marks the 2-year anniversary of the death of Kate Steinle, which was a tragedy for her family and for our entire community. My colleague from California has mentioned the murder of Officers Davis and Oliver, something that shook our northern California community.

These things are terrible, and I think we can agree that every Member of this House objects to, mourns, and is tremendously distressed and opposed to these criminal acts. But H.R. 3004 is not the solution to prevent such tragedies.

The bill expands criminal sentences for illegal reentry offenses, but, as has been mentioned by the ranking member of the Rules Committee, the person charged in connection with Kate's death—I believe he is, in fact, the murderer—spent over 16 years in Federal prison. He was repeatedly deported. It didn't prevent his crime.

I think it is important to recall that we are not here writing bumper stickers. We are here writing laws. So we need to examine what is the current law and what is the proposal to change the current law.

The discussion I have heard seems to assume that there are no harsh penalties in law for people who reenter without inspection. Nothing could be further from the truth. Right now, there is a felony provision for attempts to reenter. There are criminal penalties for reentry of certain removed aliens. For example, if you are removed subsequent to a conviction for a commission of three or more misdemeanors involving drugs, crimes against a person, or both, or a felony, there is a 10-year sentence. If you are removed subsequent to commission of an aggravated felony, it is a 20-year sentence, and on and on.

What does the bill do? It, for example, changes the 20-year sentence to a 25-year sentence. Well, you can argue whether that is wise or unwise. I personally think whether it is 20 or 25 is not going to be the major difference for a heinous criminal.

It also expands the definition of the misdemeanors that must be committed to entail these tremendous penalties. Right now, I mentioned it is penalties involving violence or drugs. This would just be garden-variety misdemeanors. If you were driving without a license, if you were loitering, that would count for the 10 years in Federal prison.

I don't think that those provisions are likely to make a material difference in the kinds of crimes that we all abhor, but there is something else that is in this bill that I think needs to be attended to. The bill's sponsor claims this targets immigrants with criminal convictions, but the reality is the bill mostly affects other people.

The bill, for the first time, would make it a criminal offense for an individual who was previously denied admission or ordered removed to seek to reenter the country legally, even if the individual has no criminal history, no history of repeated reentries. The bill does this by adding a definition to the term "crosses the border" that includes those who enter the country in "official restraint."

This small change means it would be a felony for a person who has been previously denied admission or previously removed to present themselves at a port of entry to request asylum, parole, admission, or another form of entry consistent with immigration laws. This is a drastic departure from current law.

Under current law, an individual can be prosecuted for illegal entry if they are trying to evade or intend to evade detection. If they are trying to sneak in, they get caught, we charge them with a crime. An individual who comes to a port of entry and voluntarily presents herself to an immigration officer to ask permission to enter the country legally has not committed a crime. This bill would change that.

Think about that for a minute. The bill makes it a crime to come to a port of entry not with the intent to enter the U.S. illegally, but to ask for a form of entry provided by the immigration laws.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. In other words, this bill makes it a crime for someone to try to reenter legally.

If you are a victim of human trafficking and come to a port of entry to seek protection and, ultimately, a T visa, which the law allows, you would commit a crime under this bill. If your U.S. citizen relative is critically injured and you show up at the port to ask for humanitarian parole so you can donate blood or an organ to your U.S. citizen relative, you have committed a crime. In each of these cases, you can be prosecuted and put in jail for up to 2 years, even if you ultimately win your immigration case.

I also want to make a point about some of the other types of people this bill would affect.

According to the U.S. Sentencing Commission, at least half of all the individuals convicted of illegal entry under the current statute, which is the most common Federal prosecution in law today, were coming to reunite with their family in the United States. Half of them had at least one child living in the U.S. Two-thirds of the offenders had other family members—a spouse or others—they were trying to get back to.

So, in addition to the people who are trying to enter legally, this bill massively increases penalties on people who are trying to get back to their families, many of whom are U.S. citizens.

The desperation of these broken families is a direct result of our failed immigration policy. Hundreds of thousands of immigrant parents have been deported over the years, leaving their U.S. citizen children as orphans in the United States. These parents—and I understand it—are trying to get back to their kids.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. LOFGREN. We may think that is a good thing or a bad thing, but we don't think that it is a crime to love your child and want to get back to that child.

The desperation that these families feel is a direct result of our inability to create a top-to-bottom reform of our immigration laws that allows families to be united, allows the economy to meet its needs, allows the crops to be picked legally. We have created this problem by failing to enforce our laws.

This bill doesn't solve the crime problem that we all care about. It creates new problems. It is not the answer to the terrible offenses that are at the name of it. In fact, those terrible crimes seem to me to be merely an excuse to expand deportation for the

many, many people whose only offense is wanting to be near their families.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and to oppose this bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for the continuing work he does as the chairman of the Rules Committee. It is very important work for this Nation and the House.

Mr. Speaker, there are some debates on this floor that are very complicated. They hinge on technicalities and complex judgment calls. You need to properly weigh all the data, all the studies, and all the nuances.

But I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that today's debate is not complicated. This is not about nuance. The subject is not complex. This is about answering a simple question: Is the purpose of our government to protect the American people first, or is the purpose of our government to protect felons who have entered our country illegally, broken our laws, and threatened our people?

I wish this were an exaggeration, but American citizens have died because some local governments have refused to uphold our laws. These so-called sanctuary cities offer safety for illegal felons, but they do so by putting our families, neighbors, and fellow Americans in danger.

The American people now look to their government and they are uncertain. They elected people to represent them, but would those Representatives rather protect felons here illegally or their fellow citizens?

As far as this House is concerned, let us end the uncertainty today. Our government should, and always will, put the safety of American people first. Cities offering sanctuary for criminals will no longer be ignored. Criminals who threaten our citizens and reenter our country with no respect for our laws will be punished.

□ 1300

Kate Steinle, an American citizen, a daughter, and a promising young woman would be alive today if local governments did not act as a safe haven for lawbreakers. Juan Lopez-Sanchez shot Kate after being deported five times. He had seven felony convictions before he murdered her.

After this crime, we asked the same questions the rest of America did: How could this man be let free? Why was he in America in the first place? How can cities across our Nation continue to shield such people from the law?

In America, the Federal Government has little right to tell States and localities how to conduct affairs properly left to them. But our Federal Government has every right to demand that these governments follow our just laws written in accordance with our Constitution. And if they do not, if those cities protect criminals at the expense

of law-abiding Americans, they should not expect their fellow citizens to help them through the Federal Government.

For those cities with laws designed to harbor immigrants who have entered this country illegally, our legislation will prohibit those laws, cut off Federal grant money, and allow the families who suffer as a result of their foolishness the right to have their day in court.

And to the criminals: If you break our laws and ever return, justice will come for you, and the penalty will be severe.

Mr. Speaker, being an American means something. We should never forget that. If America is your home, you are a citizen. If you are part of this national community, rest assured, the government is here for you. The American people come first.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I inquire if my colleague has more speakers.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I have several more speakers.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished young gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SESSIONS for his continued leadership here in the House of Representatives, and especially on this issue in the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill, which we are calling Kate's Law. Mr. Speaker, we are calling this crackdown on illegal immigration and sanctuary city policies Kate's Law after Kate Steinle.

For those of you who don't know the story of Kathryn "Kate" Steinle, she was a beautiful 32-year-old woman from northern California who was murdered on the streets of San Francisco while walking on a pier with her father 2 years ago this weekend. Murdered.

The alleged murderer, an illegal immigrant named Juan Francisco, had seven felony convictions and had been deported from the United States five times. Deported five times. Let that sink in. It is truly unbelievable, Mr. Speaker.

Yet he was back in our country after maneuvering through the previous administration's weak southern border and negligent immigration enforcement. Then he lived in San Francisco due to that city's blatant disregard for Federal law, a sanctuary city. San Francisco was no sanctuary for Kate; no sanctuary for that beautiful 32-year-old woman.

If this story isn't a clear sign that our system is broken, I don't know what is. We need Kate's Law to increase criminal penalties for illegal felons like Juan Francisco who have been convicted for crimes, deported, and then decided once again to illegally reenter the United States of America, a sovereign nation.

Kate's Law is straightforward, it is common sense, and it is the right beginning to make our homeland safer and get smart about immigration policy. It is time for us to make America safe again by addressing the lack of enforcement of Federal law. Kate's Law is the right answer.

I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for introducing Kate's Law so we can crack down on this kind of illegal behavior that so often means life or death for American citizens. It is time to enforce the law.

The gentlewoman, a few minutes ago, was talking about the law. Well, there are laws on the books that say it is illegal to enter this country. There are laws on the books that prohibit these types of sanctuary cities or sanctuary campuses as we are now seeing. I hope Congress will cut off the funding to these cities. It is time to get their attention, to enforce Federal law.

I am pleased the White House has vocalized their support for the underlying bill should it reach President Trump's desk.

Now I call upon my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, to support the rule and the underlying bill. It is time again to make America safe again and honor young women like Kate.

This should be a bipartisan issue. Respect for the rule of law and protecting the American citizens is really that simple.

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

Mr. Speaker, President Trump campaigned on the promise of bringing jobs back home and removing barriers to job creation. But despite these promises, President Trump's budget does the complete opposite. It cuts job training programs by 39 percent, and its draconian spending cuts would lead to massive job losses.

My colleagues will be happy to hear that I have an amendment that will ensure that the President keeps his promise of bringing jobs back home.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative PASCARELL's Bring Jobs Home Act, H.R. 685.

H.R. 685 will close a tax loophole that rewards companies for moving jobs overseas, while providing a tax credit to companies that move jobs back to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAFFETZ). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, because I listened very carefully, I hope

that, while I am opposed to the rule, we are debating a bill, in my estimation, to reinforce negative stereotypes about the immigrants.

I have listened to the response, perhaps, to that. Are you impugning through the Chair the record of Democrats on fulfilling our oath of office, the first part of which is to defend America from within and from without?

That is the oath of office. As co-chairman of law enforcement in the Congress of the United States for over 14 years, I am very close to the law enforcement community.

I think we ought to hesitate a second before we start pointing fingers. We are good at it, all of us, on both sides.

While we are doing that, most of our constituents are concerned about how to defend middle class jobs and bolster our manufacturing base. The majority of Americans agree that keeping U.S. jobs from moving overseas should be a top priority. Yet, despite the empty promises made by this President, the flow of jobs overseas has not stopped.

Mr. Speaker, the administration had awarded government contracts to companies that continue to offshore jobs. This is worse than empty words. These are the facts.

In fact, we use our tax money to help those corporations go offshore. I hope that makes you feel really good.

In December, then-President-elect Trump told hundreds of workers at the Carrier manufacturing plant in Indiana that he would save their jobs. Six hundred union jobs from that plant are moving to Monterrey, Mexico. This is happening despite Carrier receiving \$7 million in tax incentives from the State of Indiana to keep the plant open.

Chuck Jones, president of United Steelworkers Local 1999, which represents Carrier employees, said that the President "lied his" you know what "off."

Layoffs at the company start July 20. We don't stop companies from offshoring American jobs by holding rallies. We do it by making good policy, an exercise this administration and this Congress has refused.

So what we haven't settled for—and we can't—is empty words and pyrrhic victories while we undermine our values. If they want to change that, my friends on the other side can start right now, and we will help them.

Under current law, when companies move overseas, we give them a tax break for the cost. That is unbelievable. We need to stop offshoring. This Congress could defeat the previous question and bring up the Bring Jobs Home Act. This bill eliminates the tax deduction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill gives a tax credit of up to 20 per-

cent of the cost to U.S. businesses that bring jobs back to the United States. The companies would have to add jobs to claim the tax credit.

Let's stop subsidizing companies that ship jobs overseas, and start bringing jobs back to our shores. In fact, we used it in the last campaign as a reason why we have a problem with employment, because the immigrants take these jobs. That has been an empty fact. No details. No facts. No science.

Mr. Speaker, it doesn't get much simpler than this. This is not a new idea. President Obama and Congress raised the bill for years. The House blocked it on the majority—on the other side.

Senator STABENOW of Michigan leads this bill in the Senate, where it cleared a procedural vote 93-7.

I challenge you today to stop the small talk, put your money where your mouth is, take up and pass this bill to stand for American manufacturing and the workers here at home who need help.

I urge a "no" vote on the previous question so we can bring up the Bring Jobs Home Act and start bringing jobs back to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I will take a back seat to no one when it comes to upholding the law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members that remarks in debate may not engage in personalities toward the President of the United States, including by repeating remarks made elsewhere that would be improper if spoken in the Member's own words.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in strong support of Kate's Law and the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act.

This Saturday, July 1, marks 2 years since the tragic death of 32-year-old Kate Steinle, who was shot and killed by an illegal immigrant who had seven prior felony convictions and who had also been deported five times.

□ 1315

Kate's death is a clear reminder that we must do more to stop the abuse of our immigration laws by criminals who repeatedly flaunt the rule of law by illegally reentering the United States.

Kate's Law puts in place new guidelines for stiffer penalties for criminal aliens who continue to reenter the United States illegally. Kate's Law is desperately needed to protect the residents of the State of Texas.

Nicodemo Coria-Gonzalez—who had been deported five times to Mexico for crimes, including three DWIs—reentered the United States illegally and was charged with committing multiple sexual assaults and kidnapped a woman solely for the purpose of setting her on fire.

Current policy enables criminals to roam American streets—no matter

where they come from—with little fear of arrest and deportation. Kate's Law imposes stronger consequences and is an important step in restoring law and order. It will protect American lives.

Sadly, there are local and State officials in our great Nation who put the interests of criminal aliens before the safety of American citizens. These officials should take the time to meet with the families of the many victims of these criminal aliens, like I have. They will see the resulting tragedy of sanctuary city policies.

To rein in such States and localities, we need to pass the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, which will impose consequences on State and local jurisdictions that ignore Federal immigration law by refusing to work with Federal immigration officials to remove criminal aliens from the United States.

In the first month of the Trump administration, Immigration and Customs Enforcement issued over 3,000 detainers. These are orders for local authorities to keep criminal aliens in custody for 48 hours to enable ICE agents to come and get them for deportation. Remarkably, 206 of these detainers were declined by sanctuary city jurisdictions. In other words, local authorities deliberately ignored ICE's detainer request and released these dangerous individuals onto American streets.

These weren't just petty criminals, folks. Their crimes included homicide, rape, assault, domestic violence, indecent exposure to a minor, sex offenses against a minor, aggravated assault with a weapon, vehicle theft, kidnapping, driving under the influence, hit and run, and sexual assault.

Passing the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act is common sense, as it cuts off certain Federal Department of Justice grants to these sanctuary cities. Our bill redirects these funds to States and localities that are cooperating with Federal immigration authorities and making America safer.

The message of this legislation is clear: American taxpayers are tired of footing the bill for States and localities that threaten their safety.

Criminal aliens with final deportation orders make up more than 50 percent of foreign-born inmates sitting in our prisons right now. Our streets will be made safer by deporting these criminal aliens, rather than letting them loose onto American streets.

Local law enforcement officials should work with Federal law enforcement agencies to keep criminals out of our country and off of these streets. This is why we must pass Kate's Law and the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act to prevent other deaths like Kate Steinle's.

I am proud to support these two commonsense, law and order bills, and strongly urge my House colleagues to vote in favor of them today.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa

(Mr. KING), one of the leading voices in Congress, not only on this issue, but also issues of great importance and it's Americanism: that our country is a great country, and that we live in the greatest country in the world. There isn't one time that I am not around this gentleman that he does not speak about American exceptionalism, the rule of law, and the important attributes of our country that make us world leaders.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reciprocate in a compliment to the gentleman from Texas, who stands here and leads in this Congress every day, and takes on a heavy load in the Rules Committee. A lot of times those are late night meetings—maybe the rest of us have put our feet up, not so much me, but some of the rest of us, Mr. Speaker—and PETE SESSIONS is up there working away, keeping organization in this House, and helping bring these things to the floor. We would not be here on the floor today if we didn't have a Rules Committee to work with and that cooperated.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE for joining with me on this and putting his name on top of this bill as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, or we would be still stuck back in hearings and markups.

This is a great week to be debating these immigration bills that are here. A big reason for that is that this is a hold-their-feet-to-the-fire week that many of us have joined, as the radio talk show hosts that believe in secure borders, the rule of law, enforcing immigration law, and building a wall come together at the Phoenix Park Hotel in Washington, D.C. We talk about the rule of law and enforcing immigration law. That has gone on now for a long time. I have joined in most of those.

But, also, this is a week that the grieving families, who have lost a loved one at the hands of a criminal alien in this country, have not only come to this city and joined in the radio discussion that has taken place at the Phoenix Park Hotel, but they also were invited out to the White House to meet with the President yesterday, where there were a number of these families that were there to be represented and respected. I would say two-thirds to three-quarters of them are people who I have worked with from nearly the beginning of the tragedy that struck their family.

I am greatly respectful of the individuals who have had the courage to step forward that President Trump has identified. I recall those times when he asked some of these families—Jamiel Shaw, for example; Michelle Root; Mary Ann Mendoza; and Sabine Durden, whose son Dominic was killed by an illegal alien.

These families are families that have paid a huge price, but they were strong

enough and courageous enough to step up on the stage with Presidential candidate Donald Trump and recount their stories to the media, some of them to speak before the national convention and reiterate these stories.

Just this morning, I heard Jamiel Shaw reiterate the story of the murder of his son that took place within the sound of the gunshots of the living room that Jamiel Shaw was sitting in. I have heard that now for 9 years, but the pain has not gone out of his voice, Mr. Speaker. We have some obligations here. And I heard it in the previous speaker: Keep our people safe.

Well, of those who die at the hands of criminal aliens, illegal aliens—anyone who is unlawfully present in America and perpetrates violence against an American citizen, kills an American citizen, or someone who is lawfully present in America—every one of those are preventable crimes, 100 percent preventable crimes.

I would just direct the attention here, Mr. Speaker, of a tweet that I had them pull down for me. I didn't know the date, but I saw the news story about Kate Steinle. It says: "Family devastated after woman shot, killed in San Francisco.

"The family of a San Francisco woman who was killed in a seemingly random act of violence is mourning her loss as police continue to search for"

And then it is lost in space—the article that I read.

But it must have been published on the 2nd of July—she was killed on the 1st—of 2015. My tweet came up on the 3rd, the very next day. I didn't stop to think about it. I didn't wait to see if it became a national story that Bill O'Reilly would bring up. By the way, I thank Bill O'Reilly. He helped a lot in getting us here today.

But here is a message I sent out, with a picture of Kate Steinle. It says: "100 percent preventable crime. Just enforce the law. This will make you cry, too, and it happens every day."

That is within only 142 characters, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a tweet regarding Sarah Root.

Sarah Root, 21, would be alive, living & loving life if Obama had not violated his oath & ordered ICE to stand down.

Teen charged in Iowa woman's death may've fled the country

Authorities say a teenager who was at the wheel of a car that was involved in a crash in Omaha last month that killed an Iowa woman has missed a court hearing and may have fled the count

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, every day in this country, at the hands of criminal aliens, people who are lawfully here are suffering, and they are paying a huge price. There isn't a way that we quantify loss to a crime. The crime victim is often out of the equation when it comes to enforcing the law.

I sat in on a case where I was the subject of a severe property rights crime. I listened to them announce the case,

the case of the State v.—I remember his name—Jason Martin Powell. It occurred to me that I am not in this. My name isn't part of the proceedings because we don't honor the victims enough.

Well, we are honoring them here today in a couple of pieces of legislation that are coming down, and we are honoring the life of Kate Steinle, and we are honoring the work of Jim Steinle, the rest of her family, and all of those adults who came forward and put their necks on the line for this.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), a gentleman who my party prays for on a daily basis.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot. We hear every day about healthcare.

This is a healthcare bill. It is for the health of Americans, the physical health of people, so that they have the right to good health, health that is sometimes prevented by those people who are foreign nationals that commit crimes in the U.S., go to prison, get deported, go back, come back to the U.S., and commit another crime. It is a healthcare bill. And I would hope that our friends on the other side would vote for at least one healthcare bill this year, and this is that bill.

The idea that a person could commit a crime in this country, get deported, come back, commit more crimes back and forth across the border, as we have heard, and continue to do it with lawlessness and arrogance is nonsense because the law is not enforced.

Our cities talk about the immigrant communities that live there. I live in Houston, Texas. This bill helps protect the immigrant population. We have got MS-13 gangs, criminal gangs, who come to the U.S. They set up shop in our immigrant communities, they terrorize those communities, and they do it with lawlessness because they believe, if they ever get caught, they will eventually be able to come back into the United States and continue their wicked ways.

This bill helps prevent that. If cities do not want to protect their immigrant communities, and law enforcement does not want to help enforce the law, then those communities shouldn't get Federal funds for law enforcement. That is what these two bills do.

So I would hope Members of Congress would understand the importance that this bill deals with criminal aliens that run through the United States committing crimes, get deported, and continue to come back. This legislation helps us, all together, to protect the American health of everybody—those people who live in big cities and those people who live in small cities. It is a bill that protects the people who live in the United States and makes them healthier because we make sure that those people,

who want us to be unhealthy by their criminal violent acts, are not in the United States.

And that is just the way it is.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is the 38th closed rule allowing no amendments that House Republicans have brought to the floor this year alone, and it is only June. At this rate, the majority is well on its way to becoming the most closed Congress in history.

Regular order seems to be a thing of the past under this leadership, with bills coming to the House floor, as these two are, for a vote without even going through the committee process. The immigration bills we considered this week didn't even go through regular order. The disastrous healthcare repeal bill, which would impact one-sixth of the Nation's economy, didn't get a single hearing, and hardly anybody saw it.

No experts were ever called to discuss its impacts, and it was jammed through the Chamber last month without even a score from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office outlining its costs or its impacts. The Senate has also completely bypassed the committee process.

I was proud to bring the Affordable Care Act, as I said earlier, to the House floor in 2009, as chair of the Rules Committee. That process couldn't have been more different.

Let me remind those watching today that the House held 79 bipartisan hearings and markups on health insurance reform in 2009 and 2010. During this time, House Members heard from 181 witnesses from both sides of the aisle, considered 239 Democratic and Republican amendments, and accepted 121 of them.

□ 1330

That process was entirely different from what we go through today. In fact, a lot of the Members of the House are really cut out of most of the process. The idea of getting an amendment is really pretty rare.

The legislation we consider here should be able to withstand scrutiny, but, more and more, the Nation's business is done in the dark, or by a few people.

Let's get out of the back rooms, Mr. Speaker, and let legislators of both parties do their job under an open process. That is what the Speaker promised when he took the gavel, and it is what all the books and Rules of the House of Representatives desire, and it is certainly what the American people deserve.

Mr. Speaker, we should not consider a bill that would cost tens of millions of people to lose health insurance, and not consider the anti-immigration bills before us today.

So I am going to urge a "no" vote on the previous question, on the rule, and the bill, and hope for better days.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the dialogue today with the gentlewoman, my friend, from New York, the ranking member of the committee, not only for her professional conduct today, but also for her day-to-day service to the Rules Committee as both she and I work through these difficult issues that face our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here today has a lot to do with two bills that were taken out of a larger immigration bill. Yesterday, we heard a debate on H.R. 3003, and today, on H.R. 3004. They are, in sense, companion bills. Balancing acts is what I would refer to them as, acts about addressing two very specific problems that are in our country that are very interrelated.

These are law enforcement bills. Make no mistake about it. These are not political. These are law enforcement bills. These are law enforcement bills that are designed to make sure that we effectively codify into Federal law the viewpoint that cities cannot harbor criminals, rapists, murderers, or people who are robbing and killing people as they choose—multiple times—and cities turning a blind eye to not even recognize requests from other cities that might want these people, but also from the Federal Government.

The second bill that we have got is one that says that what we are going to do is not only not fund these cities that are sanctuary cities, but we are going to deal more effectively with these criminals in the system. That is Kate's Law.

Both of these bills, H.R. 3004 and H.R. 3003, effectively balance each other because, as Members of Congress, we hear from people back home, many times, not just families from people who are impacted, but really citizens who are worried about our country dividing itself on this issue of criminals.

Make no mistake about it, these are criminals. Make no mistake about it, this is a law enforcement bill. Make no mistake about it, the United States Congress needs to ensure that our cities and States follow the laws, the Federal laws that we know have been, not only cleared by Congress, but signed by the President of the United States. They will be subject to review by the courts. We will be very pleased to take that review also.

Because, in fact, what we are doing is protecting American citizens. We are answering the call. And I would say, we are also making sure that we support the President of the United States, President Trump, who spoke very clearly on these issues, not only during the campaign, but he was elected therein.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 415 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC 7. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 685) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage domestic insourcing and discourage foreign outsourcing. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 8. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 685.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member con-

trolling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 190, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 339]

YEAS—235

| | | |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| Abraham | Byrne | Dunn |
| Aderholt | Calvert | Emmer |
| Allen | Carter (GA) | Estes (KS) |
| Amash | Carter (TX) | Farenthold |
| Amodei | Chabot | Faso |
| Arrington | Chaffetz | Ferguson |
| Babin | Cheney | Fitzpatrick |
| Bacon | Coffman | Fleischmann |
| Banks (IN) | Cole | Flores |
| Barletta | Collins (GA) | Fortenberry |
| Barr | Collins (NY) | Foxx |
| Barton | Comer | Frelinghuysen |
| Bergman | Comstock | Gaetz |
| Biggs | Conaway | Gallagher |
| Bilirakis | Cook | Garrett |
| Bishop (MI) | Costello (PA) | Gianforte |
| Bishop (UT) | Cramer | Gibbs |
| Black | Crawford | Gohmert |
| Blackburn | Culberson | Goodlatte |
| Blum | Curbelo (FL) | Gosar |
| Bost | Davidson | Gowdy |
| Brady (TX) | Davis, Rodney | Granger |
| Brat | Denham | Graves (GA) |
| Bridenstine | Dent | Graves (LA) |
| Brooks (AL) | DeSantis | Graves (MO) |
| Brooks (IN) | DesJarlais | Griffith |
| Buchanan | Diaz-Balart | Grithman |
| Buck | Donovan | Guthrie |
| Bucshon | Duffy | Handel |
| Budd | Duncan (SC) | Harper |
| Burgess | Duncan (TN) | Harris |

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Hartzler | McCaul | Royce (CA) |
| Hensarling | McClintock | Russell |
| Herrera Beutler | McHenry | Rutherford |
| Hice, Jody B. | McKinley | Sanford |
| Higgins (LA) | McMorris | Schweikert |
| Hill | Rodgers | Scott, Austin |
| Holding | McSally | Sensenbrenner |
| Hollingsworth | Meadows | Sessions |
| Hudson | Meehan | Shimkus |
| Huizenga | Messer | Shuster |
| Hultgren | Mitchell | Simpson |
| Hunter | Moolenaar | Smith (MO) |
| Hurd | Mooney (WV) | Smith (NE) |
| Issa | Mullin | Smith (NJ) |
| Jenkins (KS) | Murphy (PA) | Smith (TX) |
| Jenkins (WV) | Newhouse | Smucker |
| Johnson (LA) | Noem | Stefanik |
| Johnson (OH) | Norman | Stewart |
| Johnson, Sam | Nunes | Taylor |
| Jordan | Olson | Tenney |
| Joyce (OH) | Palazzo | Thompson (PA) |
| Katko | Palmer | Thornberry |
| Kelly (MS) | Paulsen | Tiberi |
| Kelly (PA) | Pearce | Tipton |
| King (IA) | Perry | Trott |
| King (NY) | Pittenger | Turner |
| Kinzinger | Poe (TX) | Upton |
| Knight | Poliquin | Valadao |
| Kustoff (TN) | Posey | Wagner |
| Labrador | Ratcliffe | Walberg |
| LaHood | Reed | Walden |
| LaMalfa | Reichert | Walker |
| Lamborn | Renacci | Walorski |
| Lance | Rice (SC) | Walters, Mimi |
| Latta | Roby | Weber (TX) |
| Lewis (MN) | Roe (TN) | Webster (FL) |
| LoBiondo | Rogers (AL) | Wenstrup |
| Loudermilk | Rogers (KY) | Westerman |
| Love | Rohrabacher | Williams |
| Lucas | Rokita | Wilson (SC) |
| Luetkemeyer | Rooney, Francis | Wittman |
| MacArthur | Rooney, Thomas | Womack |
| Marchant | J. | Woodall |
| Marino | Ros-Lehtinen | Yoder |
| Marshall | Roskam | Yoho |
| Massie | Ross | Young (AK) |
| Mast | Rothfus | Young (IA) |
| McCarthy | Rouzer | Zeldin |

NAYS—190

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Adams | Demings | Larson (CT) |
| Aguilar | DeSaulnier | Lawrence |
| Barragan | Deutch | Lawson (FL) |
| Bass | Dingell | Lee |
| Beatty | Doggett | Levin |
| Bera | Doyle, Michael | Lewis (GA) |
| Beyer | F. | Lieu, Ted |
| Bishop (GA) | Ellison | Lipinski |
| Blumenauer | Eshoo | Loeb sack |
| Blunt Rochester | Espallat | Lofgren |
| Bonamici | Esty (CT) | Lowenthal |
| Boyle, Brendan | Evans | Lowe y |
| F. | Foster | Lujan Grisham, |
| Brady (PA) | Frankel (FL) | M. |
| Brown (MD) | Fudge | Lujan, Ben Ray |
| Brownley (CA) | Gabbard | Lynch |
| Bustos | Gallego | Maloney, |
| Butterfield | Garamendi | Carolyn B. |
| Capuano | Gonzalez (TX) | Maloney, Sean |
| Carbajal | Gottheimer | Matsui |
| Cárdenas | Green, Al | McCollum |
| Carson (IN) | Green, Gene | McEachin |
| Cartwright | Grijalva | McGovern |
| Castor (FL) | Hanabusa | McNerney |
| Castro (TX) | Hastings | Meeks |
| Chu, Judy | Heck | Meng |
| Cicilline | Higgins (NY) | Moore |
| Clark (MA) | Hoyer | Moulton |
| Clarke (NY) | Huffman | Murphy (FL) |
| Clay | Jackson Lee | Nadler |
| Cleaver | Jayapal | Neal |
| Clyburn | Jeffries | Nolan |
| Cook | Johnson (GA) | Norcross |
| Connolly | Johnson, E. B. | O'Halleran |
| Conyers | Jones | O'Rourke |
| Cooper | Kaptur | Pallone |
| Correa | Keating | Panetta |
| Costa | Kelly (IL) | Pascarell |
| Courtney | Kennedy | Payne |
| Crist | Khanna | Pelosi |
| Crowley | Kihuen | Perlmutter |
| Cuellar | Kildee | Peters |
| Davis (CA) | Kilmer | Peterson |
| Davis, Danny | Kind | Pingree |
| DeFazio | Krishnamoorthi | Pocan |
| DeGette | Kuster (NH) | Polis |
| Delaney | Langevin | Price (NC) |
| DeLauro | Larsen (WA) | Quigley |
| DeBene | | Raskin |

Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosend
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David

Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus

Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.

Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velazquez
Visclosky

Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman

Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Cummings
Engel
Franks (AZ)

Gutiérrez
Long
Napolitano

Scalise
Stivers

□ 1357

Mr. RUSH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. WALKER and WITTMAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 191, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 340]

AYES—236

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodi
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock

Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culbertson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith

Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Hultzena
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiundo
Loudermilk

Adams
Aguilar
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutsch
Lujan Grisham, M.
Lujan, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern

NOES—191

Evans
Poster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham, M.
Lujan, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern

NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 414, I call up the bill (H.R. 3003) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify provisions relating to assistance by States, and political subdivision of States, in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL). Pursuant to House Resolution 414, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows: H.R. 3003

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 "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act".

SEC. 2. STATE NONCOMPLIANCE WITH ENFORCEMENT OF IMMIGRATION LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal, State, or local law, no Federal, State, or local government entity, and no individual, may prohibit or in any way restrict, a Federal, State, or local government entity, official, or other personnel from complying with the immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17))), or from assisting or cooperating with Federal law enforcement entities, officials, or other personnel regarding the enforcement of these laws.”;

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal, State, or local law, no Federal, State, or local government entity, and no individual, may prohibit, or in any way restrict, a Federal, State, or local government entity, official, or other personnel from undertaking any of the following law enforcement activities as they relate to information regarding

NOT VOTING—6

Cummings
Franks (AZ)

Long
Napolitano

Scalise
Stivers

□ 1404

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 339 and No. 340 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of 3004. I would have also voted "nay" on H. Res. 415—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3004—Kate's Law.

the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, the inadmissibility or deportability, or the custody status, of any individual:

“(1) Making inquiries to any individual in order to obtain such information regarding such individual or any other individuals.

“(2) Notifying the Federal Government regarding the presence of individuals who are encountered by law enforcement officials or other personnel of a State or political subdivision of a State.

“(3) Complying with requests for such information from Federal law enforcement entities, officials, or other personnel.”;

(3) in subsection (c), by striking “Immigration and Naturalization Service” and inserting “Department of Homeland Security”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) COMPLIANCE.—

“(1) ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN GRANT PROGRAMS.—A State, or a political subdivision of a State, that is found not to be in compliance with subsection (a) or (b) shall not be eligible to receive—

“(A) any of the funds that would otherwise be allocated to the State or political subdivision under section 241(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(i)), the ‘Cops on the Beat’ program under part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd et seq.), or the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3750 et seq.); or

“(B) any other grant administered by the Department of Justice or the Department of Homeland Security that is substantially related to law enforcement, terrorism, national security, immigration, or naturalization.

“(2) TRANSFER OF CUSTODY OF ALIENS PENDING REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS.—The Secretary, at the Secretary’s discretion, may decline to transfer an alien in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security to a State or political subdivision of a State found not to be in compliance with subsection (a) or (b), regardless of whether the State or political subdivision of the State has issued a writ or warrant.

“(3) TRANSFER OF CUSTODY OF CERTAIN ALIENS PROHIBITED.—The Secretary shall not transfer an alien with a final order of removal pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) or (5) of section 241(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(a)) to a State or a political subdivision of a State that is found not to be in compliance with subsection (a) or (b).

“(4) ANNUAL DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall determine for each calendar year which States or political subdivision of States are not in compliance with subsection (a) or (b) and shall report such determinations to Congress by March 1 of each succeeding calendar year.

“(5) REPORTS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall issue a report concerning the compliance with subsections (a) and (b) of any particular State or political subdivision of a State at the request of the House or the Senate Judiciary Committee. Any jurisdiction that is found not to be in compliance shall be ineligible to receive Federal financial assistance as provided in paragraph (1) for a minimum period of 1 year, and shall only become eligible again after the Secretary of Homeland Security certifies that the jurisdiction has come into compliance.

“(6) REALLOCATION.—Any funds that are not allocated to a State or to a political subdivision of a State due to the failure of the State or of the political subdivision of the State to comply with subsection (a) or (b)

shall be reallocated to States or to political subdivisions of States that comply with both such subsections.

“(e) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall require law enforcement officials from States, or from political subdivisions of States, to report or arrest victims or witnesses of a criminal offense.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, except that subsection (d) of section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373), as added by this section, shall apply only to prohibited acts committed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. CLARIFYING THE AUTHORITY OF ICE DETAINERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 287(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) DETAINER OF INADMISSIBLE OR DEPORTABLE ALIENS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual who is arrested by any Federal, State, or local law enforcement official or other personnel for the alleged violation of any criminal or motor vehicle law, the Secretary may issue a detainer regarding the individual to any Federal, State, or local law enforcement entity, official, or other personnel if the Secretary has probable cause to believe that the individual is an inadmissible or deportable alien.

“(2) PROBABLE CAUSE.—Probable cause is deemed to be established if—

“(A) the individual who is the subject of the detainer matches, pursuant to biometric confirmation or other Federal database records, the identity of an alien who the Secretary has reasonable grounds to believe to be inadmissible or deportable;

“(B) the individual who is the subject of the detainer is the subject of ongoing removal proceedings, including matters where a charging document has already been served;

“(C) the individual who is the subject of the detainer has previously been ordered removed from the United States and such an order is administratively final;

“(D) the individual who is the subject of the detainer has made voluntary statements or provided reliable evidence that indicate that they are an inadmissible or deportable alien; or

“(E) the Secretary otherwise has reasonable grounds to believe that the individual who is the subject of the detainer is an inadmissible or deportable alien.

“(3) TRANSFER OF CUSTODY.—If the Federal, State, or local law enforcement entity, official, or other personnel to whom a detainer is issued complies with the detainer and detains for purposes of transfer of custody to the Department of Homeland Security the individual who is the subject of the detainer, the Department may take custody of the individual within 48 hours (excluding weekends and holidays), but in no instance more than 96 hours, following the date that the individual is otherwise to be released from the custody of the relevant Federal, State, or local law enforcement entity.”.

(b) IMMUNITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A State or a political subdivision of a State (and the officials and personnel of the State or subdivision acting in their official capacities), and a nongovernmental entity (and its personnel) contracted by the State or political subdivision for the purpose of providing detention, acting in compliance with a Department of Homeland Security detainer issued pursuant to this section who temporarily holds an alien in its custody pursuant to the terms of a detainer so that the alien may be taken into the cus-

tody of the Department of Homeland Security, shall be considered to be acting under color of Federal authority for purposes of determining their liability and shall be held harmless for their compliance with the detainer in any suit seeking any punitive, compensatory, or other monetary damages.

(2) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AS DEFENDANT.—In any civil action arising out of the compliance with a Department of Homeland Security detainer by a State or a political subdivision of a State (and the officials and personnel of the State or subdivision acting in their official capacities), or a nongovernmental entity (and its personnel) contracted by the State or political subdivision for the purpose of providing detention, the United States Government shall be the proper party named as the defendant in the suit in regard to the detention resulting from compliance with the detainer.

(3) BAD FAITH EXCEPTION.—Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not apply to any mistreatment of an individual by a State or a political subdivision of a State (and the officials and personnel of the State or subdivision acting in their official capacities), or a nongovernmental entity (and its personnel) contracted by the State or political subdivision for the purpose of providing detention.

(c) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—

(1) CAUSE OF ACTION.—Any individual, or a spouse, parent, or child of that individual (if the individual is deceased), who is the victim of a murder, rape, or any felony, as defined by the State, for which an alien (as defined in section 101(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(3))) has been convicted and sentenced to a term of imprisonment of at least one year, may bring an action against a State or political subdivision of a State in the appropriate Federal or State court if the State or political subdivision released the alien from custody prior to the commission of such crime as a consequence of the State or political subdivision’s declining to honor a detainer issued pursuant to section 287(d)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(d)(1)).

(2) LIMITATION ON BRINGING ACTION.—An action brought under this subsection may not be brought later than ten years following the occurrence of the crime, or death of a person as a result of such crime, whichever occurs later.

(3) ATTORNEY’S FEE AND OTHER COSTS.—In any action or proceeding under this subsection the court shall allow a prevailing plaintiff a reasonable attorneys’ fee as part of the costs, and include expert fees as part of the attorneys’ fee.

SEC. 4. SARAH AND GRANT’S LAW.

(a) DETENTION OF ALIENS DURING REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS.—

(1) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(A) Section 236 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226) is amended by striking “Attorney General” each place it appears (except in the second place that term appears in section 236(a)) and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”.

(B) Section 236(a) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(a)) is amended by inserting “the Secretary of Homeland Security or” before “the Attorney General—”.

(C) Section 236(e) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(e)) is amended by striking “Attorney General’s” and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security’s”.

(2) LENGTH OF DETENTION.—Section 236 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1226) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) LENGTH OF DETENTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, an alien may be detained, and for an alien described in subsection (c) shall be detained, under this

section without time limitation, except as provided in subsection (h), during the pendency of removal proceedings.

“(2) CONSTRUCTION.—The length of detention under this section shall not affect detention under section 241.”

(3) DETENTION OF CRIMINAL ALIENS.—Section 236(c)(1) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

“(E) is unlawfully present in the United States and has been convicted for driving while intoxicated (including a conviction for driving while under the influence or impaired by alcohol or drugs) without regard to whether the conviction is classified as a misdemeanor or felony under State law, or

“(F)(i)(I) is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(i).

“(II) is deportable by reason of a visa revocation under section 221(i), or

“(III) is deportable under section 237(a)(1)(C)(i), and

“(ii) has been arrested or charged with a particularly serious crime or a crime resulting in the death or serious bodily injury (as defined in section 1365(h)(3) of title 18, United States Code) of another person;” and

(C) by amending the matter following subparagraph (F) (as added by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph) to read as follows:

“any time after the alien is released, without regard to whether an alien is released related to any activity, offense, or conviction described in this paragraph; to whether the alien is released on parole, supervised release, or probation; or to whether the alien may be arrested or imprisoned again for the same offense. If the activity described in this paragraph does not result in the alien being taken into custody by any person other than the Secretary, then when the alien is brought to the attention of the Secretary or when the Secretary determines it is practical to take such alien into custody, the Secretary shall take such alien into custody.”

(4) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—Section 236 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226), as amended by paragraph (2), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—The Attorney General’s review of the Secretary’s custody determinations under subsection (a) for the following classes of aliens shall be limited to whether the alien may be detained, released on bond (of at least \$1,500 with security approved by the Secretary), or released with no bond:

“(1) Aliens in exclusion proceedings.

“(2) Aliens described in section 212(a)(3) or 237(a)(4).

“(3) Aliens described in subsection (c).

“(h) RELEASE ON BOND.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An alien detained under subsection (a) may seek release on bond. No bond may be granted except to an alien who establishes by clear and convincing evidence that the alien is not a flight risk or a danger to another person or the community.

“(2) CERTAIN ALIENS INELIGIBLE.—No alien detained under subsection (c) may seek release on bond.”

(5) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(A) Section 236(a)(2)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(a)(2)(B)) is amended by striking “conditional parole” and inserting “recognizance”.

(B) Section 236(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(b)) is amended by striking “parole” and inserting “recognizance”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on

the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any alien in detention under the provisions of section 236 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226), as so amended, or otherwise subject to the provisions of such section, on or after such date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3003.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act. This simple, straightforward bill combats dangerous sanctuary policies that permit criminals to go free. We are all too familiar with how sanctuary policies have devastated families across the United States, and today we are taking action to prevent these senseless tragedies and save American lives.

For years, the lack of immigration enforcement and spread of sanctuary policies have cost too many lives. The Obama administration encouraged or, at the very least, turned a blind eye to jurisdictions nationwide that implemented sanctuary policies designed to prevent U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement from being able to effectively enforce Federal law. Foolhardy jurisdictions continue to pass legislation and implement policies aimed at stymieing and maligning Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Earlier this year, a Baltimore City Council member introduced a resolution calling on ICE to arrest only those posing a “serious risk.” In discussing this initiative, the council member likened ICE officers to Nazis several times. Such rhetoric is reprehensible, creating a moral equivalent between genocide and a nation exercising a fundamental right and obligation of sovereignty.

In a deeply troubling move on the other coast, San Francisco announced that it would no longer participate in the Joint Terrorism Task Force because of concerns that the task force’s duties may coincide with immigration enforcement.

Sanctuary policies often focus on flouting ICE detainers, notices issued by ICE to allow it to take custody of aliens in law enforcement custody in order to initiate removal proceedings.

These irresponsible policies have led to a sharp drop in ICE’s intake of aliens from criminal detention facilities, which forces ICE agents to engage in the far more time-consuming and

dangerous task of picking them up on the streets. This, among other factors, led to a drop in the number of criminal aliens removed from the interior of the United States from almost 87,000 in fiscal year 2014 to approximately 63,500 the following 2 fiscal years.

We must discourage, not encourage, sanctuary policies and practices. H.R. 3003 addresses sanctuary policies and also takes great strides in clarifying Federal immigration detainer policy.

Since the 1990s, Federal law has barred jurisdictions from restricting communication with Federal immigration officials regarding immigration status; however, this provision has never been enforced. H.R. 3003 amends current law and expands this prohibition against impeding Federal law enforcement. Instead of merely focussing on communication, the bill ensures that no jurisdiction may restrict assistance or compliance with immigration enforcement.

To be clear, this bill imposes no affirmative duty to act on the part of any jurisdiction. Should a jurisdiction not comply with this provision, the jurisdiction will not be eligible for certain grant programs administered by the Department of Justice and Homeland Security. Eligibility for many of these grant programs is already predicated on compliance with this provision in the Immigration and Nationality Act.

This section is also in line with a recent memo by Attorney General Sessions outlining compliance with this provision as the single factor that the Justice Department will use in identifying sanctuary jurisdictions.

Regarding detainer policy, Congress has long heard that jurisdictions will not comply with ICE requests to hold individuals due to a lack of probable cause inherent in the detainer. I am pleased that H.R. 3003 provides the probable cause standards necessary to ensure that ICE only places detainees on aliens for whom they have probable cause and are deportable.

In addition, the bill mandates that ICE must take custody of the subject of a detainer within 48 hours, excluding weekends and holidays. Jurisdictions who comply in good faith with detainer requests will be immune from liability associated with that detainer, and if such an action does arise, the U.S. Government will substitute itself in as the defendant. This ensures that jurisdictions do not go bankrupt defending against never-ending litigation. And in those jurisdictions that refuse to honor a detainer resulting in an alien committing a crime, the victim or victim’s family will be provided with the opportunity to bring a lawsuit against that jurisdiction.

The third section of H.R. 3003 is named for Sarah Root and Grant Ronnebeck, two young people whose lives were suddenly taken by criminal aliens who remain at large today. This section was originally introduced as separate bills by Judiciary Committee

members STEVE KING and ANDY BIGGS, who worked tirelessly to bring these tragic cases to the attention of the committee and the Congress.

This section provides that aliens who are arrested or charged with serious crimes that result in death or serious bodily injury of another must be held without bond during the pendency of their removal proceedings.

□ 1415

In addition, aliens convicted of even one drunk driving offense will also be ineligible for bond during their removal proceedings. The latter would have prevented the August 2010 death of Sister Denise Mosier, a Catholic nun in Virginia, at the hands of a drunk driving illegal alien who was released from ICE custody on bond. These classes of individuals present a clear and present danger to society and should not be permitted to roam our communities during the pendency of their removal hearings.

The commonsense provisions of H.R. 3003 will provide better immigration enforcement and the peace of mind that no criminal will be provided sanctuary from our immigration laws.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear at the outset of this debate that this legislation does nothing to make our communities safer, and it does nothing to improve our immigration system. Instead, H.R. 3003 will trample the rights of States and localities to determine what is in the best interest of their public safety, and it will conscript law enforcement to enforce Federal immigration law.

The ultimate experts on community safety are communities themselves, and hundreds of them have determined that, as community trust increases, crime decreases. This is because immigrants will come out of the shadows and report crimes to local law enforcement when they are not threatened with deportation. In fact, a recent study found that community trust jurisdictions are actually safer than their counterparts.

Against this considered judgment, H.R. 3003 forces localities to abandon community trust principles and mandates the conscription of local offices into Federal immigration enforcement. Some localities, of course, would rightfully resist this conscription. As punishment, H.R. 3003 would rob them of vital law enforcement funding that they depend on to prevent crime, prosecute criminals, and boost community policing ranks.

Localities, therefore, would face a losing choice: they can abandon community trust policies and leave their communities in danger, or they can leave community trust policies in place but forgo law enforcement funding, leaving their community in danger.

It is important that we consider that this is more than just bad policy. It is also likely unconstitutional for multiple reasons. First, H.R. 3003 likely violates the 10th Amendment by commandeering States to comply with detainer requests that drain their resources.

In addition, the bill's changes to the Department of Homeland Security's detainer authority exacerbate the current Fourth Amendment concerns associated with immigration detainers. The bill does not require any particularized finding about the individual that may form the basis of a probable cause determination and fails to provide for a prompt judicial determination of probable cause.

The bill further compounds constitutional concerns by eliminating the ability for a detained individual to obtain an independent, individualized review of his or her bond determination by a neutral decisionmaker.

For these reasons—and there are others—I urge my colleagues to please oppose this dangerous, mean-spirited, and constitutionally suspect legislation.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), who is a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee not only for working with and cooperating on all this legislation, but for the relentless work that has come forward in the committee. He has spent a lot of time on this floor and in committee, and we are getting some progress here today.

This is a big week, and we are starting to restore the rule of law. The sanctuary cities legislation, which is before us right now, is something I just looked back through my records and wondered: How long have I slugged away on this?

The first amendment I brought was in 2005 to cut off some funding to sanctuary cities. At each appropriations opportunity, along with CJS and Homeland Security, when there was a chance, I would bring another amendment and another amendment, 2005 on through 2014 and 2015. In 2015, then I introduced the broader sanctuary cities legislation which is the basis for this legislation.

I also had the misfortune and fortune of having the Root family as my constituents. Sarah Root was tragically killed by an illegal alien on the streets. Her father and mother both have been here to testify. Her mother is in town this day. Her father, Scott Root, testified before the committee. He said this:

They bailed the killer of my daughter out of jail for less money than it took to bury her, and he was out of this country before we could have the funeral.

Those words were some of the most chilling and mournful words that I have heard in this Congress. This bill today honors his daughter's life,

Michelle's daughter's life, Sarah, and it also brings into play the enforcement that we need to have.

We have got to put an end to sanctuary cities and ban those policies—which the bill does—block the DOJ grants if they don't comply with the Federal law, and refuse the warrants to the sanctuary cities because they will just release them on the streets and let ICE take custody of them within 48 hours. And then the good faith hold harmless for ICE detainers, when they got the wrong recommendation out of the Obama administration, this makes the right recommendation to local jurisdictions.

The private cause of action is also very useful to us. It is a good, solid bill. I thank the chairman and all those who put the work in this today, and I urge its passage.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), who is a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, this bill isn't about fixing our immigration system. In fact, it makes the system more dysfunctional and puts communities in peril. This bill is about telling communities how to police themselves and protect their people. It says: We here in D.C. know better than you do, local police, across the United States.

Now, 600 or more local governments engaged in what they call community trust policies. These policies promote, among other things, allowing immigrant victims and witnesses to crime to report these offenses to local authorities without fear of immigration consequences. Years of locally informed experience have proven that this approach best ensures these communities' safety.

I think that is why we have received communications from the National Fraternal Order of Police in opposition to this bill, from the Law Enforcement Task Force—that is 36 sheriffs and chiefs across the country—in opposition to this bill, from the Major County Sheriffs of America in opposition to this bill, from the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence against this bill, as well as the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, and the National Association of Counties.

ICE is not prohibited from doing their job, but as the San Jose Police Department has told me, San Jose police are not enforcing the securities laws, they are not enforcing the Federal tax laws, and they are not enforcing the immigration laws of the United States. They are doing their job to protect their community against crime.

Now, because they are doing that, the threat is to remove funding from jurisdictions.

Now, what would that funding be?

It is grants against violent gangs. It is grants for the Anti-Heroin Task Force and the Anti-Methamphetamine Program, grants on port security to

prevent terrorists from getting into the United States, and grants for the BioWatch Program to prevent terrorists from getting biohazards and killing us all.

That is not smart to take those programs away from local governments that are working with us to help keep America safe.

Now, I always think, as I said earlier, we are not doing bumper stickers here. We are doing laws. It is important to take a look at the details of what is in this proposed bill. In addition to banning collaborative grants with localities, the remedies it has made available is if a community has a community trust policy, the Department of Homeland Security can refuse to honor warrants—legal warrants—that are issued by that jurisdiction.

That is astonishing. That is simply astonishing because what the local governments have said on the detainer policies is that the Fourth Amendment prevents them from holding people whose sentences have been served. In fact, there are a number of Federal courts that have made that determination, you can't hold somebody on a civil detainer request without violating the Fourth Amendment.

There is a remedy to that: get a warrant like anybody else. The Fourth Amendment means something, and there is a remedy. Go get a warrant. I don't know why our Federal Government feels that they can upend constitutional law for their own convenience.

Now, there is a provision in this bill that I find shocking. What it says is that if local governments violate the law—violate a court order—that they cannot violate the Fourth Amendment, that they are immunized, the Federal Government is going to pay, go ahead and violate the law. I cannot remember a time when we had a bill before us that said to States and localities: go ahead, violate the law because we are going to indemnify you for the violation.

That is not the way our Federal system should work, and it is not the way those of us who believe in our oath of office to support and defend the Constitution of the United States think that things ought to work.

Now, finally, it creates something that I think is truly astonishing: a private cause of action against a State or locality if because the detainer cannot be honored because of the Federal Court cases and a person is released and, for any reason, commits a crime that it is the locality that bears the cost, not the criminal. This is a crazy provision.

We should oppose this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to the gentlewoman from northern California that what is crazy is what the city of San Francisco is doing with their taxpayer dollars, since it was reported just yesterday that San Francisco taxpayers could soon pay \$190,000 in a law-

suit settlement with an illegal immigrant who claimed he was reported to Federal immigration authorities in violation of the city of San Francisco's sanctuary city ordinance.

□ 1430

The city attorney's office confirmed this, and the settlement is expected to be confirmed by San Francisco's supervisors in future hearings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Now, people who are murdered, people who are injured by people who are unlawfully present in the United States should have their day in court with the city of San Francisco or anyone else just as well as they are apparently willing to pay money to people who are illegally in the country because they were properly turned over to Federal authorities to be deported from this country.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia, our chairman, for his leadership on this, and I rise in strong support of the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, which has been worked on by a whole number of Members of the House.

The adoption of dangerous sanctuary policies across the country makes it more difficult to adequately enforce our immigration laws, which, in turn, needlessly puts Americans' lives at risk.

Unfortunately, sanctuary cities that fail to comply with Federal law and deliberately refuse to cooperate with Federal authorities become safe havens for undocumented criminal immigrants, because criminals know they are less likely to be detained in those cities, which are, by definition, sanctuary cities.

Far too many innocent lives are put at risk when a criminal alien convicted, for example, of drunk driving or charged with another serious offense is not detained so they could be appropriately dealt with and, if warranted, deported from our country according to the law.

That is why it is essential that we pass this resolution, which will strengthen our Nation's immigration laws, hold sanctuary cities accountable, and enhance public safety by requiring detention of criminal aliens.

The bottom line is, if we expect our Federal immigration authorities to enforce our Nation's immigration laws and protect the American people, State and local officials need to cooperate, not defy Federal immigration laws. And those local officials who refuse to do so and instead give so-called sanctuary to those that have come to our country illegally and then committed crimes here, they are putting the very people who they were sworn to serve and to protect at risk. And unfortu-

nately, this has been happening all over the country, where literally people come here illegally, commit crimes, and local entities decide not to enforce the law.

We need to pass this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ), a gentleman on the committee who has worked tirelessly with myself and Ms. LOFGREN to make this measure more understandable.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, ever since Donald Trump descended the golden escalators at Trump Tower to announce his candidacy by saying Mexican immigrants are rapists, murderers, and drug dealers, the Republican Party has had Mexican fever, and they have been working feverishly to paint immigrants all as criminals. And when something goes bad, they go back to their old favorite.

When Trump's Muslim ban was blocked in the courts, out came the Attorney General to say they were doing everything they could to do more roundups and that no immigrant was safe in America.

The Russia investigation not going well for the dear leader at the White House? Hey, let's whip out that Mexican thing, as Vice-President PENCE said. Maybe it will keep our voters happy and distracted.

Healthcare not going well? Let's just hate some Mexicans today.

Listen, almost 8 out of 10 Latinos in the United States are citizens, 1 out of 10 are legal permanent residents. That leaves 1 in 10 who are undocumented, but this policy is about going after all of us, whether we are citizens or not of the United States of America.

These bills are nothing new, and they are not really about fighting crime. They are about racial profiling and putting Latinos "in their place." Latinos, African Americans, Muslims, women, they know what it is like to be targeted.

Ninety-nine percent of the votes for this bill today will come from people who do not have to worry about racial profiling for themselves, for their children, or the people who they represent, but let's be clear. Sheriff Joe Arpaio in Arizona is the poster child for the kinds of policies the Republicans want to impose on every city and county in the country, and we know the results.

Sheriff Arpaio embodies racial profiling and rounding up people because they are brown. Oh, we will sort out their papers later, he says, whether they are citizens or legal permanent residents or whatever.

I have talked to U.S. citizens who were detained by Sheriff Arpaio because they didn't carry with them their birth certificate or a passport at all times in the country in which they were born.

Let's be clear. Sheriff Arpaio has been sued successfully to stop his racial profiling, and he has been charged criminally in Federal court for his racial profiling tactics, and still the Republicans of the House want to make

the law he is being sued for legal in the United States of America.

Sometimes Democrats have to stand up for justice, for what is right when the chips are down. Well, the chips are down, and every immigrant family and every immigrant in America is going to remember who stood up for them when they needed Democrats to fight to keep families together when the chips were down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President or Vice President.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for yielding and for his leadership on this legislation. It is an honor to serve with him on the House Judiciary Committee. And I am grateful to Representative KING as well for producing Sarah's Law.

Today, the House of Representatives can pass a crucial piece of legislation to codify the tenets of two of President Trump's executive orders on immigration enforcement.

H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, will finally hold accountable States, cities, and local law enforcement agencies that provide safe haven to criminally violent illegal immigrants by refusing to cooperate with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

You know what is astonishing and you know what is shocking, is that there are jurisdictions in this country that blatantly choose to endanger their communities by providing protection to criminals. Passage of H.R. 3003 ensures that these communities will no longer be given rewards for their dereliction of duty.

Importantly, this bill also contains a section entitled Sarah and Grant's Law, which recognizes two young Americans who were murdered by criminally violent illegal aliens who had no right to be on our streets.

In January 2015, a 21-year-old convenience store clerk and constituent of mine, Grant Ronnebeck, was working the graveyard shift at QuickTrip in Mesa, Arizona. Just before 4 a.m., an illegal alien with a long criminal record, awaiting deportation proceedings, walked in and demanded a pack of cigarettes. When Grant tried to count the money before handing them over, the man shot him and left him to die.

Sarah and Grant are far from the only Americans who have been impacted by illegal immigration. In 2014, Mesa, Arizona, police officer Brandon Mendoza was killed in a wrong-way car crash by an illegal immigrant driving under the influence of drugs and alcohol.

Despite tragic stories like these, the Obama administration continued to promote policies that circumvented many of our immigration laws, allowing thousands of criminals to return to

our communities. It is time for these reckless policies to end.

H.R. 3003 specifically targets illegals who commit serious crimes by preventing them from being released onto our streets during their deportation proceedings.

After 8 years of policies that have placed a priority on protecting all illegal aliens, including those who are violent criminals, over the rights and safety of Americans, it is refreshing to have a President who is willing to follow regular law and order. President Trump has taken active steps to reverse the failed policies of the previous administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BIGGS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump has taken active steps to reverse the failed policies of the Obama administration and has been vocally supportive of Congress' efforts to do the same.

Passing this bill is a positive step toward our duty of enforcing the Nation's immigration laws, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this vital piece of legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the ranking member of the Intellectual Properties Subcommittee.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3003. This legislation would withhold needed law enforcement funding from cities that choose not to assist Federal authorities in enforcing the immigration laws.

Besides being constitutionally suspect, this bill is also highly counterproductive. Recognizing that good policing depends on building trust with their residents, many cities forbid their law enforcement officers from questioning victims of crime or witnesses to a crime about their immigration status, and they do not share immigration information with Federal authorities.

They believe that their communities are at greater risk when a victim of domestic violence is afraid to ask the police for protection from her abuser for fear of deportation, or when witnesses to a murder refuse to assist law enforcement in tracking down the perpetrator because they are afraid their immigration status will be discovered.

These cities have concluded that taking on themselves the Federal responsibility to enforce immigration laws would destroy trust between immigrants and local law enforcement, which would make everyone less safe.

Perversely, this bill would punish these cities by denying them the funds that they need to protect public safety. Funding to hire new police officers, grants to combat the opioid crisis, and money to reduce the rape kit backlog

could all be taken away under this bill. Not only does this raise serious constitutional concerns, it is simply bad policy that will lead to more crime, not less.

As if this were not bad enough, the bill would also authorize mandatory indefinite detention of certain categories of immigrants without sufficient due process even if they present no danger to their communities.

Indefinite detention is repugnant to our values of fairness and individual liberty, but this bill perpetuates the ugly myth that immigrants are more dangerous and likely to commit more crimes than native-born Americans, and it erodes the fundamental protections that we guarantee to all who are present in this country.

Instead of taking positive steps to improve communication between Federal, State, and local authorities, this bill demonizes immigrants, punishes communities that seek to build trust between immigrants and law enforcement, and authorizes indefinite detention of certain immigrants, all while making us less safe.

For each of these reasons, this bill should be defeated, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST).

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about two very honorable lives, Paul Besaw and Lahiri Garcia, who were both taken from us far too soon by the criminal acts of one who was illegally in our country.

A death of our innocent neighbors is especially devastating when it could have been prevented had our immigration laws been upheld and had they been working.

Paul and Lahiri were paramedics in my community, dedicated to saving lives, but on January 1, a man illegally in our country, driving drunk, collided with their ambulance and killed both of them.

Paul left behind his loving wife, Dawn, and his 6-year-old daughter, Allison, who you see here behind me. When I spoke with Paul's widow, she rightfully said that if our country wasn't "too afraid or inept to enforce immigration law," her husband would still be with her today, and she is absolutely right.

Lahiri's wife, Julie Garcia, told me how hard it was for her four children to not have their father this Father's Day. She expected to grow old with her husband, but because this man wasn't sent home the first three times he was pulled over, she will no longer have that opportunity.

Both wives, both mothers, expressed to me sincere disbelief. They don't understand why this was allowed to happen, and, for the life of me, I can't understand why it is allowed either.

The bottom line is that this should never happen to anyone. Sanctuary cities are a violation of the rule of law, they are absolutely unacceptable, they

cannot be tolerated. We must enforce this rule of law.

It is, in fact, the right of every American to be protected by this government. It is not the right of anybody to spend one day, one moment, in our country illegally or without invitation.

Today, Congress is addressing this epidemic. Our bills, they crack down on dangerous sanctuary policies that put these kind of innocent lives at risk.

So let us ensure that unlawful immigrants convicted of crimes are, in fact, detained and are, in fact, deported.

Mr. Speaker, let's pass these bills. More importantly, let us be convicted that what happened to Paul and what happened to Lahiri is never allowed to happen again.

□ 1445

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the ranking member of the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security and Investigations Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that none one of us who comes to this floor doubts that any local law enforcement, our neighbors, do any second-guessing to arrest drunk drivers, murderers, and others, and that they are held to the high calling of justice. I do not want to be associated with being mild-mannered and weak on those who would do serious harm, kill, and maim, no matter who they are. That is not this debate.

This debate is whether or not this bill interferes with the legitimate enforcement of the law and whether or not it takes away the mercy that we are known for in the United States. Let me tell you why.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Fraternal Order of Police—which, by no means, is shy about enforcing the law—writing to oppose this legislation, saying that local police departments answer to local civilian government, and it is the local government which enacts statutes and ordinances.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER
OF POLICE,
Washington, DC, 27 June 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN O. MCCARTHY,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY P. PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. STENY H. HOYER,
Minority Whip, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND REPRESENTATIVES MCCARTHY, PELOSI AND HOYER: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to reiterate the FOP's opposition to any amendment or piece of legislation that would penalize law enforcement agencies by withholding Federal funding or resources from law enforcement assistance programs in an effort to coerce a policy change at the local level. The House will consider H.R. 3003 on the floor this week and

Section 2 of this bill would restrict the hiring program administered by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (Byrne-JAG) programs, as well as programs administered by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

The FOP has been very clear on this issue: we strongly believe that local and State law enforcement agencies should cooperate with their Federal counterparts. That being said, withholding needed assistance to law enforcement agencies—which have no policy-making role—also hurts public safety efforts.

Local police departments answer to local civilian government and it is the local government which enacts statutes and ordinances in their communities. Law enforcement officers have no more say in these matters than any other citizen and—with laws like the Hatch Act in place—it can be argued they have less. Law enforcement officers do not get to pick and choose which laws to enforce, and must carry out lawful orders at the direction of their commanders and the civilian government that employs them. It is unjust to penalize law enforcement and the citizens they serve because Congress disagrees with their enforcement priorities with respect to our nation's immigration laws.

The FOP issued a statement in January of this year regarding the approach of the Administration on sanctuary cities as outlined in President Trump's Executive Order. The President recognized that it is unfair to penalize the law enforcement agencies serving these jurisdictions for the political decisions of local officials. It allows the U.S. Attorney General and Secretary of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security to make an informed decision about the public safety impact without an automatic suspension from Federal grant programs. In Section 2 of H.R. 3003, there is no such discretion and it countermands the Administration's existing policy.

The FOP opposed several bills in the previous Congress, which were outlined in a letter to the Senate leadership, and we will continue to work against proposals that would reduce or withhold funding or resources from any Federal program for local and State law enforcement. If Congress wishes to effect policy changes in these sanctuary cities, it must find another way to do so.

On behalf of the more than 330,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I want to urge the House to reject H.R. 3003's punitive approach and work with law enforcement to find a better way to improve public safety in our communities.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,
National President.

COMMITTEE ON MIGRATION, UNITED
STATES CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC
BISHOPS,
Washington, DC, June 26, 2017.

CATHOLIC CHARITIES USA,
Alexandria, VA, June 26, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We write on behalf of the Committee on Migration of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB/COM) and Catholic Charities USA (CCUSA) to express our opposition to H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004.

The Catholic Church holds a strong interest in the welfare of migrants and how our nation welcomes and treats them. Our parishes include those with and without immigration status, unfortunately some who have witnessed or been victims of crime in the United States, including domestic violence, armed robbery, and assault. We understand the importance of fostering cooperation and information-sharing between immigrant communities and local law enforcement.

We oppose H.R. 3003 because it would impose obligations on local governments that we fear—and that many of them have warned—would undermine authority and discretion of local law enforcement. This, in turn, would hamper the ability of local law enforcement officials to apprehend criminals and ensure public safety in all communities.

Furthermore, Section 2 of H.R. 3003 would deny to jurisdictions vital federal funding related to law enforcement, terrorism, national security, immigration, and naturalization if those jurisdictions are deemed to be non-compliant with H.R. 3003. The Catholic service network, including Catholic Charities, works in partnership with the federal government on a number of Department of Justice and Department of Homeland Security initiatives, including disaster response and recovery, naturalization and citizenship services, and services for the immigrant, including victims of human trafficking, and domestic violence. These services are incredibly valuable to the protection and promotion of the human person and in some instances life-saving. Cutting grants related to these important national objectives, or threat of such cuts, is not humane or just, nor is it in our national interest.

Also, we oppose H.R. 3004 as it would lead to an expansion of incarceration and does not include adequate protections for people who re-enter the U.S. for humanitarian reasons or seek protection at the border. While H.R. 3004 makes notable efforts to protect us from those convicted of violent criminal offenses, the legislation goes far beyond this goal by expanding the government's ability to prosecute illegal re-entry cases and heightening the criminal penalties in these cases. In an era of fiscal austerity, it is vital that important judicial resources are efficiently utilized to prosecute and convict the most violent offenders of violent crimes. Expanding who is eligible to be prosecuted for entry or re-entry as well as enhancing sentencing requirements does not advance the common good nor will it ensure that communities are safer. Furthermore, we are concerned that, as introduced, H.R. 3004 would also prevent vulnerable asylum seekers and unaccompanied children, (who have presented themselves repeatedly at the U.S. border in the flight from violence), from being able to access protection, and instead face fines, imprisonment or both.

We respectfully urge you to reject these bills in favor of a more comprehensive and humane approach to immigration reform; an approach that upholds human dignity and family unity and places a greater emphasis on balancing the needs and rights of immigrants with our nation's best interests and security.

The United States has a long and proud history of leadership in welcoming newcomers regardless of their circumstances and promoting the common good. We stand ready to work with you on legislation that more closely adheres to this tradition and appreciate your serious consideration of our views in this regard.

Sincerely,

MOST REV. JOE VÁSQUEZ,
Bishop of Austin, Chairman, USCCB
Committee on Migration.

SR. DONNA MARKHAM, OP, PHD,
President & CEO, Catholic Charities USA.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Apr. 30, 2017]

POLICE CHIEFS: SB 4 IS A 'LOSE-LOSE' FOR
TEXAS

(By Art Acevedo and James McLaughlin)

No one believes in the "rule of law" more than the Texas Police Chiefs Association and the Texas Major Cities Chiefs, which besides Houston include Austin, Arlington, Dallas,

Fort Worth and San Antonio. We work tirelessly to make our communities safer, within the confines of the U.S. Constitution, by arresting those who commit criminal actions that threaten our communities. We specifically target those individuals committing violent crimes and arrest anyone who threatens the safety of our communities, regardless of their immigration status.

Police chiefs across the state work extremely hard to develop law enforcement agencies that build and maintain trust, communication and stronger relationships with minority communities through community-based policing and outreach programs. So we know well that no good can come of Senate Bill 4, which the state House of Representatives, joining the state Senate, passed last week.

SB 4 requires local law enforcement to take a more active role in immigration enforcement; this will tear down what we've worked so hard to build up. Officers will start inquiring about the immigration status of every person they come in contact with, or worse, only inquire about the immigration status of individuals based on their appearance. This will lead to distrust of police, less cooperation from members of the community and will foster the belief that they cannot seek assistance from police for fear of being subjected to an immigration-status investigation.

This is a lose-lose situation for everyone. Distrust and fear of contacting or assisting the police has already become evident among legal immigrants. Legal immigrants are beginning to avoid contact with the police for fear that they themselves or undocumented family members or friends may become subject to immigration enforcement. Such a divide between the local police and immigrant groups will result in increased crime against immigrants and in the broader community, create a class of silent victims, and eliminate the potential for assistance from migrants in solving crimes or preventing crime.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Law enforcement officers have to be able to abide by the law. It is unjust to penalize law enforcement and the citizens they serve because Congress disagrees with the enforcement priorities with respect to our Nation's immigration laws. And they are right. But they also say that they need to build trust in our communities.

This bill destroys community trust. It also penalizes hardworking governments of mayors and county leaders who are, in fact, trying to run the government and ensure that victims of domestic violence and crime, even as immigrants, are able to be treated in a manner where justice is had.

What about the National Sheriffs' Association or the Texas Police Chiefs in Texas' major cities who indicate that this bill will serve no good and no good can come to a similar bill in the States?

Let me say to you, I stand with the Catholic church, and I am not Catholic. What are our values? This church opposes the idea of our values.

Let me be very clear as I close. We are doing the sanctuary cities bill, but I want to know about the integrity of this place.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3003, the "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act," which requires state and local cooperation with federal immigration enforcement, ex-

pands DHS detainer authority, and expands detention authority.

I oppose this bill mainly because it directly violates the Constitution of the United States.

If H.R. 3003 were to become law, it will coerce states and localities to cooperate with immigration enforcement, it will hurt victims and witnesses to crimes, and ultimately make communities less safe, which directly contravenes the stated and alleged goals of this bill.

Police Chiefs across the nation are responding to less disturbances, not because crime is magically disappearing, but because immigrant communities are afraid to report them out of fear of being targeted.

H.R. 3003 will completely strip state and local jurisdictions of their ability to enact common-sense policies that breed respect and trust and turn local law enforcement into an auxiliary arm of the federal Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).

To ensure compliance, this bill coerces states and localities by imposing penalties that will deny federal funding for critical law enforcement, national security, drug treatment, and crime victim initiatives.

This divisive and vindictive administrative policy abridges the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution, which states:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

H.R. 3003 also violates the Fourth Amendment's proscription against unreasonable searches and seizures in respect to the changes it makes to DHS's detainer authority.

It expands upon current DHS detainer practice by broadening the ways in which DHS can determine it has probable cause to issue a detainer and it significantly expands the time an individual may be held by law enforcement.

The Supreme Court has stated that the Fourth Amendment requires a judicial finding of probable cause, usually within 48 hours of arrest.

H.R. 3003, however, allows law enforcement to hold a person up to 96 hours before DHS takes custody, and there is no mention of when the person will even see an immigration judge.

H.R. 3003 compounds these constitutional violations by eliminating the ability for a detained individual to obtain an independent, individualized review of his or her bond determination by a neutral decision-maker.

This bill also authorizes DHS to detain individuals in removal proceedings without time limitation and it expands the categories of individuals who would be subject to such a detention on a mandatory basis.

These provisions make it substantially more difficult, if not impossible, for individuals to obtain release on bond while removal proceedings are pending, thus increasing detention costs and separating families while they seek to litigate their immigration cases.

H.R. 3003 is nothing but an anti-immigrant, enforcement-only proposal that represents another step in Trump's mass deportation plan.

Mr. Speaker, rather than forcing state and local officials into a one-size-fits-all federal enforcement scheme, Congress and the administration should enact legislation and adopt policies that integrate unauthorized immigrants into our communities—approaches that the American public supports by a wide margin.

For these reasons, I join with local law enforcement chiefs and faith community leaders

in denouncing and opposing this mean-spirited, ill-considered, and un-American legislation.

I end, Mr. Speaker, by apologizing to Mika Brzezinski, to the press, for the horrible words that were said about a bleeding face.

There is no way that we can entrust this law or any other laws to this President of the United States. He has lost the trust, and I will vote for nothing until he steps down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

While we have heard a good amount of inflammatory rhetoric, my remarks will speak solely to the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of keeping America safe. In less than 2 years, over 8,000 undocumented immigrants, all subject to ICE detention, were released because of local non-cooperation policies.

Sixty-three percent of those illegal aliens had prior convictions or had been marked a public safety concern. After being released, they went on to be rearrested nearly 4,300 times, committing nearly 7,500 new offenses.

The facts are clear: States and local governments that do not comply with our immigration laws are putting American citizens at risk.

The U.S. Sentencing Commission found that, in 2014, 75 percent of all criminal defendants who were convicted and sentenced for Federal drug offenses were illegal immigrants. As of 2014, illegal immigrants made up roughly 3.5 percent of our population but committed over 10 percent of all murders.

Refusing to turn over criminal illegal immigrants poses a threat to our society, our safety, and our economy. American citizens pay nearly \$19 million a day to house and care for the 450,000 criminal immigrants in jails and prisons who are all eligible for deportation.

When cities ignore Federal immigration laws, the results are often tragic.

The sheriff of Travis County, Texas, decided she would only turn over illegal aliens who have committed a narrow list of crimes. Her policy allowed one illegal alien to be released on bail despite sexually abusing his girlfriend's 9-year-old daughter.

A Cook County sheriff released an illegal immigrant after he served a brief domestic assault sentence, despite an ICE detainer. Soon after, he went on to kill a 15-year-old girl.

America wept as 32-year-old Kate Steinle was killed by a stray bullet. The illegal immigrant who shot that gun had seven previous felony convictions.

There are thousands more stories of innocent lives lost, of families destroyed, and of crimes that could have

been prevented. Every day in America, another family grieves because of the policies of sanctuary cities.

Mr. Speaker, I rise for the protection of our citizens, the safety of our communities, the defense of our country, and to ultimately see the end of sanctuary cities.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), our Democratic Caucus chair.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Much of the same rhetoric we are hearing right now from the other side of the aisle is similar to the same rhetoric we heard back in the 1840s, 1850s, and 1860s against the Irish when they came to America. We heard it said about Italian Americans in the 1880s and 1890s.

We continue to hear the same type of rhetoric about African Americans in our country in terms of the percentage of criminal activity that takes place. What we have seen happen is the further incarceration and enslavement of African Americans in our Nation today because of similar rhetoric.

I want to make it very clear: “Immigrant” and “criminal” are not synonyms. You make it out to be that way by the passage of this legislation.

Talking about law enforcement, in New York City, James O’Neill, the police commissioner, has said this law will make New York City less safe than it is today.

I remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that 9/11 happened in my hometown, in my city. Since then, there have been no major incidents of terrorism in New York City because they have been able to collect information—much of it from the undocumented community in our city—to prevent similar events from happening again. That is why this bill is so egregious.

The first responsibility of the Federal Government is to protect its citizens from foreign invasion, foreign attack, terrorist attacks. This bill will withhold terrorism money from New York City. It will prevent the city of New York from continuing to collect the information they and other cities around this country need to protect their citizens, to develop the trust that the community has to have in its police department and the police department in its communities.

That is how law enforcement works, that is how they catch the criminals, and that is how they help the Federal Government deport criminals who have committed criminal offenses in a city like New York.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire at this time how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 12 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman

from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), the chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, across the country, more than 300 municipalities have adopted policies to limit local law enforcement cooperation with Federal authorities, making it harder to keep our families and communities safe.

Back in my home State of Tennessee, the Nashville City Council has recently been advancing legislation to become one of these sanctuary cities. Giving Federal funds to sanctuary cities defies logic and it demands attention.

Yesterday, I offered an amendment to expand the bill before us today so that sanctuary cities would no longer have access to Community Development Block Grants and certain other economic development grants, as well, that send more than about 300 billion taxpayer dollars a year to local communities.

On its website, the Community Development Block Grant program says its purpose is to provide services to vulnerable communities and address issues that “pose an immediate threat to the health or welfare of the community.”

What population is more vulnerable than a 6-year-old girl in Lebanon, Tennessee, who was sexually molested while she was sleeping? Just last month, charges were brought against a criminal illegal immigrant for repeatedly breaking into her room at night and making videos while he assaulted her. The evil individual had been in police custody before.

For Kate Steinle, who has been talked about many times on the floor, her killer had a criminal record of not one, two, or three, but seven felonies. He had been deported not once, twice, or three times, but five times. Is that who liberal legislators around the country want to give “sanctuary”?

We need more communication and cooperation between local, State, and Federal law enforcement officers who are trying to keep our communities safe, not less. It is time to stop giving taxpayer dollars to these cities. I am voting for this bill today to do just that.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the distinguished ranking member, for yielding.

I don’t know what our friend from Tennessee was talking about. I am not here as a liberal legislator. I am here as a local government person. I spent 14 years in local government.

We are not sanctuary cities. We are trying to solve crimes by seeking cooperation from the immigrant community. This bill will make it harder. Most of our local police chiefs would tell you that—if you would listen to them.

Oddly enough, the Members supporting this bill are the same Members who sanctimoniously decry Federal mandates and overreach—except when

they want one. Here we are, dictating how local governments should implement Federal immigration laws.

At the local level, we know effective, community-based policing relies on trust between the police and communities. This bill would erode that collaboration and that trust.

How can we expect our Nation’s immigrants to turn to the police if they witness or fall victim to a crime if they are afraid of being deported or separated from their families?

The bill will punish local police departments and those relationships. It should be defeated. This local government guy will oppose this bad policy bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I was at the White House with President Trump and the parents and relatives of those daughters and sons who were killed by those who are here illegally. The stories were very heavy. They should weigh on all of us.

One story that was shared was given by Michelle Root about her beautiful daughter who was struck down and killed in a senseless way by someone here illegally. Michelle is in the gallery here today, and she is a great advocate.

In late January 2016, Sarah’s parents, Michelle and Scott Root, started their day with joy. On that day, their beautiful daughter, Sarah, graduated. She had the whole world ahead of her. But for Michelle and Scott, the day ended with loss and tragedy. It was the unimaginable loss of their daughter. Sarah was killed by a drunk driver here illegally. It is so senseless. Sarah had her whole life in front of her.

Through incompetence and uncertainty about the law or the policy, or both—but for sure, a lack of common sense—Sarah’s killer was released. Today, Sarah’s killer is free.

Today, Sarah’s parents, Michelle and Scott, and Sarah’s brother, Scotty, fight for Sarah’s justice. They fight for her honor. They fight to make sure no other parent or loved one has to go through the tragic ordeal they had to go through.

□ 1500

My vote today is about policy, but it is in honor of Sarah Root. It is hard to find a love stronger than a parent has for their child. Sarah will always be loved and certainly not forgotten by her family and friends and those who never even met her. She has touched their hearts. They continue to advocate, and so must we.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman, my colleagues in Iowa and across the border in Nebraska who support this legislation and fought for it to be incorporated into this bill.

God is taking care of Sarah now. Her memory lives on. I urge the passage of this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not in order to refer to persons in the gallery.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a former justice to the Texas Supreme Court.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the only sanctuary involved here today is the sanctuary that this sorry bill provides for prejudice. This is the Trump counterpart to the outrageous SB4 that Governor Greg Abbott has been promoting in Texas. It all goes back to the rhetoric of last year about the “bad hombres” and the attacks on Mexico and Mexicans.

I will tell you, I want the bad hombres off the street no matter where they come from, but I look to my local police chiefs, to my local sheriffs and law enforcement officers to tell me what the best way is to protect our families from crime. They say maintaining the confidence of the immigrant community is vital, and that measures like this, which simply have politicians in Washington interfering with and attempting to intimidate local law enforcement officers, do exactly the opposite of what all these speeches claim that they do.

Anti-immigrant hysteria, what a way to leave for July Fourth from a Congress that has accomplished practically nothing but to attack immigrants as we depart instead of standing by and supporting local law enforcement and making our communities safe.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond and point out that many, many of the victims of these crimes are Hispanic, African American, and others, and they were seated around the Cabinet table at the White House yesterday pleading for this legislation because they had lost their loved ones. They would much rather have been able to rewind the tape and be with those loved ones who were killed by people who were illegally present in the United States. The victims would never have suffered if our laws had simply been enforced.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN).

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act.

Congress has a responsibility to protect the rule of law in our country and to provide for the safety of our citizens. The American people overwhelmingly oppose sanctuary cities and believe that we should be doing more to enforce our Federal immigration laws.

The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act clarifies the authority of the Department of Homeland Security to order the detainment of illegal immigrants arrested for crimes until they can be processed for deportation.

It also cuts off certain Federal grants to cities and States that violate Federal immigration law. It is simple: If you don't comply with the Federal immigration law, you are not eligible for certain Federal grants.

It is time for us to enforce our immigration laws.

National attention was brought to the consequences of the sanctuary city

policies by the death of Kate Steinle, who was killed by an illegal immigrant who had previously been convicted of seven felonies and deported five times. If the city of San Francisco had worked with the Federal Government to enforce the Federal immigration law instead of releasing this criminal, Kate Steinle would be alive today.

Our current system of laws failed Kate and all those who have died at the hands of convicted felons in this country illegally. The people who I am honored to represent do not understand why some American cities get to flout the law and not cooperate with Federal officials. This legislation makes it clear that they don't, that sanctuary cities are illegal. By holding these jurisdictions accountable and stopping sanctuary cities, we will make Americans of every background safer on our streets.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), a dedicated civil rights leader.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3003.

In jurisdictions within my district, Cook County, cities like Chicago, Evanston, and Skokie, which are immigrant rich, we have adopted sanctuary cities, sometimes called welcoming cities, ordinances in order to reassure immigrants that they can, with safety, talk to law enforcement within our jurisdictions.

Skokie Mayor George Van Dusen said: “It has taken the Village of Skokie years—decades really—to form the bridges that we have of trust with our immigrant community.”

These policies work. A January study found that sanctuary cities tend to be safer and have stronger economies than not.

This bill would push communities to abandon sanctuary city policies, breaking down that hard-earned trust between immigrants and law enforcement. Turning law enforcement into immigration enforcement makes cities less safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, it makes immigrants less likely to report crimes. This bill protects criminals in our communities and not victims.

I urge my colleagues to vote for safer communities and vote against this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for making sure this bill gets to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I am registering my support for Kate's Law and H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals—for Criminals—Act. I support these bills

for the sake of Kate Steinle and every single one of those who share her tragic fate.

She was murdered in broad daylight by a violent, criminal illegal alien. This was an easily preventable and heartbreaking crime, and we simply cannot fail the American people by refusing to act on these bills.

The government's first responsibility is the security and protection of our homeland, a duty that should not be abdicated or yielded based on convenience.

In 2011—2011—a GAO study found that aliens committed more than 25,000 homicides, more than 69,000 sexual offenses, 14,000 kidnappings, 42,000 robberies, and 213,000 assaults, among other offenses. Every single one of these is too many.

Very few things in this world we can get at 100 percent, but these are 100 percent preventable if these people would not have been here. These are preventable crimes, completely preventable, and we must stop the willful neglect of complacency by government officials who refuse to enforce existing—this is not new. This is existing law we are asking them to enforce, we are requiring them to enforce.

According to a March 2017 Washington Times article, nearly 500 jurisdictions have sanctuary policies that block—that block—that limit ICE from apprehending criminal aliens.

A January 2017 article from the Washington Examiner reported that, from January 2014 to September 2015, sanctuary jurisdictions rejected 17,000 ICE detainees. Those are 17,000 criminals that are out on the street that we know about that we let go.

Adding insult to injury, these sanctuary jurisdictions seek Federal funds to help them defy Federal law enforcement efforts to remove the dangerous criminal aliens from the streets.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to put Americans first, and we support the restoration of law and order by supporting these proposals.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. LOFGREN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters from the National Fraternal Order of Police; Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force; National League of Cities; U.S. Conference of Mayors; and the National Association of Counties in opposition to this bill.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,

Washington, DC, 27 June 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN O. MCCARTHY,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY P. PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. STENY H. HOYER,
Minority Whip, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND REPRESENTATIVES MCCARTHY, PELOSI AND HOYER: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to reiterate the FOP's opposition to any amendment or piece of legislation that would penalize law enforcement agencies by withholding Federal funding or resources from law enforcement assistance programs in an effort to coerce a policy change at the local level. The House will consider H.R. 3003 on the floor this week and Section 2 of this bill would restrict the hiring program administered by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (Byrne-JAG) programs, as well as programs administered by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

The FOP has been very clear on this issue: we strongly believe that local and State law enforcement agencies should cooperate with their Federal counterparts. That being said, withholding needed assistance to law enforcement agencies—which have no policy-making role—also hurts public safety efforts.

Local police departments answer to local civilian government and it is the local government which enacts statutes and ordinances in their communities. Law enforcement officers have no more say in these matters than any other citizen and—with laws like the Hatch Act in place—it can be argued they have less. Law enforcement officers do not get to pick and choose which laws to enforce, and must carry out lawful orders at the direction of their commanders and the civilian government that employs them. It is unjust to penalize law enforcement and the citizens they serve because Congress disagrees with their enforcement priorities with respect to our nation's immigration laws.

The FOP issued a statement in January of this year regarding the approach of the Administration on sanctuary cities as outlined in President Trump's Executive Order. The President recognized that it is unfair to penalize the law enforcement agencies serving these jurisdictions for the political decisions of local officials. It allows the U.S. Attorney General and Secretary of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security to make an informed decision about the public safety impact without an automatic suspension from Federal grant programs. In Section 2 of H.R. 3003, there is no such discretion and it countermands the Administration's existing policy.

The FOP opposed several bills in the previous Congress, which were outlined in a letter to the Senate leadership, and we will continue to work against proposals that would reduce or withhold funding or resources from any Federal program for local and State law enforcement. If Congress wishes to effect policy changes in these sanctuary cities, it must find another way to do so.

On behalf of the more than 330,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I want to urge the House to reject H.R. 3003's punitive approach and work with law enforcement to find a better way to improve public safety in our communities. Please feel free to contact me or my Senior Advisor Jim Pasco in my

Washington office if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,
National President.

LAW ENFORCEMENT
IMMIGRATION TASK FORCE,
June 28, 2017.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: As law enforcement leaders dedicated to preserving the safety and security of our communities, we have concerns about legislative proposals that would attempt to impose punitive, "one-size-fits-all" policies on state and local law enforcement. Rather than strengthening state and local law enforcement by providing us with the tools to work with the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in a manner that is responsive to the needs of our communities, these proposals would represent a step backwards.

Attempts to defund so-called sanctuary cities regularly sweep too broadly, punishing jurisdictions that engage in well-established community policing practices or adhere to federal court decisions that have found federal immigration detainers to violate constitutional protections. We oppose these approaches and urge Congress to work to encourage—rather than compel—law enforcement agency cooperation within our federal system.

We believe that law enforcement should not cut corners. Multiple federal courts have questioned the legality and constitutionality of federal immigration detainers that are not accompanied by a criminal warrant signed by a judge. Even though the legality of such immigration holds is doubtful, some have proposed requiring states and localities to enforce them, shielding them from lawsuits. While this approach would reduce potential legal liability faced by some jurisdictions and departments, we are concerned these proposals would still require our agencies and officers carry out federal directives that could violate the U.S. Constitution, which we are sworn to follow.

Immigration enforcement is, first and foremost, a federal responsibility. Making our communities safer means better defining roles and improving relationships between local law enforcement and federal immigration authorities. But in attempting to defund "sanctuary cities" and require state and local law enforcement agencies. Local control has been a beneficial approach for law enforcement for decades—having the federal government compel state and local law enforcement to carry out new and sometimes problematic tasks undermines the delicate federal balance and will harm locally-based policing.

Rather than requiring state and local law enforcement agencies to engage in additional immigration enforcement activities, Congress should focus on overdue reforms of the broken immigration system to allow state and local law enforcement to focus their resources on true threats—dangerous criminals and criminal organizations. We believe that state and local law enforcement must work together with federal authorities to protect our communities and that we can best serve our communities by leaving the enforcement of immigration laws to the federal government. Threatening the removal of valuable grant funding that contributes to the health and well-being of communities across the nation would not make our communities safer and would not fix any part of our broken immigration system.

Our immigration problem is a national problem deserving of a national approach, and we continue to recognize that what our broken system truly needs is a permanent

legislative solution—broad-based immigration reform.

Sincerely,

Chief Chris Magnus, Tucson, AZ; Chief Sylvis Moir, Tempe, AZ; Ret. Chief Roberto Villaseñor, Tucson, AZ; Chief Charlie Beck, Los Angeles, CA; Ret. Chief James Lopez, Los Angeles County, CA; Sheriff Margaret Mims, Fresno County, CA; Sheriff Mike Chitwood, Volusia County, FL; Sheriff Paul Fitzgerald, Story County, IA; Chief Wayne Jerman, Cedar Rapids, IA; Sheriff Bill McCarthy, Polk County, IA.

Public Safety Director, Mark Prosser, Storm Lake, IA; Sheriff Lonny Pulkrabek, Johnson County, IA; Chief Mike Tupper, Marshalltown, IA; Chief William Bones, Voise, ID; Ret. Chief Ron Teachman, South Bend, IN; Ret. Chief James Hawkins, Garden City, KS; Commissioner William Evans, Boston, MA; Chief Ken Ferguson, Framingham, MA; Chief Brian Kyes, Chelsea, MA; Chief Tom Manger, Montgomery County, MD.

Chief Todd Axtell, Saint Paul, MN; Sheriff Eli Rivera, Cheshire County, NH; Chief Cel Rivera, Lorain, OH; Public Safety Commissioner Steven Pare, Providence, RI; Chief William Holbrook, Columbia, SC; Sheriff Leon Lott, Richland County, SC; Ret. Chief Fred Fletcher, Chattanooga, TN; Chief Art Acevedo, Houston, TX.

Sheriff Edward Gonzalez, Harris County, TX; Sheriff Sally Hernandez, Travis County, TX; Sheriff Lupe Valdez, Dallas County, TX; Ret. Chief Chris Burbank, Salt Lake City, UT; Sheriff John Riquhart, King County, WA; Asst. Chief Randy Gaber, Madison, WI; Chief Michael Koval, Madison, WI; Chief Todd Thomas, Appleton, WI.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES,

Cleveland, OH, June 28, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 19,000 cities and towns represented by the National League of Cities (NLC), I am writing to express our strong opposition to the "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act" (H.R. 3003). The bill, which was made public just recently, completely bypassed the House Judiciary Committee and includes provisions that will result in violations of due process and the Fourth and Tenth Amendments to the Constitution.

We are very troubled by the fact that the bill—which preempts local authority, jeopardizes public safety, and exposes local governments to litigation and potential liability—was drafted with no input from local officials.

NLC has consistently opposed federal legislation that would impose harmful sanctions on local governments—sanctions that prohibit or restrict compliance when a detainer request is issued by the Department of Homeland Security's Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). Specifically, NLC has significant concerns with the provisions in H.R. 3003 that:

1. Undermine local government's authority to govern their public safety and local law enforcement programs. The bill would prevent localities from establishing laws or policies that prohibit or "in any way" restrict compliance with or cooperation with federal immigration enforcement. H.R. 3003 would strip local governments ability to enact common-sense crime prevention policies that ensure victims of crime will seek protection and report crimes.

2. Penalize local governments that fail to comply with federal immigration efforts with the denial of federal funding for critical law enforcement, national security, drug treatment, and crime victim initiatives, including the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP), Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), and Byrne JAG programs that provide hundreds of millions of dollars to localities nationwide.

3. Compel local governments to honor Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) detainer requests, even though the federal courts have determined that ICE use of detainers violates the Fourth Amendment, and that localities may be held liable for honoring them.

4. Expand ICE's detainer authority requiring localities to hold undocumented immigrants for up to 96 hours, which is twice what is currently allowed even if probable cause has not been shown. The bill also does not provide any additional funding to local governments to cover the costs associated with detaining the undocumented immigrants. Requiring cities to shoulder the financial burden being forced upon them with no input impacts our ability to pay for essential infrastructure and services such as roads, schools and libraries.

5. Create a "private right of action" that would allow crime victims or their family members to sue localities if the crime was committed by someone who was released by the locality that did not honor an ICE detainer request. This provision could allow frivolous lawsuits against a local government by anyone who alleges that they were a victim of a crime committed by an immigrant.

6. Compel local governments to utilize their local law enforcement resources to implement federal civil immigration enforcement in violation of the Tenth Amendment's "commandeering" principle. The Tenth Amendment does not permit the federal government to force counties and cities to allocate local resources, including police officers, technology, and personnel, to enforce federal immigration law. The federal government also cannot withhold funds from localities refusing to participate in federal efforts if the programs affected are unrelated to the purpose of the federal program, or if the sanctions are punitive in nature.

Since the inception of the United States of America, lawful immigrants and refugees have played a vital role in the civic, economic and social life of cities. We recognize that local governments address issues associated with federal immigration laws in a variety of ways that best meet the needs of all their residents. Some cities provide greater leniency towards undocumented immigrants who do not violate state and local laws by not dedicating municipal resources to enforce federal immigration laws. Unfortunately, these cities are wrongfully characterized as safe havens for undocumented immigrants who violate state and local laws.

We believe the power to enforce federal immigration laws remains exclusively a federal power and we strongly oppose federal efforts to commandeer our local law enforcement to take on the duties of federal immigration enforcement agents.

Our nation's local elected officials call on you to do the right thing and vote against H.R. 3003 when it is considered on the floor. We urge you to move beyond punitive bills like H.R. 3003 and work with us to develop a positive legislation that will fix our broken immigration system and make our cities safer.

Thank you for your leadership and for willingness to stand up for America's cities by voting against this legislation that would impose harmful sanctions on local governments.

Sincerely,

MATT ZONE,
President, National
League of Cities,
Ward 15 Council-
man.

THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE

OF MAYORS,

Washington, DC, June 26, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I write to register the strong opposition of the nation's mayors to H.R. 3003, a partisan bill that seeks to punish so-called "sanctuary cities," which is expected to be considered by the full House this week.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors represents well over a thousand mayors and nearly 150 million people. Today, we concluded the 85th Annual Meeting of The U.S. Conference of Mayors and adopted policy that reinforces and builds on previous positions we have taken which oppose provisions in this bill. Specifically, the nation's mayors:

urge members of Congress to withdraw legislation that attempts to cut local law enforcement funding necessary to ensure the safety of our communities, indemnify conduct that violates the constitutional rights afforded to both United States citizens and immigrant populations, and further criminalizes immigration and infringes on the rights of immigrant;

oppose punitive policies that limit local control and discretion, and urge instead that Congress and the Administration pursue immigration enforcement policies that recognize that local law enforcement has limited resources and community trust is critical to local law enforcement and the safety of our communities;

oppose federal policies that commandeer local law enforcement or require local authorities to violate, or be placed at risk of violating, a person's Fourth Amendment rights; expend limited resources to act as immigration agents; or otherwise assist federal immigration authorities beyond what is determined by local policy.

H.R. 3003 would do all of these things and more:

It would jeopardize public safety by withholding critical public safety funding from jurisdictions that tell their police officers not to ask an individual their immigration status. Many departments have such policies to encourage crime victims and witnesses to report crimes and to build trust with immigrant communities.

It would put jurisdictions at risk of violating an individual's Fourth Amendment rights by establishing probable cause standards for ICE's issuance of detainers that do not require a judicial determination of probable cause. Numerous federal courts have found that continued detention under an ICE detainer, absent probable cause, would state a claim for a violation of the Fourth Amendment and subject the detaining officer or jurisdiction to civil liability.

While it says it would provide immunity to jurisdictions which comply with detainers and hold them harmless in any suits filed against them, they would still be subject to Fourth Amendment challenges.

Further compelling and expanding compliance with certain enforcement provisions, such as immigration detainers, and cutting off federal funding to jurisdictions which do not comply with these provisions likely conflict with the Tenth Amendment.

H.R. 3003 is a bad bill for our cities and their residents and for our nation. It would jeopardize public safety, preempt local authority, and expose local governments to litigation and potential findings of damages. America's mayors call on you to do the right thing and vote against H.R. 3003 when it is considered on the floor.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors urges you instead to focus on positive legislation that will fix our broken immigration system and make our cities safer. The nation's mayors pledge to work with you on bipartisan immigration reform legislation that will fix our

nation's broken immigration system. We need to move beyond punitive bills like H.R. 3003 and develop an immigration system that works for our nation, our cities and our people.

To make our cities safer we urge you to consider legislation that will help us to fight crime and prevent terrorism. The U.S. Conference of Mayors and the Major Cities Chiefs Association agree that to make the streets of America safe, Congress must act to strengthen bonds between communities and police, expand homeland security grants, invest in mental health and substance abuse services, reduce gun violence, and reform the criminal justice system and strengthen re-entry services.

Sincerely,

MITCHELL J. LANDRIEU,
Mayor of New Orleans,
President.

MAJOR COUNTY SHERIFFS OF AMERICA
AND NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
COUNTIES,

June 29, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. STENY HOYER,
Minority Whip, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, MAJORITY LEADER MCCARTHY AND REPRESENTATIVES PELOSI AND HOYER: On behalf of the Major County Sheriffs of America (MCSA) and the National Association of Counties (NACo), we write to express our commitment to work with Congress and the Administration on measures to prevent crime and violence, but are concerned that H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act is not an effective approach. While we applaud measures to protect the public from repeat, violent predators, we cannot support further cuts in funding that weaken crime prevention efforts, officer recruitment, and safety and wellness programs.

Most sheriffs want to cooperate with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) so that it may remove criminal illegal aliens from the United States, but sheriffs must follow the law that has rendered current ICE requests illegal. Without proper arrest authority, sheriffs cannot willfully disregard an individual's 4th amendment rights as articulated in these court cases. Make no mistake, the American public has a right to know which jurisdictions are blatantly ignoring the rule of law and are endangering community safety and they should be held accountable. If a jurisdiction is following the law of its state or a binding court ruling, it is misguided for Congress to cut funding for programs that support State and local law enforcement agencies in nearly every jurisdiction in this country.

ICE's removal of illegal aliens who are committing crimes in our communities is important to ensure public safety. Their removal mitigates the drain on sheriffs' resources by ensuring these criminals are not sitting in our jails and that our deputies are not continually investigating their crimes. As leaders in law enforcement, the MCSA been working collaboratively with the Department of Homeland Security to find an agreeable solution that is lawful, effects good public safety policy, and allows ICE to effectively do its job of removing criminal illegal aliens from our country.

We know Members of Congress believe that efforts to stop violence in American cities

must be strengthened, not weakened. While we appreciate Congress' support for law enforcement, we strongly feel a law enforcement grant penalty solution would not only negatively impact law enforcement efforts across the country, but also not achieve its intended purpose.

Very Respectfully,

MICHAEL J. BOUCHARD,
Sheriff, Oakland
County (MI), Vice
President—Govern-
ment Affairs, Major
County Sheriffs of
America (MCSA).

MATTHEW D. CHASE,
Executive Director,
National Association
of Counties (NACo).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to H.R. 3003 because, if this bill passed, it would punish our communities more than it would punish the criminals. As written, this bill would deny critical funding for our police departments.

As a former 20-year prosecutor in local counties, I know firsthand how much our local police rely on Federal funding not just to do their job, but to be safe when they keep our communities safe. Any decrease in any sort of funding would decrease the safety of our officers as they strive to protect and serve our communities. This law will not only affect our police officers' safety, but it will negatively affect the sense of security in our communities.

Yes, the underlying intent of the law is to make it easier for ICE to target undocumented people who are criminals—I get it—but it is not that simple.

In the past few months, my district has seen two large-scale raids by ICE. Yes, they swept up criminals, but they also snagged collaterals, law-abiding people who were here in the wrong place at the right time. Those operations cast a complete pall over the community that affected our ability to enforce our laws.

As a gang prosecutor, over and over I experienced people who were afraid to come forward out of fear of retaliation. Now they are afraid of the police, afraid of the courts, and afraid of our government. That is why I am opposed to H.R. 3003.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to reflect back on why localities adopt these community trust policies.

The chairman of the committee mentioned somebody in San Francisco who is suing the city. In a way, that shows the efficacy of the trust policies.

This man, Mr. Figueroa-Zarceno, was a victim of crime. His truck was stolen. He went into the police department to report that his truck was stolen. There was a removal order that was 10 or 20

years old. He has an American citizen child. He is a working person. When he went outside, he was picked up by ICE.

I think what that tells other people who are victims of crime who might have an outstanding removal order is: Don't report the crime. It is one thing if you have lost your truck. It has been stolen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. LOFGREN. Not that I am for stealing trucks, but here is a bigger problem.

The cities of Houston and Los Angeles report a dramatic drop-off in reports of sexual violence. Why? Because immigrants are afraid to report; and not just because they might be undocumented, but they might have a sister or a next-door neighbor or a spouse who is undocumented, even if they are a citizen. So what has happened is with these threats come an unwillingness of immigrants to report crime, to be witnesses to crime, to keep our communities safe.

These stories that we have heard of the victims of crime are heartbreaking, but we are not without remedies under current law.

The most important law in our country is the Constitution. The Constitution includes the Fourth Amendment.

□ 1515

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. LOFGREN. The Constitution is the most important law we have. We read it aloud on the first day of our Congress. It includes the Fourth Amendment, which requires probable cause and warrants. A bunch of courts have made that ruling relative to detainers.

Well, that doesn't leave the Federal Government without remedies. Get a warrant. There is not a jurisdiction in the United States that will not honor a judicial warrant. Don't blame the local police. Look to the Department of Homeland Security for why they have dropped the ball and been unwilling to take the steps that are well within their authority today to make sure if there is someone that they need, they get a warrant and they obtain that person for whatever is the next step in their process.

To somehow suggest that this misguided bill is the answer is a big mistake.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON).

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of this bill today. I stand in support of the rule of law. I stand in support of our institutions.

I also stand in memory of Sarah Root, a young woman who was mur-

dered by a drunk driver on January 16. She was killed in my district—or Nebraska 02—a short time after graduating from Bellevue University with a 4.0 grade point average, with a bright future ahead of her. She was loved by her parents and her extended family. If you see her picture, that beautiful smile would warm any room.

The perpetrator was here illegally from Honduras. He posted bail and never was seen again. ICE failed to hold him, and justice was denied. We can't let this happen again.

The bill today will fix this. We can't let a travesty of justice like this ever happen again. Our systems have to hold people accountable. When ICE lets people go like this and they leave, a travesty of justice occurs.

Today we stand with Michelle Root, the mother of Sarah Root, who is here, and we stand with Scott Root. We remember Sarah Root, and we say: Never again.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3003 is not making our communities safer. If it was, the bill's sponsors would have heeded the strong opposition of organizations like the National Fraternal Order of Police, who stated that, "withholding needed assistance to law enforcement agencies—which have no policymaking role—hurts public safety efforts;" and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, who cautioned, "H.R. 3003 is a bad bill for our cities and their residents and for our Nation. It would jeopardize public safety, preempt local authority, and expose local governments to litigation and potential findings of damage."

Instead, this legislation is a down payment on the President's and the Republican majority's mass deportation plan.

This bill, and the one that we will debate later today, is a portion of the mass deportation bill known as the "Davis-Oliver Act," which has been cited as a priority for the Trump administration, and is supported by anti-immigrant groups, such as NumbersUSA and the Center for Immigration Studies.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to oppose this dangerous legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining? The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL). The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

First, let me be clear: the only law enforcement agencies that risk losing any Federal grants because of this legislation are those agencies that, without any outside compulsion, deliberately choose to violate Federal law by outright prohibiting their law enforcement officers from voluntarily communicating with ICE and cooperating with it in the enforcement of Federal law.

Second, let me also be clear that this bill does not require State and local law enforcement agencies to comply with ICE detainees, and it does not seek to cut off any Federal grants to jurisdictions that choose not to comply.

Finally, it is a long-settled principle of constitutional law. And let me remind you that all of these law enforcement officers vowed to defend the Constitution, and the Constitution grants supremacy to Federal immigration law.

When there is a conflict with Federal immigration law, State laws that are in conflict are invalid, preempted by Federal law under the 10th Amendment. Under the 10th Amendment, State and local law enforcement agencies have no obligation to comply with unconstitutional provisions of State or local law that asks them to violate title 8, United States Code, section 1373.

Then, again, getting back to the amazing news that we have, the city of San Francisco has just agreed to pay \$190,000 to an illegal alien because the San Francisco sheriff complied with an ICE detainer and turned the alien over to ICE, apparently in violation of San Francisco policy. That individual, under Federal law, because he was the victim of a crime, will be eligible to apply for a U visa.

Respect for the rule of law is the way to keep communities safe. Respect for the rule of law is the way to make sure that people like Kate Steinle are not murdered in the city of San Francisco, as we have heard of other murders all during the debate today, by people who are unlawfully present in the United States. Therefore, they are all preventable crimes.

Law enforcement in this country needs to cooperate. Most law enforcement officers want that to be done. Let's support them, let's support this legislation, and make sure that the rule of law is upheld.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following additional letters in opposition to H.R. 3003. These are additional letters of opposition that I mentioned earlier on H.R. 3003.

JUNE 26, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We write on behalf of the Committee on Migration of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB/COM), and Catholic Charities USA (CCUSA) to express our opposition to H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004.

The Catholic Church holds a strong interest in the welfare of migrants and how our nation welcomes and treats them. Our parishes include those with and without immigration status, unfortunately some who have witnessed or been victims of crime in the United States, including domestic violence, armed robbery, and assault. We understand the importance of fostering cooperation and information-sharing between immigrant communities and local law enforcement.

We oppose H.R. 3003 because it would impose obligations on local governments that we fear—and that many of them have

warned—would undermine authority and discretion of local law enforcement. This, in turn, would hamper the ability of local law enforcement officials to apprehend criminals and ensure public safety in all communities.

Furthermore, Section 2 of H.R. 3003 would deny to jurisdictions vital federal funding related to law enforcement, terrorism, national security, immigration, and naturalization if those jurisdictions are deemed to be non-compliant with H.R. 3003. The Catholic service network, including Catholic Charities, works in partnership with the federal government on a number of Department of Justice and Department of Homeland Security initiatives, including disaster response and recovery, naturalization and citizenship services, and services for the immigrant, including victims of human trafficking, and domestic violence. These services are incredibly valuable to the protection and promotion of the human person and in some instances life-saving. Cutting grants related to these important national objectives, or threat of such cuts, is not humane or just, nor is it in our national interest.

Also, we oppose H.R. 3004 as it would lead to an expansion of incarceration and does not include adequate protections for people who re-enter the U.S. for humanitarian reasons or seek protection at the border. While H.R. 3004 makes notable efforts to protect us from those convicted of violent criminal offenses, the legislation goes far beyond this goal by expanding the government's ability to prosecute illegal re-entry cases and heightening the criminal penalties in these cases. In an era of fiscal austerity, it is vital that important judicial resources are efficiently utilized to prosecute and convict the most violent offenders of violent crimes. Expanding who is eligible to be prosecuted for entry or re-entry as well as enhancing sentencing requirements does not advance the common good nor will it ensure that communities are safer. Furthermore, we are concerned that, as introduced, H.R. 3004 would also prevent vulnerable asylum seekers and unaccompanied children, (who have presented themselves repeatedly at the U.S. border in the flight from violence), from being able to access protection, and instead face fines, imprisonment or both.

We respectfully urge you to reject these bills in favor of a more comprehensive and humane approach to immigration reform; an approach that upholds human dignity and family unity and places a greater emphasis on balancing the needs and rights of immigrants with our nation's best interests and security.

The United States has a long and proud history of leadership in welcoming newcomers regardless of their circumstances and promoting the common good. We stand ready to work with you on legislation that more closely adheres to this tradition and appreciate your serious consideration of our views in this regard.

Sincerely,

MOST REV. JOE VÁSQUEZ,
Bishop of Austin,
Chairman, USCCB
Committee on Migration.

SR. DONNA MARKHAM, OP,
PHD.,
President & CEO,
Catholic Charities
USA.

NATIONAL TASK FORCE TO END,
SEXUAL AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE,
June 27, 2017.

The National Taskforce to End Sexual and Domestic Violence (NTF), comprised of national leadership organizations advocating on behalf of sexual assault and domestic vio-

lence victims and representing hundreds of organizations across the country dedicated to ensuring all survivors of violence receive the protections they deserve, write to express our deep concerns about the impact that H.R. 3003, the "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act," and H.R. 3004, or "Kate's Law," will have on victims fleeing or recovering from sexual assault, domestic violence, or human trafficking, and on communities at large.

This year is the twenty-third anniversary of the bipartisan Violence Against Women Act ("VAWA") which has, since it was first enacted, included critical protections for immigrant victims of domestic and sexual violence. H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 will have the effect of punishing immigrant survivors and their children and pushing them into the shadows and into danger, undermining the very purpose of VAWA. Specifically, the nation's leading national organizations that address domestic and sexual assault oppose H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 because:

Community trust policies are critical tools for increasing community safety. Laws that seek to intertwine the federal immigration and local law enforcement systems will undermine the Congressional purpose of protections enacted under VAWA and will have the chilling effect of pushing immigrant victims into the shadows and undermining public safety. Immigration enforcement must be implemented in a way that supports local community policing and sustains community trust in working with local law enforcement. H.R. 3003 runs contrary to community policing efforts and will deter immigrant domestic violence and sexual assault survivors not only from reporting crimes, but also from seeking help for themselves and their children. While H.R. 3003 does not require that local law enforcement arrest or report immigrant victims or witnesses of criminal activity, the language in the bill provides no restriction prohibiting such practices.

Perpetrators use fear of deportation as tool of abuse. Local policies that minimize the intertwining of local law enforcement with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) help protect the most vulnerable victims by creating trust between law enforcement and the immigrant community, which in turn help protect entire communities. Abusers and traffickers use the fear of deportation of their victims as a tool to silence and trap them. If immigrants are afraid to call the police because of fear of deportation, they become more vulnerable to abuse and exploitation. Not only are the individual victims and their children harmed, but their fear of law enforcement leads many to abstain from reporting violent perpetrators or seeking protection and, as a result, dangerous criminals are not identified and go unpunished.

As VAWA recognizes, immigrant victims of violent crimes often do not contact law enforcement due to fear that they will be deported. Immigrants are already afraid of contacting the police and HR 3003 proposes to further intertwine federal immigration and local law enforcement systems will only exacerbate this fear. The result is that perpetrators will be able to continue to harm others, both immigrant and U.S. Citizen victims alike. Since January of 2017, victim advocates have been describing the immense fear expressed by immigrant victims and their reluctance to reach out for help from police. A recent survey of over 700 advocates and attorneys at domestic violence and sexual assault programs indicate that immigrant victims are expressing heightened fears and concerns about immigration enforcement, with 78 percent of advocates and attorneys reporting that victims are describing fear of contacting the police; 75 percent

of them reporting that victims are afraid of going to court; and 43 percent reporting working with immigrant victims who are choosing not to move forward with criminal charges or obtaining protective orders.

In addition, according to Los Angeles Police Chief Charlie Beck, reporting of sexual assault and domestic violence among Latinos has dropped significantly this year, possibly due to concerns that police interaction could result in deportation. According to Chief Beck, reports of sexual assault have dropped 25 percent among Los Angeles' Latino population since the beginning of the year compared to a three percent drop among non-Latino victims. Similarly, reports of spousal abuse among Latinos fell by about 10 percent among Latinos whereas the decline among non-Latinos was four percent. The Houston Police Department reported in April that the number of Hispanics reporting rape is down 42.8 percent from last year. In Denver, CO, the Denver City Attorney has reported that some domestic violence victims are declining to testify in court. As of late February, the City Attorney's Office had dropped four cases because the victims fear that ICE officers will arrest and deport them. Both the City Attorney and Aurora Police Chief have spoken on the importance of having trust with the immigrant community in order to maintain public safety and prosecute crime.

H.R. 3003 Will Unfairly Punish Entire communities.

H.R. 3003 punishes localities that follow Constitutional guidelines and refuse to honor detainer requests that are not supported by due process mandates. H.R. 3003 likely covers more than 600 jurisdictions across the country, most of which do not characterize their policies to follow constitutional mandates as "sanctuary" policies. H.R. 3003 penalizes jurisdictions by eliminating their access to various federal grants, including federal law enforcement grants, such as the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, and other federal grants related to law enforcement or immigration, such as those that fund forensic rape kit analysis. Withholding federal law enforcement funding would, ironically, undermine the ability of local jurisdictions to combat and prevent crime in their communities.

In addition, the fiscal impact of both H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 will result in limited federal law enforcement resources being further reduced as a result of shifting funding from enforcing federal criminal laws addressing violent crimes, including those protecting victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking, to the detention and prosecution of many non-violent immigration law violators.

H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 Will Unfairly Punish Victims.

By greatly expanding mandatory detention and expanding criminal penalties for re-entry, H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 will have harsh consequences for immigrant survivors. Victims of human trafficking, sexual assault, and domestic violence are often at risk of being arrested and convicted. In recognition of this fact, existing ICE guidance cites the example of when police respond to a domestic violence call, both parties may be arrested or a survivor who acted in self-defense may be wrongly accused. In addition, if the abuser speaks English better than the survivor, or if other language or cultural barriers (or fear of retaliation from the abuser) prevent the survivor from fully disclosing the abuse suffered, a survivor faces charges and tremendous pressure to plead guilty (without being advised about the long-term consequences) in order to be released from jail and reunited with her children. In addition, victims of trafficking are often arrested and convicted for prostitution-related

offenses. These victims are often desperate to be released and possibly to be reunited with their children following their arrests or pending trial. These factors—combined with poor legal counsel, particularly about the immigration consequences of criminal pleas and convictions—have in the past and will likely continue to lead to deportation of wrongly accused victims who may have pled to or been unfairly convicted of domestic violence charges and/or prostitution. H.R. 3003 imposes harsh criminal penalties and H.R. 3004 imposes expanded bases for detention without consideration of mitigating circumstances or humanitarian exceptions for these victims.

In addition, H.R. 3004 expands the criminal consequences for re-entry in the U.S. without recognizing the compelling humanitarian circumstances in which victims who have been previously removed return for their safety. Victims of domestic and sexual violence and trafficking fleeing violence in their countries of origin will be penalized for seeking protection from harm. In recent years, women and children fleeing rampant violence in El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras, have fled to the United States, seeking refuge. Frequently, because of inadequate access to legal representation, they are unable to establish their eligibility for legal protections in the United States, resulting in their removal. In many cases, the risk of domestic violence, sexual assault, and/or human trafficking in their countries of origin remain unabated and victims subsequently attempt to reenter the U.S. to protect themselves and their children. Other victims of domestic and sexual violence and trafficking may be deported because their abusers or traffickers isolate them, or prevent them from obtaining lawful immigration status. They are deported, with some victims having to leave their children behind in the custody of their abusers or traffickers. Under H.R. 3004, these victims risk harsh criminal penalties for re-entry for attempting to protect themselves and their children.

On behalf of the courageous survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, stalking and human trafficking that our organizations serve, we urge you to vote against HR 3003 and 3004, and to affirm the intent and spirit of VAWA by supporting strong relationships between law enforcement and immigrant communities, which is critical for public safety in general, and particularly essential for domestic and sexual violence victims and their children.

Sincerely,

THE NATIONAL TASKFORCE TO END SEXUAL AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (www.Awawa.org).

JUNE 28, 2017.

Re Vote NO on the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003, and Kate's Law, H.R. 3004.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 407 undersigned local, state, and national immigrant, civil rights, faith-based, and labor organizations, we urge you to oppose the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003 and Kate's Law, H.R. 3004, and any similar legislation that jeopardizes public safety, erodes the goodwill forged between local police and its residents, and perpetuates the criminalization and incarceration of immigrants. H.R. 3003 would strip badly needed law enforcement funding for state and local jurisdictions, runs afoul of the Tenth and Fourth Amendment, and unnecessarily expands the government's detention apparatus. H.R. 3004 unwisely expands the federal government's ability to criminally prosecute immigrants for immigration-based offenses, excludes critical humanitarian protections for those fleeing violence, and doubles down on the failed experiment of incarceration for immigration violations.

Over 600 state and local jurisdictions have policies or ordinances that disentangle their state and local law enforcement agencies from enforcing federal immigration law. The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003, seeks to attack so-called "sanctuary" jurisdictions (many of whom do not consider themselves as such) by penalizing state and local jurisdictions that follow the Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution by refusing to honor constitutionally infirm requests for detainers. H.R. 3003 penalizes jurisdictions by eliminating various federal grants, including funding through the Cops on the Beat program, the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, and any other federal grant related to law enforcement or immigration. Importantly, using the threat of withholding federal grants to coerce state and local jurisdictions likely runs afoul of the Tenth Amendment's prohibition on commandeering, a position supported by over 300 law professors.

"Sanctuary" policies are critical to promote public safety for local communities. Fearing referral to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, victims and witnesses of crime are significantly less likely to communicate with local law enforcement. Local law enforcement authorities have repeatedly echoed this sentiment, acknowledging that community policing policies are paramount to enhancing public safety. Indeed, "sanctuary" jurisdictions have less crime and more economic development than similarly situated non-"sanctuary" jurisdictions. Withholding critically-needed federal funding would, paradoxically, severely cripple the ability of state and local jurisdictions to satisfy the public safety needs of their communities.

Kate's Law, H.R. 3004, would further criminalize the immigrant community by drastically increasing penalties for immigrants convicted of unlawful reentry. Operation Streamline encapsulates our nation's failed experiment with employing criminal penalties to deter migration. Under Operation Streamline, the federal government prosecutes immigrants for reentry at significant rates. By all practical measures, Operation Streamline has failed to deter migration, wasted billions of taxpayer dollars, and unfairly punished thousands of immigrants who try to enter or reenter the United States to reunite with their children and loved ones. We fear that H.R. 3004's increased penalties for reentry would double down on this failed strategy, explode the prison population, and cost billions of dollars.

Instead of passing discredited enforcement-only legislation, Congress should move forward on enacting just immigration reform legislation that provides a roadmap to citizenship for the nation's eleven million aspiring Americans and eliminates mass detention and deportation programs that undermine fundamental human rights. Legislation that erodes public safety, disrespects local democratic processes, and raises serious constitutional concerns represents an abdication of the Congress' responsibility to enact fair, humane, and just immigration policy. In light of the above, we urge you to vote NO on the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003 and Kate's Law, H.R. 3004.

Please contact Jose Magana-Salgado, of the Immigrant Legal Resource Center, if you have any questions regarding this letter. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

America's Voice Education Fund; American Federation of Teachers; American

Friends Service Committee (AFSC); American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee; Americans Committed to Justice and Truth; Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund (AALDEF); Asian Americans Advancing Justice-AAJC; Asian Americans Advancing Justice-Asian Law Caucus; Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, AFL-CIO (APALA); Asian Pacific Institute on Gender-Based Violence; ASISTA; Bend the Arc Jewish Action; Black Alliance for Just Immigration; Casa de Esperanza: National Latin@ Network; Catholic Legal Immigration Network, Inc.; Center for American Progress; Center for Employment Training; Center for Gender & Refugee Studies; Center for Law and Social Policy; Center for New Commu-

Center for Popular Democracy (CPD); Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) Refugee & Immigration Ministries; Christian Community Development Association; Church World Service; Coalition on Human Needs; CODEPINK; Columban Center for Advocacy and Outreach; Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador (CISPES); Community Initiatives for Visiting Immigrants in Confinement (CIVIC); Defending Rights & Dissent; Disciples Center for Public Witness; Disciples Home Missions; Dominican Sisters of Sparkill; Drug Policy Alliance; Easterseals Blake Foundation; Equal Rights Advocates; Farmworker Justice; Freedom Network USA; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Fuerza Mundial.

Futures Without Violence; Grassroots Leadership; Hispanic Federation; Hispanic National Bar Association; Holy Spirit Missionary Sisters—USA—JPIC; Immigrant Legal Resource Center; Intercommunity Peace & Justice Center; Interfaith Worker Justice; Isaiah Wilson; Jewish Voice for Peace; Jewish Voice for Peace—Boston; Jewish Voice for Peace—Tacoma chapter; Jewish Voice for Peace—Western MA; Justice Strategies; Kids in Need of Defense (KIND); Lambda Legal; Laotian American National Alliance; Latin America Working Group; Latino Victory Fund; LatinoJustice PRLDEF.

League of United Latin American Citizens; Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service; Mi Familia Vota; Milwaukee Chapter, Jewish Voice for Peace; NAACP; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Coalition Against Domestic Violence; National Coalition for Asian Pacific American Community Development; National Council of Asian Pacific Americans (NCAPA); National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of La Raza (NCLR); National Day Laborer Organizing Network (NDLON); National Education Association; National Immigrant Justice Center; National Immigration Law Center; National Immigration Project of the NLG; National Iranian American Council (NIAC); National Justice for Our Neighbors; National Korean American Service & Education Consortium (NAKASEC); National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health.

National Latina/o Psychological Association; National Lawyers Guild; National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund; National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; National Resource Center on Domestic Violence; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; OCA—Asian Pacific American Advocates; Our Revolution; People's Action; PICO National Network; Queer Detainee Empowerment Project; Refugee and Immigrant Center for Education and Legal Services (RAICES); School Social Work Association of America; Sisters of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, New Windsor; Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC); Southern Border Communities Coalition; Southern Poverty Law Center; T'ruah; The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights;

The Advocates for Human Rights; The Hampton Institute: A Working Class Think Tank.

The National Alliance to Advance Adolescent Health; The Queer Palestinian Empowerment Network; The Sentencing Project; The United Methodist Church—General Board of Church and Society; U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants; UndocuBlack Network; Unitarian Universalist Association; Unitarian Universalist Legislative Ministry of New Jersey; Unitarian Universalist Service Committee; UNITE HERE; United Child Care, Inc.; United for a Fair Economy; UU College of Social Justice; UURISE—Unitarian Universalist Refugee & Immigrant Services & Education; Voto Latino; We Belong Together; WOLA; Women's Refugee Commission; Working Families; Yemen Peace Project; YWCA.

STATE AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

(MILU) Mujeres Inmigrantes Luchando Unidas; #VigilantLOVE; 580 Cafe/Wesley Foundation Serving UCLA; Acting in Community Together in Organizing Northern Nevada (ACTIONN); Advocates for Basic Legal Equality, Inc.; Alianza; All for All; Alliance San Diego; Allies of Knoxville's Immigrant Neighbors (AKIN); American Gateways; Aquinas Center; Arkansas United Community Coalition; Asian Americans Advancing Justice—Atlanta; Asian Americans Advancing Justice—LA; Asian Americans United; Asian Counseling and Referral Service; Asian Law Alliance; Asian Pacific American Legal Resource Center; Asylee Women Enterprise; Atlas: DIY.

Bear Creek United Methodist Church—Congregation Kol Ami Interfaith Partnership; Bethany Immigration Services; Brighton Park Neighborhood Council; Cabrini Immigrant Services of NYC; Campaign for Hoosier Families; Canal Alliance; Capital Area Immigrants' Rights Coalition; CASA; Casa Familiar, Inc.; Casa Latina; Casa San Jose; Catholic Charities; Catholic Charities San Francisco, San Mateo & Marin; Causa Oregon; CDWBA Legal Project, Inc.; Central American Legal Assistance; Central New Jersey Jewish Voice for Peace; Central Pacific Conference of the United Church of Christ; Central Valley Immigrant Integration Collaborative (CVIIC); Centro Laboral de Graton.

Centro Latino Americano; Centro Legal de la Raza; Centro Romero; Chelsea Collaborative; Chicago Religious Leadership Network on Latin America; Church Council of Greater Seattle; Church of Our Saviour/La Iglesia de Nuestro Salvador Episcopal; Church Women United in New York State; Cleveland Jobs with Justice; Coalición de Lideres Latinos-CLILA; Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights (CHIRLA); Coalition of African Communities; Coloradans For Immigrant Rights, a program of the American Friends Service Committee; Colorado People's Alliance (COPA); Columbia Legal Services; Comite Pro Uno; Comite VIDA; Committee for Justice in Palestine—Ithaca; Community Action Board of Santa Cruz County, Inc.; Community Legal Services and Counseling Center.

Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto; Community of Friends in Action, Inc.; Connecticut Legal Services, Inc.; CRLA Foundation; CT Working Families; DC-Maryland Justice for Our Neighbors; Delaware Civil Rights Coalition; Do the Most Good Montgomery County (MD); Dominican Sisters-Grand Rapids (MI); Dream Team Los Angeles DTLA; DRUM—Desis Rising Up & Moving; East Bay Sanctuary Covenant; Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon; El CENTRO de Igualdad y Derechos; El Monte Wesleyan Church; Emerald Isle Immigration Center; Employee Rights Center; Encuentro; End Do-

mestic Abuse WI; English Ministry—Korean Presbyterian Church of St. Louis.

Episcopal Refugee & Immigrant Center Alliance; Equal Justice Center; Equality California; Erie Neighborhood House; First Congregational UCC of Portland; First Unitarian Universalist Church of Berks County; Florida Center for Fiscal and Economic Policy; Florida Immigrant Coalition, Inc. (FLIC); Franciscans for Justice; Frida Kahlo Community Organization; Friends of Broward Detainees; Friends of Miami-Dade Detainees; Georgia Latino Alliance for Human Rights; Gethsemane Lutheran Church; Grassroots Alliance for Immigrant Rights; Greater Lafayette Immigrant Allies; Greater New York Labor Religion Coalition; Greater Rochester COALITION for Immigration Justice; Grupo de Apoyo e Integracion Hispanoamericano; HACES.

Hana Center; Harvard Islamic Society; Her Justice; HIAS Pennsylvania; Hispanic Interest Coalition of Alabama; Hispanic Legal Clinic; Hudson Valley Chapter of JVP; Human Rights Initiative of North Texas; ICE-Free Capital District; Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; Immanuel Fellowship; a bilingual congregation; Immigrant Justice Advocacy Movement (IJAM); Immigrant Legal Advocacy Project; Immigration Action Group; Immigration Center for Women and Children; Inland Empire-Immigrant Youth Coalition (IEIYC); Interfaith Movement for Human Integrity; International Institute of Buffalo; Irish International Immigrant Center; IRTF—InterReligious Task Force on Central America and Colombia.

Japanese American Citizens League, San Jose Chapter; Jewish Voice for Peace—Albany, NY chapter; Jewish Voice for Peace—Albuquerque; Jewish Voice for Peace—Austin; Jewish Voice for Peace—Bay Area; Jewish Voice for Peace—Cleveland; Jewish Voice for Peace—DC Metro; Jewish Voice for Peace—Denver; Jewish Voice for Peace—Ithaca; Jewish Voice for Peace—Los Angeles; Jewish Voice for Peace—Madison; Jewish Voice for Peace—New Haven; Jewish Voice for Peace—Philadelphia; Jewish Voice for Peace—Pittsburgh; Jewish Voice for Peace—Portland; Jewish Voice for Peace—San Diego; Jewish Voice for Peace—South Florida; Jewish Voice for Peace—Syracuse, NY; Jewish Voice for Peace—Triangle NC; Jolt.

Justice for our Neighbors Houston; Justice for Our Neighbors Southeastern Michigan; Justice For Our Neighbors West Michigan; JVP—HV. Jewish Voice for Peace—Hudson Valley; Kentucky Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; Kids for College; Kino Border Initiative; Kitsap Immigrant Assistance Center; KIWA (Koreatown Immigrant Workers Alliance); Korean Resource Center; La Casa de Amistad; La Coalición de Derechos Humanos; La Comunidad, Inc.; La Raza Centro Legal; Lafayette Urban Ministry; Las Vegas Chapter of Jewish Voice for Peace; Latin American Legal Defense and Education Fund; Latino Racial Justice Circle; Latinx Alliance of Lane County; Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County.

Legal Services for Children; Lemkin House inc.; Long Island Wins; Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition; Massachusetts Law Reform Institute; Middle East Crisis Response (MECR); Migrant and Immigrant Community Action Project; Migrant Justice/Justicia Migrante; MinKwon Center for Community Action; Mission Asset Fund; Mississippi Immigrants Rights Alliance (MIRA); Mosaic Family Services; Movement of Immigrant Leaders in Pennsylvania (MILPA); Mujeres Unidas y Activas; Mundo Maya Foundation; National Lawyers Guild—Los Angeles Chapter; New Jersey Alliance for Immigrant Justice; New Mexico Dream Team; New Mexico Immigrant Law Center; New Mexico Voices for Children.

New Sanctuary Movement of Philadelphia; New York Immigration Coalition; NH Conference United Church of Christ Immigration Working Group; North Carolina Council of Churches; North County Immigration Task Force; North Jersey chapter of Jewish Voice for Peace; Northern Illinois Justice for Our Neighbors; Northern Manhattan Coalition for Immigrant Rights; Northwest Immigrant Rights Project (NWIRP); OCCORD; Occupy Bergen County (New Jersey); OneAmerica; OneJustice; Oregon Interfaith Movement for Immigrant Justice—IMIRJ; Organized Communities Against Deportations; OutFront Minnesota; Pangea Legal Services; PASO—West Suburban Action Project; Pax Christi Florida; Pennsylvania Immigration and Citizenship Coalition.

Pilgrim United Church of Christ; Pilipino Workers Center; Polonians Organized to Minister to Our Community, Inc. (POMOC); Portland Central America Solidarity Committee; Progreso: Latino Progress; Progressive Jewish Voice of Central PA; Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada; Project Hope-Proyecto Esperanza; Project IRENE; Puget Sound Advocates for Retirement Action (PSARA); Racial Justice Action Center; Reformed Church of Highland Park; Refugees Helping Refugees; Refugio del Rio Grande; Resilience Orange County; Rocky Mountain Immigrant Advocacy Network (RMIAN); Rural and Migrant Ministry; Safe Passage; San Francisco CASA (Court Appointed Special Advocates); Services, Immigrant Rights, and Education Network (SIREN).

Sickle Cell Disease Association of America, Philadelphia/ Delaware Valley Chapter; Sisters of St. Francis, St. Francis Province; Sisters of St. Joseph of Rochester, Inc.; Skagit Immigrant Rights Council; Social Justice Collaborative; South Asian Fund For Education, Scholarship And Training (SAFEST); South Bay Jewish Voice for Peace; South Texas Immigration Council; Southeast Immigrant Rights Network; St John of God Church; Students United for Nonviolence; Tacoma Community House; Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition; Teresa Messer, Law Office of Teresa Messer; Thai Community Development Center; The Garden, Lutheran Ministry; The International Institute of Metropolitan Detroit; The Legal Project; Tompkins County Immigrant Rights Coalition; Transgender Resource Center of New Mexico.

Trinity Episcopal Church; U-Lead Athens; Unitarian Universalist Mass Action Network; Unitarian Universalist PA Legislative Advocacy Network (UUPLAN); United African Organization; United Families; University Leadership Initiative; University of San Francisco Immigration and Deportation Defense Clinic; UNO Immigration Ministry; UPLIFT; UpValley Family Centers; VietLead; Vital Immigrant Defense Advocacy & Services, Santa Rosa, CA; Volunteers of Legal Service; Washtenaw Interfaith Coalition for Immigrant Rights; Watertown Citizens for Peace, Justice, and the Environment; Wayne Action for Racial Equality; WeCount!; WESPAC Foundation; Wilco Justice Alliance (Williamson County, TX).

Women Watch Afrika, Inc.; Worksafe; Young Immigrants in Action; YWCA Alaska; YWCA Alliance; YWCA Berkeley/Oakland; YWCA Brooklyn; YWCA Clark County; YWCA Elgin; YWCA Greater Austin; YWCA Greater Pittsburgh; YWCA Greater Portland; YWCA Madison; YWCA Minneapolis; YWCA Mount Desert Island; YWCA NE KANSAS; YWCA of Metropolitan Detroit; YWCA of the University of Illinois; YWCA Olympia; YWCA Pasadena-Foothill Valley; YWCA Rochester & Monroe County; YWCA Southeastern Massachusetts; YWCA Southern Arizona; YWCA Tulsa; YWCA Warren; YWCA Westmoreland County.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 414, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. DEMINGS. I am opposed in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Demings moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3003 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 6, insert after line 5 the following:

“(7) PUBLIC SAFETY EXCEPTION.—For purposes of this subsection, a State, or a political subdivision of a State, shall not be found to be out of compliance with subsection (a) or (b) if the State or political subdivision of the State certifies to the Attorney General that such compliance would endanger public safety.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today not just as a Member of Congress, but as a 27-year veteran of law enforcement and as a former police chief. As such, I am compelled to warn of the harm this bill, in its current form, will cause for our law enforcement agencies.

As a police chief, it was my responsibility to reduce crime and maintain livable neighborhoods; neighborhoods where families can live in peace, and enjoy local parks, community centers, restaurants, and shopping; neighborhoods where children can walk to school and play in their front yard and backyard without fear.

That is the kind of community that everyone in America deserves—one where they feel safe and secure.

H.R. 3003 impedes on law enforcement's ability to effectively do its job. It will create an environment that will erode the trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve.

The local police are the first ones to respond. They are the thin blue line that stands between those who are in this country, who are trying to live in peace, and those that would do them harm. We want our neighbors—immigrants—to call the police to report crimes without fear or hesitation. When they do not, Mr. Speaker, our community is at the mercy of the criminals.

This does not make our communities more safe, yet that is what is at stake with the bill before us. Supporters of the bill claim that it has an exemption for victims and witnesses, but it is not a complete exemption.

Law enforcement officers investigate and interview witnesses. Their goal is to solve crimes, regardless of the immigration status of victims and witnesses, including victims of sexual assault and domestic violence.

I filed an amendment with the Rules Committee that would have exempted victims and witnesses from all of the bill's intrusive requirements. The Rules Committee blocked me from offering that amendment, but the bill, in its current form, would undermine law enforcement's ability to do its job, therefore, making our communities less safe.

Mr. Speaker, don't just take my word for it. The National Fraternal Order of Police stands against the bill. They represent over 330,000 law enforcement officers across the Nation. These officers are not responsible for creating laws, and eliminating Federal grant funding for political reasons impedes their ability to solve crimes.

As the FOP writes:

Withholding assistance to law enforcement agencies, which have no policymaking rule, will hurt public safety efforts.

No one knows our communities better than the law enforcement officials sworn to protect their communities, which is why I have offered this motion which would exempt from the mandates and penalties in the bill those jurisdictions in which local law enforcement officials conclude that the mandates in this bill would endanger public safety.

Politics should never impede public safety. The President has said that, when lawmakers vote on this bill, they should put America's safety first.

I strongly agree, and I urge my colleagues to support this motion and put our public safety first.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman is quite correct: everyone deserves to feel safe.

Kate Steinle deserved to feel safe when she was walking down the pier with her father in San Francisco, when she was killed.

Not enacting this legislation endangers public safety, not the opposite, as those on the other side have argued.

How would you trust local government officials, who have instructed their law enforcement officers to not cooperate with Federal law enforcement officers to take dangerous criminals off of our streets, when this motion to recommit would say: “Oh, they will have to certify that such compliance would endanger public safety and then the law wouldn't apply?”

It is circular reasoning.

The nonenforcement of immigration laws has led to the bolstering of sanctuary jurisdiction policies in communities throughout the United States. These policies hamper the enforcement of Federal law and do nothing to truly promote trust between law enforcement and U.S. citizens.

This bill provides a commonsense approach to fixing the damage caused by sanctuary policies without mandating any affirmative duty. In order to be in compliance with section 1373 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended in this bill, States and localities have no affirmative duties to act. They have no obligations to cooperate or communicate, or even engage with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement at any level.

□ 1530

Instead, they simply may not affirmatively restrict a government entity, including law enforcement, from cooperating or communicating with ICE.

So I am shocked that so many on the other side of the aisle view compliance with this provision as a condition for eligibility for certain grant programs as outlandish. This is not a novel concept. And compliance with section 1373 is already a condition of eligibility for these grant programs.

As for detainees, H.R. 3003 creates the probable cause standard that so many have argued was lacking for so long. Once enacted, States and localities can look to Federal law to receive clarification on what probable cause standard is employed before a detainer request is placed.

To further aid jurisdictions, the threat of expensive and time-consuming frivolous litigation is abated by providing immunity for jurisdictions that exercise good faith in honoring a detainer.

Finally, this bill ensures that dangerous criminal aliens convicted of drunk driving or not yet convicted of very serious crimes are prevented from freely walking the streets of our communities during their removal hearings. This bill is a strong first step in ensuring that our immigration laws are enforced.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this motion to recommit, to vote for the base bill, and to send a message that sanctuary policies will not be tolerated so that the rule of law will prevail.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mrs. DEMINGS. 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.

KATE'S LAW

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 415, I call up the bill (H.R. 3004) to amend section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to reentry of removed aliens, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 415, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3004

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 "Kate's Law".

SEC. 2. ILLEGAL REENTRY.

Section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1326) is amended to read as follows:

"REENTRY OF REMOVED ALIEN

"SEC. 276. (a) REENTRY AFTER REMOVAL.—Any alien who has been denied admission, excluded, deported, or removed, or who has departed the United States while an order of exclusion, deportation, or removal is outstanding, and subsequently enters, attempts to enter, crosses the border to, attempts to cross the border to, or is at any time found in the United States, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

"(b) REENTRY OF CRIMINAL OFFENDERS.—Notwithstanding the penalty provided in subsection (a), if an alien described in that subsection was convicted before such removal or departure—

"(1) for 3 or more misdemeanors or for a felony, the alien shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both;

"(2) for a felony for which the alien was sentenced to a term of imprisonment of not less than 30 months, the alien shall be fined under such title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both;

"(3) for a felony for which the alien was sentenced to a term of imprisonment of not less than 60 months, the alien shall be fined under such title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both; or

"(4) for murder, rape, kidnapping, or a felony offense described in chapter 77 (relating to peonage and slavery) or 113B (relating to terrorism) of such title, or for 3 or more felonies of any kind, the alien shall be fined under such title, imprisoned not more than 25 years, or both.

"(c) REENTRY AFTER REPEATED REMOVAL.—Any alien who has been denied admission, excluded, deported, or removed 3 or more times and thereafter enters, attempts to enter, crosses the border to, attempts to cross the border to, or is at any time found in the United States, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

"(d) PROOF OF PRIOR CONVICTIONS.—The prior convictions described in subsection (b) are elements of the crimes described, and the penalties in that subsection shall apply only in cases in which the conviction or convictions that form the basis for the additional penalty are—

"(1) alleged in the indictment or information; and

"(2) proven beyond a reasonable doubt at trial or admitted by the defendant.

"(e) AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES.—It shall be an affirmative defense to a violation of this section that—

"(1) prior to the alleged violation, the alien had sought and received the express consent of the Secretary of Homeland Security to reapply for admission into the United States; or

"(2) with respect to an alien previously denied admission and removed, the alien—

"(A) was not required to obtain such advance consent under the Immigration and Nationality Act or any prior Act; and

"(B) had complied with all other laws and regulations governing the alien's admission into the United States.

"(f) LIMITATION ON COLLATERAL ATTACK ON UNDERLYING REMOVAL ORDER.—In a criminal proceeding under this section, an alien may not challenge the validity of any prior removal order concerning the alien.

"(g) REENTRY OF ALIEN REMOVED PRIOR TO COMPLETION OF TERM OF IMPRISONMENT.—Any alien removed pursuant to section 241(a)(4) who enters, attempts to enter, crosses the border to, attempts to cross the border to, or is at any time found in, the United States shall be incarcerated for the remainder of the sentence of imprisonment which was pending at the time of deportation without any reduction for parole or supervised release unless the alien affirmatively demonstrates that the Secretary of Homeland Security has expressly consented to the alien's reentry. Such alien shall be subject to such other penalties relating to the reentry of removed aliens as may be available under this section or any other provision of law.

"(h) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section and section 275, the following definitions shall apply:

"(1) CROSSES THE BORDER TO THE UNITED STATES.—The term 'crosses the border' refers to the physical act of crossing the border, regardless of whether the alien is free from official restraint.

"(2) FELONY.—The term 'felony' means any criminal offense punishable by a term of imprisonment of more than 1 year under the laws of the United States, any State, or a foreign government.

"(3) MISDEMEANOR.—The term 'misdemeanor' means any criminal offense punishable by a term of imprisonment of not more than 1 year under the applicable laws of the United States, any State, or a foreign government.

"(4) REMOVAL.—The term 'removal' includes any denial of admission, exclusion, deportation, or removal, or any agreement by which an alien stipulates or agrees to exclusion, deportation, or removal.

"(5) STATE.—The term 'State' means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, and any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material on H.R. 3004.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, for too long, illegal reentry of criminal aliens has been viewed as a minor felony with only a fraction of those repeat offenders ever seeing the inside of a Federal courtroom. Section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act provides Federal prosecutors with the tools necessary to truly deter criminal aliens from reentering the United States.

Unfortunately, the section simply does not go far enough to act as a deterrent. Criminal aliens view the risk as worth the reward, as most charged under this section of law are given minuscule sentences that belie the severity of the crime.

Aliens who reenter the United States after being removed, demonstrate a flagrant disregard for our immigration laws and pose a tremendous threat to public safety and national security in every community nationwide.

This Congress has heard from countless victims and family members of victims whose lives were forever changed or completely destroyed by criminal aliens preying on our citizens.

This bill is named in memory and in honor of Kate Steinle. On July 1, 2015, Ms. Steinle was enjoying an evening at a popular attraction in San Francisco with her father. As three shots were fired, Ms. Steinle collapsed screaming. Her father, Jim, performed CPR until paramedics arrived, but she ultimately succumbed to the severe damage caused by the bullet and she died hours later.

Her murderer was arrested an hour later and identified as a middle-aged criminal alien who had been removed from the United States and had returned at least five times. The gun used had been stolen from a Federal officer with the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. Speaker, these horrific events must be better deterred and prevented. No legislation can prevent every tragic situation, but this Congress has a duty to take every action possible to mitigate this harm and danger.

It is in this vein that I am proud to bring Kate's Law to the House floor today. This bill seeks to amend and greatly improve section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act by enhancing the maximum sentences for criminal aliens who seek to reenter the United States.

While an alien reentering this country is subject to a sentence of up to 2 years, current law only subjects certain criminals to enhance penalties. Specifically, only criminal aliens previously convicted of an aggravated felony, as defined in our immigration laws, controlled substance violations, crimes against other persons, or certain felonies would trigger an enhanced sentence of either 10 or 20 years.

Kate's Law closes the loophole into which so many criminal aliens fall. The bill provides that a criminal alien, pre-

viously convicted of any three misdemeanors or any felony, would, upon conviction for illegal reentry, be subject to a maximum sentence of 10 years.

Aliens previously convicted of a crime for which they were sentenced to at least 30 months, would, upon conviction for illegal reentry, be subject to a maximum sentence of 15 years.

Aliens previously convicted of a crime for which they were sentenced to at least 60 months, would, upon conviction for illegal reentry, be subject to a maximum sentence of 20 years.

Aliens previously convicted for murder, rape, kidnapping, a peonage offense, or any three felonies, would, under conviction for illegal reentry, be subject to a maximum sentence of 25 years.

These are significant enhancements to our immigration laws and are long overdue. I would be remiss, however, if I failed to mention a caveat added to the bill. If enacted, Kate's Law adds affirmative defenses for aliens charged under this section. If an alien can prove that they had the express consent of the Secretary of Homeland Security to reapply for admission, or that an alien previously denied admission and removed was not required to obtain such consent, then the alien may present that as an affirmative defense to the illegal reentry crime.

This safeguard will ensure that only aliens who illegally reenter the United States may be convicted and sentenced to enhanced penalties under this section.

This is missing from the current statute, and I am sure my colleagues on both side of the aisle would agree that due process protections such as these add to the efficacy of such a measure.

Nothing that this Congress can pass will ever bring Kate Steinle back, nor take away the pain suffered by her family, and countless other victims of crimes committed by criminal aliens. Kate's Law, however, will offer a deterrent against future criminal aliens who seek to illegally reenter the United States. Knowing they may face up to 2 years in Federal prison is one thing, but the possibility of a sentence of 10, 15, 20, or 25 years will have the desired effect.

I agree with many of my colleagues on both side of the aisle that we must take many other steps to address our immigration system. This Congress must pass strong measures to ensure that immigration enforcement in the interior of the United States remains a priority. Kate's Law is an essential component of that larger effort to bring about true enforcement of our immigration laws, and protect this Nation from criminal aliens.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3004 is an anti-immigrant enforcement-only proposal

that represents yet another step in President Trump's mass deportation plan.

This legislation significantly expands the Federal Government's ability to prosecute individuals for illegal entry and attempted reentry into the United States.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say this bill is about protecting us from criminals. But don't be fooled about the ultimate effect of this bill. It does far more than target immigrants with criminal histories.

For the first time, this legislation would make it a felony for an individual who has been previously removed or merely denied admission to come to an official port of entry to ask for reentry into the country legally. This is true even if the individual has no criminal history whatsoever.

For instance, the expanded offense would apply to persecuted asylum seekers voluntarily presenting themselves at a port of entry to request asylum under our own immigration laws.

It would reach desperate victims of sex trafficking who approach the Customs and Border Protection officer to seek protection.

It would even extend to persons asking to enter on humanitarian parole to donate lifesaving organs to United States citizen relatives.

Under H.R. 3004, all of these individuals could face up to 2 years in prison simply for coming to an official port of entry to request immigration benefits provided under our immigration laws.

Finally, this bill perpetuates the fiction that immigrants are somehow inherently criminal. Nothing could be further from the truth. Numerous studies examining this issue conclude that immigrants actually commit crimes at a significantly lower rate than native-born Americans.

Given this legislation's defects, it comes to us as no surprise that organizations across the Nation join with me in opposition. They include:

The conservative Cato Institute, which called H.R. 3004, "a waste of Federal resources" that fails to safeguard "Americans against serious criminals."

Cities For Action, representing over 150 mayors and municipal leaders, warned the bill would place asylum seekers at further risk.

And the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence, which described how this measure, H.R. 3004, will punish victims of domestic and sexual violence merely for requesting protection.

H.R. 3004 is not what its sponsors would like us to believe. In truth, it is a mean-spirited bill that would have far-reaching consequences by making it a crime to ask for benefits that our immigration laws provide.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this dangerous legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from

Iowa (Mr. KING), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and for working this legislation through and facilitating that it comes to the floor this week.

This week, the event of “Hold Their Feet to the Fire” is being held where many of the families of those who have been killed by illegal aliens are here to contribute. They went to the White House, and the message has been sent across the country. They have gone and done radio shows, and they have been part of this for a long time.

I think of how far back this goes, Kate Steinle’s law. From my perspective, she was murdered on the streets of San Francisco on July 1, 2015. I hit the news, I think, the next day. I sent out a tweet on July 3 that said it was a 100 percent preventable crime. Just enforce the law. This story will make you cry, too. And it happens every day.

What we are trying to accomplish with Kate’s Law is sentencing that is enhanced for those who overstay or those who have been deported from the United States and come back into the United States.

I want to compliment former Congressman Matt Salmon from Arizona, who, after her death on July 1, introduced legislation only 8 days later, which was the foundation for what we are talking about here with this bill. That was H.R. 3011, introduced on July 9, 2015.

□ 1545

Matt is retired. I picked up that legislation in the first days of this year, and we have cooperated in this Judiciary Committee to get this here to this time.

But, also, Bill O’Reilly, who made this a national issue, it hit my heart as soon as I saw the story. It hit the hearts of America when it went out over television, and it is too bad that we can’t look at data and come here and fix a massive problem that we have.

It is too bad it has to be focused on individuals and personalities, when there are many other families out there that have suffered equally with that of the Steinle family and the other families we have talked about here today.

Nonetheless, if that is what it takes to get America to move, we are here now. We are here this week. We have the right legislation in front of us. I urge its adoption.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), our senior Representative on the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. The bill is part of a larger mass deportation bill marked up by the House Judiciary Committee earlier this month. I think the message it is intended to convey is that this bill is needed to keep us safe.

We have heard the sad story of the murder of Kate Steinle, which was not news to any of us in northern California. That was a horrible murder, and the fact is, this bill would not have prevented that murder. The offender had been deported multiple times. He had served 16 years in Federal prison, so the idea that the 10-year enhancement would have somehow fixed this is just misplaced.

When we talk about the bill, it is as if we don’t have harsh penalties now for misbehavior in the law. If you take a look at the enhancements, it expands criminal sentences for individuals who reenter the country after removal. We already have very strong penalties against that.

To say that this bill will keep us safe because, for example, we have a 20-year—under current law, a 20-year sentence for a conviction for an aggravated felony, this would raise it to 25; I don’t think that is going to fix this problem. If it were only that, we could have a discussion which, unfortunately, we never did on a bipartisan basis.

The bill does other things that are very damaging. It actually makes it a felony, punishable by up to 2 years, to attempt to reenter the country legally, in full compliance with our immigration laws; and this is true for individuals who have no criminal background whatsoever.

Now, the sponsors of the bill may argue that is necessary, but I have seen no rationale for why that would make any sense, nor why it would certainly not have prevented the tragic murder of Kate Steinle.

Now, let’s give some examples of who that could apply to. You have individuals who have lived here, we have met them, DREAMers, people who have been here all their lives, brought over as children, who were removed. If that person who has been removed becomes a victim of sex trafficking, the process is this: They can come and seek asylum. They can flee from their traffickers. And if they present themselves to our port of entry today, they are not trying to evade detection. No, they are trying to be found. They are turning themselves in, saying: I am fleeing from the sex traffickers; I want to make a claim for asylum; I need to be kept safe from the sex traffickers. This bill would make that act a felony.

Now, the chairman has said how wonderful it is that we have created an affirmative defense in the act. What he has neglected to mention is that right now we don’t need an affirmative defense because it is not a crime to go to the port of entry and seek a benefit, either humanitarian parole for a purpose that is sometimes granted to travel if a member of your family is dying, to provide an organ donation to a member, an American citizen, who is in the U.S. who is dying. That is not a crime today, and you don’t need an affirmative defense because it is not a crime.

Now, I think the fact that it eliminates an important constitutional pro-

vision is problematic. We all know we can’t change the Constitution by statute. The case of U.S. v. Mendoza-Lopez basically says this: If you are going to prosecute somebody for entry after removal, which happens all the time—in fact, that is the single most prevalent Federal prosecution in the system today; that is number one—you have to—and you did not have an opportunity to actually contest the first removal because, for example, you were never notified at a hearing—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. LOFGREN. Since that is an element of the offense, the Mendoza case says you have to be able to at least collaterally attack that because you never had a chance to do so initially. This eliminates that constitutional case. You can’t do that by statute.

So the point I am making is that the majority of those who enter the United States without inspection are coming back to try and get next to their families, their U.S. citizen kids, their U.S. citizen spouses. They are not criminals. They are not creating any kind of crime.

We all oppose crime, but this remedy is unrelated to the horror stories that we have heard.

You know, we are creating law here, not bumper stickers. I hope that we will vote against this misplaced law and work together to solve the real problems that we face.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a member of the Judiciary Committee and chairman of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I especially want to thank him for his leadership on this.

Nearly 2 years ago, Kate Steinle, a young woman with a promising future, had her life tragically taken away from her when she was brutally murdered by an undocumented criminal who had been convicted of a series of felonies and had been deported five times; five times, and then he kept coming back, and then he finally killed this innocent young woman, Kate Steinle.

Sadly, this tragic event barely registered with the previous administration and other supporters of dangerous sanctuary city policies. During a July 2015 hearing, shortly after Kate’s murder, I asked President Obama’s Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson whether the White House had reached out to the Steinle family.

I will never forget what the Secretary said to me. He responded: Who? He had no idea who Kate Steinle or her family were. I had to explain to him what had happened to Kate Steinle. It was embarrassing.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, I have heard countless stories from families who, like the Steinles, have fallen victim to heinous crimes because of the failure

to enforce our Nation's immigration laws. We can and must do better to protect all the Kate Steinles all across America from being victimized by undocumented criminals who should never have been here in the first place.

I really can't emphasize enough how important this issue is, and H.R. 3004 will help address this problem finally and enhance public safety by toughening the penalties for criminal aliens who have been deported from our country, but then keep returning to the United States, and, again, far too many of them who commit crimes against innocent Americans like Kate Steinle.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. This draconian legislation would dramatically expand the penalties for illegal reentry into the United States, even for people who have committed minor and nonviolent offenses.

Although most people who illegally reenter the country do so to reunite with their families or to flee violence or persecution, this bill considers them all dangerous criminals who deserve lengthy prison sentences.

This bill is nothing less than fearmongering, based on the widely debunked myth that immigrants commit crimes at a higher rate than native-born Americans when, in fact, we know it is just the opposite.

Let me tell you about one of these supposed dangerous criminals who was mercifully released from ICE custody just yesterday, after 4 months in detention.

In 1986, 17-year-old Carlos Cardona illegally entered the United States, having fled threats of violence in his native Colombia. At age 21, he made a foolish mistake and committed a non-violent drug offense. He served 45 days in prison, and, ever since then, for the last 27 years, he has lived a crime-free and a productive life as an active member of his community in Queens, New York.

Not only that, after the September 11 attacks on this country, he volunteered as a recovery worker at Ground Zero. Like so many other workers there, due to his sacrifice, he developed acute respiratory issues from the toxic fumes and other illnesses that have put his life in jeopardy.

Unfortunately, although he is married to an American citizen, he was unable to adjust his immigration status because of his decades-old conviction. However, he was allowed to stay in the country in recognition of his services after 9/11, as long as he checked in periodically with immigration authorities, which he did.

But shortly after President Trump took office, Mr. Cardona was detained after appearing for a routine appointment with ICE, and he was placed in deportation proceedings and in custody. It was only thanks to a major

public campaign and the compassion of Governor Cuomo, who pardoned his almost 30-year-old drug conviction, that he was released.

Under this legislation, had Mr. Cardona been deported and then illegally reentered the country to see his wife and daughter, he would face up to 10 years in prison because of his decades-old prior conviction. Even if he presented himself to border agents and sought asylum, on the reasonable basis that he had reasonable fears because, in fact, two of his brothers back in Colombia have been murdered, he would still be subject to prosecution and massive penalties, just for appearing at the border.

This is both callous and irrational. This bill would dramatically expand the mass incarceration of immigrants, even for those with minor offenses and those who simply seek refuge in our country.

It serves no purpose, increases no one's safety, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this cruel legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to quote from a letter from the Sergeants Benevolent Association that we received 2 days ago in support of Kate's Law, and I want to read a sentence from it.

"In recent years, the need to protect our citizens from those aliens who enter the United States illegally, commit crimes here, are deported, and who illegally return to the U.S. and commit additional crimes has become a top concern of the law enforcement community."

This is from the Sergeants Benevolent Association, Police Department, City of New York. I include it in the RECORD.

SERGEANTS BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION,
POLICE DEPARTMENT, CITY
OF NEW YORK,

New York, NY, June 27, 2017.

HON. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am writing on behalf of the more than 13,000 members of the Sergeants Benevolent Association of the New York City Police Department to advise you of our strong support for H.R. 3004, "Kate's Law," that will be considered by the House of Representatives later this week. We are grateful that the Congress is moving expeditiously to take up this important legislation.

In recent years, the need to protect our citizens from those aliens who enter the United States illegally, commit crimes here, are deported, and who illegally return to the U.S. and commit additional crimes has become a top concern of the law enforcement community. It is a problem that was exemplified in the horrific murder of the young woman in whose honor H.R. 3004 is named, Kate Steinle. In 2015, Ms. Steinle was shot and killed on a San Francisco pier while out for a walk with her father. Her murderer was a career criminal who had already been deported five previous times, had a long criminal history, had served multiple prison sentences, and was on probation in Texas at the time of the shooting. Nearly two years has passed since Steinle's murder, and little has been done to address the scourge of violence perpetrated by those who break our laws and continue to illegally reenter the United

States. That is why prompt congressional action on "Kate's Law" is so critically important.

H.R. 3004 will ensure that those deported aliens with criminal histories who decide to illegally reenter the U.S. will face stiff prison sentences upon their return. First, the bill provides for monetary fines and between 10 and 25 years in prison for those aliens deported or removed who illegally return, depending on the severity of their prior crimes. In addition, this legislation provides for up to 10 years in prison for any alien who has been refused entry, deported, or removed from the U.S. three times or more, but who returns or attempts to reenter the U.S.

Finally, for any criminal aliens who were removed from the U.S. prior to the completion of a prison term and who then attempt to reenter, H.R. 3004 requires that such individuals be incarcerated for the remainder of their sentenced prison term without any possibility for parole or supervised release. The passage of "Kate's Law" is critical to ensuring that deported aliens with criminal records are deterred from illegally reentering the U.S., and will help law enforcement protect our communities from violent criminals and suspected terrorists who are illegally present in the U.S.

On behalf of the membership of the Sergeants Benevolent Association, thank you again for your efforts on this and other issues important to law enforcement across the nation.

Sincerely,

ED MULLINS,
President.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA).

□ 1600

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today in support of Kate's Law and No Sanctuary for Criminals Act. These important bills represent an important step towards keeping Americans safe.

Yesterday, I participated in a roundtable discussion at the White House with the President and family members of individuals who were murdered by criminal illegal immigrants.

The stories I heard were heart-breaking. Sadly, they are not uncommon. See, when I was mayor of Hazleton, I sat with the victims' families and listened to their stories. These stories have changed my life.

Everyone talks about the illegal immigrant, but very seldom do we ever talk about the victims. I sat with the family of Derek Kichline, a 29-year-old Hazleton city man and father of three young children who was murdered by the head of the Latin Kings while working on his pickup truck in his driveway.

Derek's killer was arrested and let go in New York City, a sanctuary city.

I also talked with the father of Carly Snyder, a beautiful 21-year-old girl who was studying to be a veterinarian. Her father told me that Carly was brutally stabbed 37 times and murdered by her next door neighbor. She had knife wounds on the palms of her hand and knife wounds in her back as she died on the kitchen floor.

An illegal immigration and Federal fugitive with a long history of gang violence and drug use killed Carly.

Carly's killer was apprehended trying to cross the southern border but was released on \$5,000 bond and disappeared into the United States until one day he showed up at Carly Snyder's doorstep.

I have never forgotten these stories. I understand that there is nothing that we can do to bring these people back. I know there is nothing we can do to relieve the pain that their families still feel.

But by passing these bills, we can prevent these crimes from happening to other families. Let me be clear: violent crimes committed by illegal immigrants are preventable. The illegal immigrant who committed these violent crimes should not have been present in this country and certainly should not have been walking around free. Too many mayors and local governments think that they are above Federal law, and we have a chance to change that today.

We can send a clear message to the American people that their government is serious about keeping them safe. I thank the President today for standing up for the victims of these preventable crimes, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same by voting "yes" on these important bills.

This is a test of the willingness of Congress to stand for families across this country who have lost loved ones to crimes committed by criminals who had no business being in this country in the first place. It is time that we side with the victims like Derek Kichline, Carly Snyder, and Kate Steinle instead of criminals.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak about H.R. 3004, but let me first talk about two of my constituents, Officer Jose Vargas, one of the most decorated police officers in the State of California, and the other, Jose Angel Garibay, a young marine that made the ultimate sacrifice for America.

In 1977, Jose Vargas was named as 1 of the 10 most outstanding police officers in America by the International Association of Chiefs of Police. But it wasn't always that way. At age 16, Jose Vargas headed north to the border for a better life.

Officer Vargas crossed the border 15 times over 4 years. Officer Vargas was probably the only police officer who we know that spent time in a Federal holding cell. America today is better because of Jose Vargas. Jose Vargas added to the greatness of this country and to the security of this country.

Jose Angel Garibay, a young marine, was the first soldier from Orange County, California, to make the ultimate sacrifice in the Middle East. He also came to this country undocumented and became a U.S. citizen posthumously.

Mr. Speaker, yes, we must keep out the bad hombres. We don't welcome those who would do us harm, but America must continue to welcome those

who come to America to work hard and to contribute. This bill fails to make this critical and important distinction.

At the end of the day, we are all immigrants and we are all part of this great country, and I urge my colleagues today: do not brand millions of immigrants as criminals when their only crime is searching for the American Dream.

I urge Members to vote "no" on H.R. 3004.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and members of the House Judiciary Committee for their work on this issue. And as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, the issues being debated and voted on this week are an area of critical importance when it comes to keeping our Nation and our people safe.

Mr. Speaker, we are a nation of immigrants. I am the grandson of Irish immigrants. We are also a nation of laws. Both must be respected and honored by all of us. Left, right, or center, we can all agree that our immigration system is broken, and given that broken status, it is the responsibility of this body to fix it. This goal cannot be achieved by selectively choosing which laws we enforce and which laws we ignore.

As a former FBI agent, I worked each day to keep Americans and keep our Nation safe. And as a Federal prosecutor, I prosecuted cases that resulted in the removal of violent felons who were in our country illegally in order to keep our communities safe.

I have seen firsthand the threats our Nation faces from a fragmented and broken immigration system and a porous border. We cannot and must not allow partisanship to prevent sensible fixes from being implemented. Our Nation's security depends on us.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today is one borne of a preventable tragedy. Kate Steinle was a bright, aspiring, 32-year-old woman with a life of possibilities ahead of her. Let this bill be her legacy. Let this bill result in Kate Steinle saving the lives of others. Let us do her that honor.

Kate's Law will increase penalties for those who reenter our country following their removal from the U.S., including Federal prison sentences up to 25 years for those previously deported who have criminal records.

Moreover, this bill supports our brave women and men in law enforcement as they work to keep violent gangs and criminal cartels, including the likes of MS-13, out of our communities. I am a cosponsor of this legislation, and I am proud to advance it.

Mr. Speaker, the time is now for us to step up and protect those who elected us to serve on their behalf, and I urge all of my colleagues to make a bold bipartisan statement to our communities back home today. Join me in support of H.R. 3004. Let's get this done for Kate Steinle and her family.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of opposition to H.R. 3004, namely, the Federal Defenders of New York and 407 local, State, national immigrant civil rights, faith, and labor organizations.

FEDERAL DEFENDERS
OF NEW YORK, INC.
New York, NY, June 29, 2017.

Re H.R. 3004, Kate's Law

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, DC.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chair, House Judiciary Committee, Washington,
DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, JR.,
Ranking Member, House Judiciary Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. RYAN, MS. PELOSI, MR. GOOD-
LATTE, AND MR. CONYERS: We write on behalf
of the Federal Public and Community Def-
enders in response to inquiries for our views
on H.R. 3004. We oppose the bill for the fol-
lowing reasons.

H.R. 3004 would make it a crime to openly
and directly present oneself to immigration
officials seeking asylum, temporary protec-
tion, or for other innocent reasons. In doing
so, the bill would incentivize people with
genuine claims of fear to enter the country
surreptitiously.

Even while criminalizing essentially inno-
cent conduct and drastically increasing po-
tential penalties, the bill would purport to
deprive defendants of the right to challenge
the validity of fundamentally unfair or un-
lawful removal orders.

The bill would transform a basic element
of the criminal offense into an affirmative
defense and would thereby unfairly place the
burden on the alien to produce records in the
government's control.

The bill would unjustifiably increase po-
tential penalties, including for those with
truly petty criminal records, and create a
significant risk that defendants, in mass
guilty plea proceedings on the border as
occur now, would be pressured to admit prior
convictions that they do not have.

Finally, H.R. 3004 raises serious federalism
issues and would impinge on States' sov-
ereign interests by ordering them to impose
certain state prison sentences thereby im-
peding States' ability to manage their own
criminal justice systems and prison popu-
lations.

The bill would harm individuals, families
and communities not just on the border but
across the nation. Nearly 21 percent of re-
entry prosecutions in fiscal year 2016 were in
districts other than those on the southwest
border, in every state and district in the
country. And though there may be a percep-
tion that illegal reentry offenders are dan-
gerous criminals, the motive for most people
returning to the United States after being
removed is to reunite with family, return to
the only place they know as home, seek
work to support their families, or flee vio-
lence or persecution in their home countries.
Further, according to a recent Sentencing
Commission study, one quarter of reentry of-
fenders had no prior conviction described in
§1326(b), and the most common prior offense
was driving under the influence, followed by
minor non-violent misdemeanors and felo-
nies, illegal entry, illegal reentry, and sim-
ple possession of drugs. Nearly half (49.5%)
had children in the United States, and over
two thirds (67.1%) had relatives in this coun-
try. Over half (53.5%) were under the age of
18 when they first entered the United States,

and almost three quarters (74.5%) had worked here for more than a year at some point before their arrest. These are not hardened criminals.

I. THE BILL WOULD MAKE IT A CRIME TO OPENLY AND DIRECTLY PRESENT ONESELF TO IMMIGRATION OFFICIALS, SEEKING ASYLUM, TEMPORARY PROTECTION, OR FOR OTHER INNOCENT REASONS, AND WOULD THUS INCENTIVIZE SURREPTITIOUS ENTRY

The bill would add as criminal acts in violation of 8 U.S.C. §1326, “crosses the border” or “attempts to cross the border,” and would define “crosses the border” as the “physical act of crossing the border, regardless of whether the alien is free from official restraint.” This would mean that people previously denied admission or removed who present themselves at a designated port of entry seeking asylum or for other innocent reasons, and who intend to be and are in fact under official restraint, would for the first time be guilty of violating §1326.

Freedom from official restraint is an essential part of the definition of entering, attempting to enter, and being found in the United States under the law of most circuits. Entering has long required both “physical presence” in the country and “freedom from official restraint.” Attempting to enter requires proof of specific intent to commit the completed offense of entry, and so requires intent to enter “free of official restraint.” Similarly, an alien cannot be “found in” the United States unless he has been free from official restraint. An alien is under official restraint whenever he “lacks the freedom to go at large and mix with the population,” including when he directly and voluntarily surrenders himself to immigration officials at a port of entry to seek asylum, protection, or imprisonment.

Thus, an alien who walked directly across the border to a marked border patrol car and asked to be taken into custody did not attempt to re-enter the United States because he intended to be, and was, under official restraint. Likewise, an alien who crossed the border after being beaten by gang members in Mexico, in a delusional belief that they were chasing him, with the sole intent of placing himself in the protective custody of U.S. officials, could not be guilty of attempting to enter. In a similar case, the government dismissed the charges after the border patrol agent’s report confirmed that the defendant had crossed the border and asked the agent for protection from people he feared were trying to kill him. Similarly, an alien who went directly to the border station and presented himself for entry was not “found in” the United States because he was never free from official restraint.

Thus, under current law, an alien who directly and overtly presents herself to immigration officials at a port of entry, as opposed to evading official restraint, has not violated §1326; even one who crosses the border outside a port of entry but in sight of immigration officials, and who presents herself directly to such officials, has not done so. But absent the “freedom from official restraint” requirement, the law would “make criminals out of persons who, for any number of innocent reasons, approach immigration officials at the border.” *Argueta-Rosales*, 819 F.3d at 1160. “For example, [an alien] might approach a port of entry to seek asylum, or he might be under the mistaken assumption that he has been granted permission to reenter. Under those circumstances, the alien would not have committed the gravamen of the offense of attempted illegal entry in violation of §1326(a).” *United States v. Valdez-Novoa*, 780 F.3d 906, 923 (9th Cir. 2015) (Bybee, J.). Because “in a literal and physical sense a person coming from abroad

enters the United States whenever he reaches any land, water or air space within the territorial limits of this nation,” “freedom from official restraint must be added to physical presence.” *Vavilatos*, 209 F.2d at 197.

Permitting arrest and prosecution regardless of whether the person was free from official restraint is particularly troubling because although border patrol agents are required by law to refer an alien for a “credible fear” or “reasonable fear” interview with an asylum officer upon indication that she fears persecution or has suffered or may suffer torture, people are increasingly being turned away at the border without the required protection screening. Under H.R. 3004, agents would now be empowered to arrest them rather than turn them away.

By eliminating the “freedom from official restraint” requirement, the bill would cast aside well-settled century-old law from the civil immigration context that for nearly as long has functioned well in the criminal immigration context to distinguish illicit or clandestine entries from legitimate attempts to bring oneself to the attention of U.S. authorities at the border.

Since it would now be a crime to openly seek help, H.R. 3004 would have the perverse effect of incentivizing people with genuine claims of fear to “jump the fence” in the hope of not being caught and returned to a country where the danger is real. Faced with a choice between being killed or risking being caught and removed, the logical, life-sustaining choice is obvious.

II. THE BILL WOULD PERVERSELY CRIMINALIZE REPEATED UNSUCCESSFUL ATTEMPTS TO GAIN ASYLUM, EVEN AS BORDER PATROL AGENTS INCREASINGLY TURN AWAY ASYLUM SEEKERS IN VIOLATION OF LAW

The bill would create a new crime for an alien who has been denied admission, excluded, deported or removed three or more times who subsequently enters, attempts to enter, crosses the border, attempts to cross the border, or is found in the United States, subject to punishment for up to ten years. This would criminalize, for the first time, repeated efforts to seek asylum that are genuine but unsuccessful, as each attempt counts as a denial of admission or removal.

As noted above, border patrol agents are increasingly turning away asylum seekers without referring them for appropriate screening as required by law. Human rights organizations have documented at least 125 cases of asylum seekers being turned away without proper safeguards to protect their right to seek protection between November 2016 and April 2017, often repeatedly. For example, a Honduran family whose son was murdered by a gang after he was denied asylum, another Honduran family whose son showed the agent a bullet hole wound in his chest, and a Mexican woman whose father, son, grandfather and uncle were all killed within seven days, were repeatedly turned away without referral for protection screening or asylum adjudication. Agents informed people seeking refuge that the United States no longer gives asylum, threatened them with force, or threatened to call Mexican immigration authorities to deport them to the country they were fleeing.

A person who presents himself at a port of entry without a valid visa is subject to denial of admission or expedited removal. But if such a person expresses fear of return, he is entitled by law not to be expelled but to be interviewed by an asylum officer. When border patrol agents simply expel people who express fear without allowing them a chance to be interviewed and to press their claims, the agents are breaking the law and giving these people a removal order or a denial of

admission that they should not have. Thus, bona fide asylum-seekers—those most likely to accumulate “three strikes”—would face criminal prosecution rather than what they are entitled to—a non-adversarial interview with an asylum officer that could ultimately lead to persecution-based relief.

III. THE BILL WOULD PURPORT TO UNCONSTITUTIONALLY PROHIBIT CHALLENGES TO THE VALIDITY OF REMOVAL ORDERS

The bill would state that “an alien may not challenge the validity of any prior removal order concerning the alien.” This provision, perhaps more than any other, demonstrates the overreaching and unduly harsh nature of these proposed changes to existing law. The bill seeks to visit criminal convictions and drastic penalties on noncitizens who reenter even when the administrative process that led to their original deportation or removal was fundamentally unfair or achieved an unlawful result, and even when they were deprived of judicial review of that fundamental injustice. The Supreme Court long ago held, in *United States v. Mendoza-Lopez*, 481 U.S. 828 (1987), that a defendant cannot be convicted and punished under §1326 when the deportation order was issued in an agency proceeding bereft of due process that no court ever reviewed. But this bill seeks to do precisely that, and at the same time to criminalize attempts to enter the country legally and in most cases to increase the penalties that may be imposed.

IV. THE AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES WOULD BE UNAVAILABLE TO MOST, DO NOT ADDRESS ANY EXISTING PROBLEM, AND WOULD UNFAIRLY PLACE THE BURDEN ON DEFENDANTS TO PRODUCE RECORDS IN THE GOVERNMENT’S CONTROL

The bill would purport to create two affirmative defenses: (1) “prior to the alleged violation,” the alien “sought and received express consent of [DHS] to reapply for admission,” or (2) “with respect to an alien previously denied admission and removed,” the alien “was not required to obtain such advance consent under the [INA] or any prior Act,” and “had complied with all other laws and regulations governing his or her admission into the United States.” The first defense would be unavailable to anyone who did not have the wherewithal, resources and time to file the proper form and get it approved before arriving in the United States. The second defense is not available to anyone whose period of inadmissibility has not expired, usually ten years. These requirements are simply unrealistic for those with little or no education or money or who are fleeing violence.

Moreover, this is a solution in search of a problem, and it would undermine due process. Because the absence of most of these conditions is currently an element, see 8 U.S.C. §1326(a)(2), the government routinely provides the defense with the relevant records, which are in the individual’s “A file,” maintained in government custody and otherwise available to the individual only through a FOIA request. Placing the burden on the defendant to prove an affirmative defense would illogically and unfairly require him to produce records that are in the government’s control.

V. THE BILL WOULD UNJUSTIFIABLY INCREASE POTENTIAL PENALTIES, INCLUDING FOR THOSE WITH TRULY PETTY CRIMINAL RECORDS

While it appears that the statutory maximum would increase for most defendants under the bill, there is no evidence that any increase is needed to reflect the seriousness of these offenses, or that such increases would be effective in deterring illegal immigration. At the same time, the cost of additional incarceration would be steep—approximately

\$32,000 per prisoner per year. If each of the 16,000 persons convicted of illegal reentry in 2016 received one additional year, it would cost the taxpayers an extra half a billion dollars.

Increasing sentences for these offenders is also unnecessary and unfair because noncitizens suffer much harsher conditions of confinement than other federal prisoners. BOP contracts with private prison companies to detain noncitizens convicted of immigration offenses and other federal crimes. A recent analysis shows that many persons incarcerated in “immigrant only contract prisons” suffer serious medical neglect, in some cases leading to death. An investigation done by the American Civil Liberties Union found that “the men held in these private prisons are subjected to shocking abuse and mistreatment, and discriminated against by BOP policies that impede family contact and exclude them from rehabilitative programs.”

Two of the penalty increases are particularly unwarranted. The bill would increase a defendant’s statutory maximum from two to 10 years if he was removed subsequent to conviction of any three misdemeanors, whereas the 10-year maximum currently applies only if the three misdemeanors involved drugs, crimes against the person, or both. This would apply to a re-entrant with a truly petty criminal record. If the defendant had three misdemeanor convictions for driving without a license, a common scenario for undocumented immigrants and other impoverished people, his maximum sentence would more than triple. And because the bill does not require that the three misdemeanors stem from three separate occasions, a 10-year statutory maximum would apply to a re-entrant with convictions from a single incident for disorderly conduct, public intoxication and public urination.

Likewise, the 25-year maximum for any three felonies would increase the maximum sentence by 15 years for garden variety felonies, such as felony possession of a small quantity of drugs. Worse, if the definition of “felony” means any offense “punishable by a term of more than 1 year under the laws of” the convicting jurisdiction, it would punish defendants who were never convicted of a felony by up to 25 years, because the maximum punishment is more than one year for misdemeanors in many states, including Colorado, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Vermont. We are also concerned that definition of “felony,” by mistake or by design, indicates that if a particular kind of offense is punishable by more than one year in any jurisdiction, it is a felony; it states that “any offense” is a felony if it is punishable by more than one year “under the laws of the United States, any State, or a foreign government.”

VI. THE BILL WOULD CREATE A SIGNIFICANT RISK THAT DEFENDANTS WOULD BE PRESUMED INTO ADMITTING PRIOR CONVICTIONS THAT THEY DO NOT HAVE

The bill would require that prior convictions upon which increased statutory maxima are based be alleged in an indictment and proved beyond a reasonable doubt at trial or admitted by the defendant. Records of prior convictions are notoriously unreliable and national criminal databases that generate “rap sheets” frequently contain purported convictions that have been misrecorded, expunged, or even belong to other individuals. In border districts where the great majority of illegal re-entry prosecutions take place, re-entry cases have often been rapidly “processed” in batches of up to eighty defendants at once, with 99% of cases ending in guilty pleas. Given the way these cases are handled on the border, and the fact that many if not

most of the defendants speak little or no English and have little or no education, this provision carries a significant risk that defendants will be pressured to admit to convictions they do not have and thus significantly raise their sentencing exposure.

VII. THE BILL WOULD IMPINGE ON STATES’ SOVEREIGN INTERESTS IN MANAGING THEIR OWN PRISON POPULATIONS

The bill would mandate that any alien removed pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1231(a)(4) who enters or attempts to enter, crosses or attempts to cross the border, or is found in the United States, “shall be incarcerated for the remainder of the sentence that was pending at the time of deportation without any reduction for parole or supervised release” unless the alien affirmatively demonstrates express consent. Section 1231(a)(4)(B) provides that the Attorney General may remove an alien convicted of a non-violent offense before he has completed a sentence of imprisonment (i) of an alien in federal custody and the Attorney General determines that removal is appropriate and in the best interest of the United States, (ii) of an alien in State custody if the chief state official determines that removal is appropriate and in the best interest of the State and submits a written request for removal. Thus, for example, an alien sentenced to 8 years who is eligible for parole in 6 years may apply for early conditional release and be removed after 5 years. Under H.R. 3004, if he illegally re-entered thereafter, he would be required to serve all three years that were pending when he was removed.

As far as we are aware, §1231(a)(4)(B)(i) has never been systematically implemented for federal inmates. Some states, however, have implemented some sort of program to avail themselves of §1231(a)(4)(B)(ii). A handful have entered into an MOU with ICE in which they agree that a person removed pursuant to §1231(a)(4)(B)(ii) who returns illegally will serve the remainder of the original sentence. Other states release prisoners to ICE under §1231(a)(4)(B)(ii) through state legislation or parole board policy under which they do not agree to that condition.

HR 3004 would require any State that releases a prisoner to ICE under §1231(a)(4)(B)(ii) to incarcerate such a person for the remainder of the sentence should they return unlawfully. It would thus impinge on States’ sovereign interests in managing their own prison populations according to their own priorities and resources. The bill would remove the flexibility that States currently have to treat unlawfully returned prisoners as they see fit, and would ossify the ICE MOU into law.

Thank you for considering our views, and please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions.

Very Truly Yours,

NEIL FULTON,
*Federal Defender,
North and South
Dakota, Co-Chair,
Federal Defender
Legislative Committee.*

DAVID PATTON,
*Executive Director,
Federal Defenders of
New York, Co-Chair,
Federal Defender
Legislative Committee.*

JON SANDS,
Federal Defender, District of Arizona, Co-Chair, Federal Defender Legislative Committee.

JUNE 28, 2017.

Re Vote NO on the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003, and Kate’s Law, H.R. 3004

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 407 undersigned local, state, and national immigrant, civil rights, faith-based, and labor organizations, we urge you to oppose the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003 and Kate’s Law, H.R. 3004, and any similar legislation that jeopardizes public safety, erodes the goodwill forged between local police and its residents, and perpetuates the criminalization and incarceration of immigrants. H.R. 3003 would strip badly needed law enforcement funding for state and local jurisdictions, runs afoul of the Tenth and Fourth Amendment, and unnecessarily expands the government’s detention apparatus. H.R. 3004 unwisely expands the federal government’s ability to criminally prosecute immigrants for immigration-based offenses, excludes critical humanitarian protections for those fleeing violence, and doubles down on the failed experiment of incarceration for immigration violations.

Over 600 state and local jurisdictions have policies or ordinances that disentangle their state and local law enforcement agencies from enforcing federal immigration law. The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003, seeks to attack so-called “sanctuary” jurisdictions (many of whom do not consider themselves as such) by penalizing state and local jurisdictions that follow the Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution by refusing to honor constitutionally infirm requests for detainers. H.R. 3003 penalizes jurisdictions by eliminating various federal grants, including funding through the Cops on the Beat program, the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, and any other federal grant related to law enforcement or immigration. Importantly, using the threat of withholding federal grants to coerce state and local jurisdictions likely runs afoul of the Tenth Amendment’s prohibition on commandeering, a position supported by over 300 law professors.

“Sanctuary” policies are critical to promote public safety for local communities. Fearing referral to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, victims and witnesses of crime are significantly less likely to communicate with local law enforcement. Local law enforcement authorities have repeatedly echoed this sentiment, acknowledging that community policing policies are paramount to enhancing public safety. Indeed, “sanctuary” jurisdictions have less crime and more economic development than similarly situated non-“sanctuary” jurisdictions. Withholding critically-needed federal funding would, paradoxically, severely cripple the ability of state and local jurisdictions to satisfy the public safety needs of their communities.

Kate’s Law, H.R. 3004, would further criminalize the immigrant community by drastically increasing penalties for immigrants convicted of unlawful reentry. Operation Streamline encapsulates our nation’s failed experiment with employing criminal penalties to deter migration. Under Operation Streamline, the federal government prosecutes immigrants for reentry at significant rates. By all practical measures, Operation Streamline has failed to deter migration, wasted billions of taxpayer dollars, and unfairly punished thousands of immigrants who try to enter or reenter the United States to reunite with their children and loved ones. We fear that H.R. 3004’s increased penalties for reentry would double down on this failed strategy, explode the prison population, and cost billions of dollars.

Instead of passing discredited enforcement-only legislation, Congress should move forward on enacting just immigration reform legislation that provides a roadmap to citizenship for the nation's eleven million aspiring Americans and eliminates mass detention and deportation programs that undermine fundamental human rights. Legislation that erodes public safety, disrespects local democratic processes, and raises serious constitutional concerns represents an abdication of the Congress' responsibility to enact fair, humane, and just immigration policy. In light of the above, we urge you to vote NO on the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003 and Kate's Law, H.R. 3004.

Please contact Jose Magana-Salgado, of the Immigrant Legal Resource Center if you have any questions regarding this letter. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

National Organizations:

America's Voice Education Fund; American Federation of Teachers; American Friends Service Committee (AFSC); American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee; Americans Committed to Justice and Truth; Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund (AALDEF); Asian Americans Advancing Justice—ANC; Asian Americans Advancing Justice—Asian Law Caucus; Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, AFL-CIO (APALA); Asian Pacific Institute on Gender-Based Violence; ASISTA; Bend the Arc Jewish Action; Black Alliance for Just Immigration; Casa de Esperanza: National Latin@ Network; Catholic Legal Immigration Network, Inc.; Center for American Progress; Center for Employment Training; Center for Gender & Refugee Studies; Center for Law and Social Policy; Center for New Community.

Center for Popular Democracy (CPD); Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) Refugee & Immigration Ministries; Christian Community Development Association; Church World Service; Coalition on Human Needs; CODEPINK; Columban Center for Advocacy and Outreach; Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador (CISPES); Community Initiatives for Visiting Immigrants in Confinement (CIVIC); Defending Rights & Dissent; Disciples Center for Public Witness; Disciples Home Missions; Dominican Sisters of Sparkill; Drug Policy Alliance; Easterseals Blake Foundation; Equal Rights Advocates; Farmworker Justice; Freedom Network USA; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Fuerza Mundial.

Futures Without Violence; Grassroots Leadership; Hispanic Federation; Hispanic National Bar Association; Holy Spirit Missionary Sisters—USA—JPIC; Immigrant Legal Resource Center; Intercommunity Peace & Justice Center; Interfaith Worker Justice; Isaiah Wilson; Jewish Voice for Peace; Jewish Voice for Peace—Boston; Jewish Voice for Peace—Tacoma chapter; Jewish Voice for Peace—Western MA; Justice Strategies; Kids in Need of Defense (KIND); Lambda Legal; Laotian American National Alliance; Latin America Working Group; Latino Victory Fund; LatinoJustice PRLDEF.

League of United Latin American Citizens; Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service; Mi Familia Vota; Milwaukee Chapter, Jewish Voice for Peace; NAACP; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Coalition Against Domestic Violence; National Coalition for Asian Pacific American Community Development; National Council of Asian Pacific Americans (NCAAPA); National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of La Raza (NCLR); National Day Laborer Organizing Network (NDLON); National Education Association; National Immigrant Justice Center; National Immigration Law Cen-

ter; National Immigration Project of the NLG; National Iranian American Council (NIAC); National Justice for Our Neighbors; National Korean American Service & Education Consortium (NAKASEC); National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health.

National Latina/o Psychological Association; National Lawyers Guild; National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund; National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; National Resource Center on Domestic Violence; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; OCA—Asian Pacific American Advocates; Our Revolution; People's Action; PICO National Network; Queer Detainee Empowerment Project; Refugee and Immigrant Center for Education and Legal Services (RAICES); School Social Work Association of America; Sisters of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, New Windsor; Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC); Southern Border Communities Coalition; Southern Poverty Law Center; T'ruah: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights; The Advocates for Human Rights; The Hampton Institute: A Working Class Think Tank.

The National Alliance to Advance Adolescent Health; The Queer Palestinian Empowerment Network; The Sentencing Project; The United Methodist Church—General Board of Church and Society; U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants; UndocuBlack Network; Unitarian Universalist Association; Unitarian Universalist Legislative Ministry of New Jersey; Unitarian Universalist Service Committee; UNITE HERE; United Child Care, Inc.; United for a Fair Economy; UU College of Social Justice; UURISE—Unitarian Universalist Refugee & Immigrant Services & Education; Voto Latino; We Belong Together; WOLA; Women's Refugee Commission; Working Families; Yemen Peace Project; YWCA.

State and Local Organizations: (MILU) Mujeres Inmigrantes Luchando Unidas; #VigilantLOVE; 580 Cafe/Wesley Foundation Serving UCLA; Acting in Community Together in Organizing Northern Nevada (ACTIONN); Advocates for Basic Legal Equality, Inc.; Alianza; All for All; Alliance San Diego; Allies of Knoxville's Immigrant Neighbors (AKIN); American Gateways; Aquinas Center; Arkansas United Community Coalition; Asian Americans Advancing Justice—Atlanta; Asian Americans Advancing Justice—LA; Asian Americans United; Asian Counseling and Referral Service; Asian Law Alliance; Asian Pacific American Legal Resource Center; Asylee Women Enterprise; Atlas: DIY.

Bear Creek United Methodist Church—Congregation Kol Ami Interfaith Partnership; Bethany Immigration Services; Brighton Park Neighborhood Council; Cabrini Immigrant Services of NYC; Campaign for Hoosier Families; Canal Alliance; Capital Area Immigrants' Rights Coalition; CASA; Casa Familiar, Inc.; Casa Latina; Casa San Jose; Catholic Charities; Catholic Charities San Francisco, San Mateo & Marin; Causa Oregon; CDWBA Legal Project, Inc.; Central American Legal Assistance; Central New Jersey Jewish Voice for Peace; Central Pacific Conference of the United Church of Christ; Central Valley Immigrant Integration Collaborative (CVIIC); Centro Laboral de Graton.

Centro Latino Americano; Centro Legal de la Ran; Centro Romero; Chelsea Collaborative; Chicago Religious Leadership Network on Latin America; Church Council of Greater Seattle; Church of Our Saviour/La Iglesia de Nuestro Salvador Episcopal; Church Women United in New York State; Cleveland Jobs with Justice; Coalicion de Lideres Latinos—CLILA; Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights (CHIRLA); Coalition

of African Communities; Coloradans For Immigrant Rights, a program of the American Friends Service Committee; Colorado People's Alliance (COPA); Columbia Legal Services; Comite Pro Uno; Comite VIDA; Committee for Justice in Palestine—Ithaca; Community Action Board of Santa Cruz County, Inc; Community Legal Services and Counseling Center.

Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto; Community of Friends in Action, Inc.; Connecticut Legal Services, Inc; CRLA Foundation; CT Working Families; DC-Maryland Justice for Our Neighbors; Delaware Civil Rights Coalition; Do the Most Good Montgomery County (MD); Dominican Sisters—Grand Rapids (MI); Dream Team Los Angeles DTLA; DRUM—Desis Rising Up & Moving; East Bay Sanctuary Covenant; Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon; EL CENTRO de Igualdad y Derechos; El Monte Wesleyan Church; Emerald Isle Immigration Center; Employee Rights Center; Encuentro; End Domestic Abuse WI; English Ministry rean Presbyterian Church of St. Louis.

Episcopal Refugee & Immigrant Center Alliance; Equal Justice Center; Equality California; Erie Neighborhood House; First Congregational UCC of Portland; First Unitarian Universalist Church of Berks County; Florida Center for Fiscal and Economic Policy; Florida Immigrant Coalition, Inc. (FLIC); Franciscans for Justice; Frida Kahlo Community Organization; Friends of Broward Detainees; Friends of Miami-Dade Detainees; Georgia Latino Alliance for Human Rights; Gethsemane Lutheran Church; Grassroots Alliance for Immigrant Rights; Greater Lafayette Immigrant Allies; Greater New York Labor Religion Coalition; Greater Rochester COALITION for Immigration Justice; Grupo de Apoyo e Integracion Hispanoamericano; HACES.

Hana Center; Harvard Islamic Society; Her Justice; HIAS Pennsylvania; Hispanic Interest Coalition of Alabama; Hispanic Legal Clinic; Hudson Valley Chapter of JVP; Human Rights Initiative of North Texas; ICE-Free Capital District; Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; Immanuel Fellowship; a bilingual congregation; Immigrant Justice Advocacy Movement (IJAM); Immigrant Legal Advocacy Project; Immigration Action Group; Immigration Center for Women and Children; Inland Empire—Immigrant Youth Coalition (IHEYC); Interfaith Movement for Human Integrity; International Institute of Buffalo; Irish International Immigrant Center; IRTF—InterReligious Task Force on Central America and Colombia.

Japanese American Citizens League, San Jose Chapter; Jewish Voice for Peace—Albany, NY chapter; Jewish Voice for Peace—Albuquerque; Jewish Voice for Peace—Austin; Jewish Voice for Peace—Bay Area; Jewish Voice for Peace—Cleveland; Jewish Voice for Peace—DC Metro; Jewish Voice for Peace—Denver; Jewish Voice for Peace—Ithaca; Jewish Voice for Peace—Los Angeles; Jewish Voice for Peace—Madison; Jewish Voice for Peace—New Haven; Jewish Voice for Peace—Philadelphia; Jewish Voice for Peace—Pittsburgh; Jewish Voice for Peace—Portland; Jewish Voice for Peace—San Diego; Jewish Voice for Peace—South Florida; Jewish Voice for Peace—Syracuse, NY; Jewish Voice for Peace—Triangle NC; Jolt.

Justice for our Neighbors Houston; Justice for Our Neighbors Southeastern Michigan; Justice For Our Neighbors West Michigan; JVP-HV. Jewish Voice for Peace-Hudson Valley; Kentucky Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; Kids for College; Kino Border Initiative; Kitsap Immigrant Assistance Center; KIWA (Koreatown Immigrant Workers Alliance); Korean Resource Center; La Casa de Amistad; La Coalición de

Derechos Humanos; La Comunidad, Inc.; La Raza Centro Legal; Lafayette Urban Ministry; Las Vegas Chapter of Jewish Voice for Peace; Latin American Legal Defense and Education Fund; Latino Racial Justice Circle; Latinx Alliance of Lane County; Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County.

Legal Services for Children; Lemkin House Inc; Long Island Wins; Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition; Massachusetts Law Reform Institute; Middle East Crisis Response (MECR); Migrant and Immigrant Community Action Project; Migrant Justice / Justicia Migrante; MinKwon Center for Community Action; Mission Asset Fund; Mississippi Immigrants Rights Alliance (MIRA); Mosaic Family Services; Movement of Immigrant Leaders in Pennsylvania (MILPA); Mujeres Unidas y Activas; Mundo Maya Foundation; National Lawyers Guild—Los Angeles Chapter; New Jersey Alliance for Immigrant Justice; New Mexico Dream Team; New Mexico Immigrant Law Center; New Mexico Voices for Children.

New Sanctuary Movement of Philadelphia; New York Immigration Coalition; NH Conference United Church of Christ Immigration Working Group; North Carolina Council of Churches; North County Immigration Task Force; North Jersey chapter of Jewish Voice for Peace; Northern Illinois Justice for Our Neighbors; Northern Manhattan Coalition for Immigrant Rights; Northwest Immigrant Rights Project (NWIRP); OCCORD; Occupy Bergen County (New Jersey); OneAmerica; OneJustice; Oregon Interfaith Movement for Immigrant Justice—IMIrJ; Organized Communities Against Deportations; OutFront Minnesota; Pangea Legal Services; PASO—West Suburban Action Project; Pax Christi Florida; Pennsylvania Immigration and Citizenship Coalition.

Pilgrim United Church of Christ; Pilipino Workers Center; Polonians Organized to Minister to Our Community, Inc. (POMOC); Portland Central America Solidarity Committee; Progreso: Latino Progress; Progressive Jewish Voice of Central PA; Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada; Project Hope-Proyecto Esperanza; Project IRENE; Puget Sound Advocates for Retirement Action (PSARA); Racial Justice Action Center; Reformed Church of Highland Park; Refugees Helping Refugees; Refugio del Rio Grande; Resilience Orange County; Rocky Mountain Immigrant Advocacy Network (RMIAN); Rural and Migrant Ministry; Safe Passage; San Francisco CASA (Court Appointed Special Advocates); Services, Immigrant Rights, and Education Network (SIREN).

Sickle Cell Disease Association of America, Philadelphia/Delaware Valley Chapter; Sisters of St. Francis, St. Francis Province; Sisters of St. Joseph of Rochester, Inc; Skagit Immigrant Rights Council; Social Justice Collaborative; South Asian Fund for Education, Scholarship and Training (SAFEST); South Bay Jewish Voice for Peace; South Texas Immigration Council; Southeast Immigrant Rights Network; St. John of God Church; Students United for Nonviolence; Tacoma Community House; Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition; Teresa Messer, Law Office of Teresa Messer; Thai Community Development Center; The Garden, Lutheran Ministry; The International Institute of Metropolitan Detroit; The Legal Project; Tompkins County Immigrant Rights Coalition; Transgender Resource Center of New Mexico.

Trinity Episcopal Church; U-Lead Athens; Unitarian Universalist Mass Action Network; Unitarian Universalist PA Legislative Advocacy Network (UUPLAN); United African Organization; United Families; University Leadership Initiative; University of San Francisco Immigration and Deportation Defense Clinic; UNO Immigration Ministry;

UPLIFT; UpValley Family Centers; VietLead; Vital Immigrant Defense Advocacy & Services, Santa Rosa, CA; Volunteers of Legal Service; Washtenaw Interfaith Coalition for Immigrant Rights; Watertown Citizens for Peace, Justice, and the Environment; Wayne Action for Racial Equality; WeCount!; WESPAC Foundation; Wilco Justice Alliance (Williamson County, TX).

Women Watch Afrika, Inc.; Worksafe; Young Immigrants in Action; YWCA Alaska; YWCA Alliance; YWCA Berkeley/Oakland; YWCA Brooklyn; YWCA Clark County; YWCA Elgin; YWCA Greater Austin; YWCA Greater Pittsburgh; YWCA Greater Portland; YWCA Madison; YWCA Minneapolis; YWCA Mount Desert Island.

YWCA NE KANSAS; YWCA of Metropolitan Detroit; YWCA of the University of Illinois; YWCA Olympia; YWCA Pasadena-Foothill Valley; YWCA Rochester & Monroe County; YWCA Southeastern Massachusetts; YWCA Southern Arizona; YWCA Tulsa; YWCA Warren; YWCA Westmoreland County.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. LOFGREN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters in opposition to this bill from the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence, the CATO Institute, Church World Service, and the ACLU.

NATIONAL TASK FORCE TO END
SEXUAL & DOMESTIC VIOLENCE,

June 27, 2017.

The National Taskforce to End Sexual and Domestic Violence (NTF), comprised of national leadership organizations advocating on behalf of sexual assault and domestic violence victims and representing hundreds of organizations across the country dedicated to ensuring all survivors of violence receive the protections they deserve, write to express our deep concerns about the impact that H.R. 3003, the “No Sanctuary for Criminals Act,” and H.R. 3004, or “Kate’s Law,” will have on victims fleeing or recovering from sexual assault, domestic violence, or human trafficking, and on communities at large.

This year is the twenty-third anniversary of the bipartisan Violence Against Women Act (“VAWA”) which has, since it was first enacted, included critical protections for immigrant victims of domestic and sexual violence. H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 will have the effect of punishing immigrant survivors and their children and pushing them into the shadows and into danger, undermining the very purpose of VAWA. Specifically, the nation’s leading national organizations that address domestic and sexual assault oppose H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 because:

Community trust policies are critical tools for increasing community safety. Laws that seek to intertwine the federal immigration and local law enforcement systems will undermine the Congressional purpose of protections enacted under VAWA and will have the chilling effect of pushing immigrant victims into the shadows and undermining public safety. Immigration enforcement must be implemented in a way that supports local community policing and sustains community trust in working with local law enforcement. H.R. 3003 runs contrary to community policing efforts and will deter immigrant domestic violence and sexual assault survivors not only from reporting crimes, but also from seeking help for themselves and their

children. While H.R. 3003 does not require that local law enforcement arrest or report immigrant victims or witnesses of criminal activity, the language in the bill provides no restriction prohibiting such practices.

Perpetrators use fear of deportation as tool of abuse. Local policies that minimize the intertwining of local law enforcement with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) help protect the most vulnerable victims by creating trust between law enforcement and the immigrant community, which in turn help protect entire communities. Abusers and traffickers use the fear of deportation of their victims as a tool to silence and trap them. If immigrants are afraid to call the police because of fear of deportation, they become more vulnerable to abuse and exploitation. Not only are the individual victims and their children harmed, but their fear of law enforcement leads many to abstain from reporting violent perpetrators or seeking protection and, as a result, dangerous criminals are not identified and go unpunished.

As VAWA recognizes, immigrant victims of violent crimes often do not contact law enforcement due to fear that they will be deported. Immigrants are already afraid of contacting the police and H.R. 3003 proposes to further intertwine federal immigration and local law enforcement systems will only exacerbate this fear. The result is that perpetrators will be able to continue to harm others, both immigrant and U.S. Citizen victims alike. Since January of 2017, victim advocates have been describing the immense fear expressed by immigrant victims and their reluctance to reach out for help from police. A recent survey of over 700 advocates and attorneys at domestic violence and sexual assault programs indicate that immigrant victims are expressing heightened fears and concerns about immigration enforcement, with 78% of advocates and attorneys reporting that victims are describing fear of contacting the police; 75% of them reporting that victims are afraid of going to court; and 43% reporting working with immigrant victims who are choosing not to move forward with criminal charges or obtaining protective orders.

In addition, according to Los Angeles Police Chief Charlie Beck, reporting of sexual assault and domestic violence among Latinos has dropped significantly this year, possibly due to concerns that police interaction could result in deportation. According to Chief Beck, reports of sexual assault have dropped 25 percent among Los Angeles’ Latino population since the beginning of the year compared to a three percent drop among non-Latino victims. Similarly, reports of spousal abuse among Latinos fell by about 10 percent among Latinos whereas the decline among non-Latinos was four percent. The Houston Police Department reported in April that the number of Hispanics reporting rape is down 42.8 percent from last year. In Denver, CO, the Denver City Attorney has reported that some domestic violence victims are declining to testify in court. As of late February, the City Attorney’s Office had dropped four cases because the victims fear that ICE officers will arrest and deport them. Both the City Attorney and Aurora Police Chief have spoken on the importance of having trust with the immigrant community in order to maintain public safety and prosecute crime?

H.R. 3003 WILL UNFAIRLY PUNISH ENTIRE
COMMUNITIES

H.R. 3003 punishes localities that follow Constitutional guidelines and refuse to honor detainer requests that are not supported by due process mandates. H.R. 3003 likely covers more than 600 jurisdictions

across the country, most of which do not characterize their policies to follow constitutional mandates as “sanctuary” policies. H.R. 3003 penalizes jurisdictions by eliminating their access to various federal grants, including federal law enforcement grants, such as the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, and other federal grants related to law enforcement or immigration, such as those that fund forensic rape kit analysis. Withholding federal law enforcement funding would, ironically, undermine the ability of local jurisdictions to combat and prevent crime in their communities.

In addition, the fiscal impact of both H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 will result in limited federal law enforcement resources being further reduced as a result of shifting funding from enforcing federal criminal laws addressing violent crimes, including those protecting victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking, to the detention and prosecution of many non-violent immigration law violators.

H.R. 3003 AND H.R. 3004 WILL UNFAIRLY PUNISH VICTIMS

By greatly expanding mandatory detention and expanding criminal penalties for re-entry, H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 will have harsh consequences for immigrant survivors. Victims of human trafficking, sexual assault, and domestic violence are often at risk of being arrested and convicted. In recognition of this fact, existing ICE guidance cites the example of when police respond to a domestic violence call, both parties may be arrested or a survivor who acted in self-defense may be wrongly accused. In addition, if the abuser speaks English better than the survivor, or if other language or cultural barriers (or fear of retaliation from the abuser) prevent the survivor from fully disclosing the abuse suffered, a survivor faces charges and tremendous pressure to plead guilty (without being advised about the long-term consequences) in order to be released from jail and reunited with her children. In addition, victims of trafficking are often arrested and convicted for prostitution-related offenses. These victims are often desperate to be released and possibly to be reunited with their children following their arrests or pending trial. These factors—combined with poor legal counsel, particularly about the immigration consequences of criminal pleas and convictions—have in the past and will likely continue to lead to deportation of wrongly accused victims who may have pled to or been unfairly convicted of domestic violence charges and/or prostitution. H.R. 3003 imposes harsh criminal penalties and H.R. 3004 imposes expanded bases for detention without consideration of mitigating circumstances or humanitarian exceptions for these victims.

In addition, H.R. 3004 expands the criminal consequences for re-entry in the U.S. without recognizing the compelling humanitarian circumstances in which victims who have been previously removed return for their safety. Victims of domestic and sexual violence and trafficking fleeing violence in their countries of origin will be penalized for seeking protection from harm. In recent years, women and children fleeing rampant violence in El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras, have fled to the United States, seeking refuge. Frequently, because of inadequate access to legal representation, they are unable to establish their eligibility for legal protections in the United States, resulting in their removal. In many cases, the risk of domestic violence, sexual assault, and/or human trafficking in their countries of origin remain unabated and victims subsequently attempt to reenter the U.S. to pro-

tect themselves and their children. Other victims of domestic and sexual violence and trafficking may be deported because their abusers or traffickers isolate them, or prevent them from obtaining lawful immigration status. They are deported, with some victims having to leave their children behind in the custody of their abusers or traffickers. Under H.R. 3004, these victims risk harsh criminal penalties for re-entry for attempting to protect themselves and their children.

On behalf of the courageous survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, stalking and human trafficking that our organizations serve, we urge you to vote against H.R. 3003 and 3004, and to affirm the intent and spirit of VAWA by supporting strong relationships between law enforcement and immigrant communities, which is critical for public safety in general, and particularly essential for domestic and sexual violence victims and their children.

Sincerely,

THE NATIONAL TASKFORCE TO END SEXUAL AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.

[From the CATO Institute]

KATE’S LAW: A WASTE OF FEDERAL RESOURCES

(By David Bier)

The House of Representatives will vote on a bill this week titled “Kate’s Law” (H.R. 3004). While it is nominally an “immigration” bill, its principal aim relates to criminal justice—namely, an increase in the maximum sentences for immigrants who reenter the country illegally after a deportation. The bill is a waste of federal resources. It would likely balloon America’s population of nonviolent prisoners, while not protecting Americans against serious criminals.

KATE’S LAW WOULD NOT HAVE HELPED KATE

The bill’s namesake is Kate Steinle, a 32-year-old medical sales rep killed in San Francisco in 2015. Her killer was Juan Francisco Lopez-Sanchez who was in the country without status after five removals. Proponents of this bill—providing lengthier prison sentences for people who reenter the country after a removal—believe that this would have somehow helped Kate Steinle. This assertion cannot withstand a moment’s contact with the facts of the case, which I have previously laid out in detail here.

After his last three apprehensions, the government prosecuted Lopez-Sanchez for felony illegal reentry. He served 15 years in federal prison in three five-year increments. None of the facts of this case would have changed if he had served those 15 years consecutively. Indeed, because Lopez-Sanchez never actually made it across the border without being caught since 1997, the only reason that he ended up in San Francisco is because the Bureau of Prisons inexplicably decided to ignore a request for transfer from Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). Instead, it shipped him to the city based on a 20-year-old marijuana charge—an offense no longer even exists in the city. Thus, deterrence against reentry has no relevance whatsoever to this case.

THE PROVISIONS OF KATE’S LAW

This legislation introduced by House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte (R-VA) should not be confused with other bills of the same name introduced in the House and the Senate by Rep. Steve King (R-IA) and Sen. Ted Cruz (R-TX), respectively. The entire purpose of the prior iterations of “Kate’s Law” was to create mandatory minimum sentences for crossing the border illegally after a removal. Indeed, the alternate title for the bills was the “Establishing Mandatory Minimums for Illegal Reentry Act.” This new Kate’s Law, however, mercifully

contains no mandatory minimum sentences—a sign that criminal justice reformers’ criticisms of them (including Cato’s) have started to penetrate the mainstream.

But the purpose of the law in the broader sense remains: trying to lock up more immigrants for longer periods. Most of the actual text comes from section 3705 of the Senate comprehensive immigration reform bill (S. 744) passed in June 2013, but the Kate’s Law authors have added several odious provisions. The heart of the bill would create a new 10-year maximum sentence for any person removed or denied entry more than two times who reenters. The current maximum for regular reentry is just 2 years. It would increase the maximum sentences for people who reenter after being convicted of various criminal offenses—including for immigration offenses—to up to 25 years.

Kate’s Law deletes two important provisions from the 5,744 language that would have protected from prosecution non-felon juveniles (p. 772–73) and humanitarian groups that provide immigrants caught in deserts or mountains food, water, or transportation to safety, which are sometimes the target of the “aiding and abetting” statutes (p. 774). Kate’s Law would also prohibit challenging the legality or validity of a prior removal order, which is a common defense in these cases. If the earlier removal was not valid, as in at least one case where a U.S. citizen was deported, it should not be the basis of prosecution.

Kate’s Law also would allow for prosecutions of immigrants who attempt to enter the United States unsuccessfully. Under current judicial interpretation, an alien must be “free from official restraint”—that is, not in the custody or control of a government official. The 9th Circuit has interpreted to include even chases along the border. Thus, the bill would significantly expand the number of people eligible for prosecution for the criminal reentry statute.

KATE’S LAW WOULD FURTHER OVER-CRIMINALIZATION

The U.S. Sentencing Commission estimated that the original mandatory minimums version of Kate’s Law would increase the federal prison population by almost 60,000 in 5 years—a massive 30 percent increase in the total federal prison population. Unfortunately, the House is moving this new version—revealed late last week—without an estimate of either its financial impact or its impact on the federal prison population. But the law would likely completely reverse the recent 5 percent decline in the federal prison population, the first reduction since the 1970s.

Immigration offenses are already the top reason for a federal arrest, composing half of all federal criminal arrests up, a share that has doubled since 2004. From 1998 to 2010, 56 percent of all federal prison admissions were for immigration crimes. Locking up immigrants requires taxpayers to pay to watch, house, clothe, and feed them, and unlike U.S. citizens who are released into the interior, their incarceration does not prevent other U.S. residents from being exposed their criminal behavior (assuming illegal crossing is a concern in that regard).

While naturally locking people up has some deterrent effect on future crossing, Border Patrol doesn’t bother to keep good data on this impact compared to its other efforts. Given the costs of incarceration—both to the person incarcerated and to the U.S. taxpayer—this seems like a critical insight. In any case, if Congress was serious about discouraging illegal immigration, it would make legal immigration significantly easier. As I have shown, the availability of work permits has a major impact on illegal immigration.

It's not clear that the motivation for Kate's Law is reducing illegal immigration per se, but rather the belief that illegal immigrants are more likely to commit serious crimes and so should be singled out. Yet as my colleagues' recent paper demonstrates, illegal immigrants are much less likely to end up behind bars than U.S.-born citizens. Because unauthorized immigrants are required to serve sentences before their removal, this is the best indication that they are less likely to commit crimes that require jail time.

In the end, Kate's Law is an improvement on its prior versions, but still an unjustifiable use of federal resources.

CWS STATEMENT TO OPPOSING H.R. 3003, THE NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT, AND H.R. 3004, KATE'S LAW

As a 71-year old humanitarian organization representing 37 Protestant, Anglican, and Orthodox communions and 34 refugee resettlement offices across the country, Church World Service (CWS) urges all Members of Congress to support the long-standing efforts of law enforcement officials to foster trusting relationships with the communities they protect and serve. As we pray for peace and an end to senseless acts of violence that are too prevalent in this country, CWS encourages the U.S. Congress to refrain from politicizing tragedies or conflating the actions of one person with an entire community of our immigrant brothers and sisters and oppose H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, and H.R. 3004, Kate's Law.

H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, would target more than 600+ cities, counties, and states across the country and threaten to take away millions of dollars in federal funding that local police use to promote public safety. Communities are safer when they commit to policies that strengthen trust and cooperation between local law enforcement, community leadership and institutions, and all residents, regardless of immigration status. The Federal government should not hurt intentional, community-based policing efforts that are vital in communities across the country. Many cities have already recognized that requests by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) to hold individuals beyond their court-appointed sentences violate due process and have been found unconstitutional by federal courts. This bill would raise profound constitutional concerns by prohibiting localities from declining to comply with ICE detainer requests even when such compliance would violate federal court orders and the U.S. Constitution. Local police that refuse ICE detainer requests see an increase in public safety due to improved trust from the community. It is precisely this trust that enables community members to report dangerous situations without the fear of being deported or separated from their families. When local police comply with ICE detainer requests, more crimes go unreported because victims and witnesses are afraid of being deported if they contact the police. This bill would also undermine local criminal prosecutions by allowing the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to ignore state or local criminal warrants and refuse to transfer individuals to state or local custody in certain circumstances. This bill would reduce community safety by preventing state and local jurisdictions from holding people accountable.

The United States already spends more than \$18 billion on immigration enforcement per year, more than all other federal law enforcement agencies combined. H.R. 3004, Kate's Law, would expand the federal government's ability to prosecute individuals for "illegal reentry" and impose even more

severe penalties in these cases—even though prosecutions for migration-related offenses already make up more than 50% of all federal prosecutions. Yet, this bill does not include adequate protections for individuals who re-enter the U.S. in order to seek protection, which would place asylum seekers at risk of being returned to the violence and persecution they fled. We have seen how Border Patrol's current practices violate existing U.S. law and treaty obligations by preventing viable asylum claims from moving forward. DHS has found that in some areas, Border Patrol refers asylum seekers for criminal prosecution despite the fact that they have expressed fear of persecution. In May 2017, a report was released highlighting that many asylum seekers, who had expressed a fear of returning to their home countries are being turned away by CBP agents. New barriers to protection are unnecessary and would dangerously impede our obligations under international and U.S. law.

Federal, state, and local policies that focus on deportation do not reduce crime rates. Individuals are being deported who present no risk to public safety and who are long-standing community members, including parents of young children. Immigrants come to this country to reunite with family, work, and make meaningful contributions that enrich their communities. Several studies over the last century have affirmed that all immigrants, regardless of nationality or status, are less likely than U.S. citizens to commit violent crimes. A recent report found a correlation between the increase in undocumented immigrants, and the sharp decline in violent and property crime rates. Immigration is correlated with significantly higher employment growth and a decline in the unemployment rate, and immigrants have high entrepreneurial rates, creating successful businesses that hire immigrant and U.S. citizen employees.

As communities of faith, we are united by principles of compassion, stewardship, and justice. CWS urges all Members of Congress to oppose H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, and H.R. 3004, Kate's Law. What we need are real solutions and immigration policies that treat our neighbors with the dignity and respect that all people deserve and affirm local law enforcement officers' efforts to build trust with their communities.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
Washington, DC, June 27, 2017.

HON. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

HON. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Re ACLU Opposes H.R. 3003 (No Sanctuary for Criminals Act) and H.R. 3004 (Kate's Law)

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union ("ACLU"), we submit this letter to the House of Representatives to express our strong opposition to H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, and H.R. 3004, Kate's Law.

NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT (H.R. 3003)

H.R. 3003 conflicts with the principles of the Fourth Amendment.

H.R. 3003 defies the Fourth Amendment by amending 8 USC Section 1373 of the Immigration and Nationality Act ("INA") to force localities to comply with unlawful detainer requests or risk losing federal funding. This is despite the fact that an "increasing number of federal court decisions" have held that "detainer-based detention by state and local law enforcement agencies violates the Fourth Amendment," as recognized by

former Department of Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson in 2014.

Disturbingly, H.R. 3003 seeks to penalize the 600+ localities that abide by the Fourth Amendment. These jurisdictions have recognized that by entangling local authorities and federal immigration enforcement, immigration detainers erode trust between immigrant communities and local law enforcement. In this way, immigration detainers ultimately undermine public safety, as entire communities become wary of seeking assistance from police and other government authorities that are supposed to provide help in times of need. Thus, by forcing jurisdictions to comply with unlawful detainer requests, H.R. 3003 will only make communities less safe, not more.

H.R. 3003 would also amend Section 287 of the INA to allow the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") to take custody of a person being held under a detainer within 48 hours (excluding weekends and holidays) "but in no instance more than 96 hours" following the date that the individual would otherwise be released from criminal custody. This, again, raises serious Fourth Amendment concerns, as the Supreme Court has stated that the Constitution requires a judicial finding of probable cause within 48 hours of arrest. This provision would disregard the Court's ruling entirely and allow a local law enforcement agency to hold a person for up to 7 days before requiring DHS intervention—and never requiring the person be brought before a judge for a probable cause hearing.

Protection against unreasonable detention by the government is the bedrock of the Constitution's Fourth Amendment, which provides that the government cannot hold anyone in jail without getting a warrant or approval from a neutral magistrate. This constitutional protection applies to everyone in the United States—citizen and immigrant alike.

Immigration detainers, however, do not abide by these standards. Detainers are one of the key tools that DHS uses to apprehend individuals who come in contact with local and state law enforcement agencies. An immigration detainer is a written request from DHS to that local law enforcement agency, requesting that they detain an individual for an additional 48 hours after the person's release date, in order to allow immigration agents extra time to decide whether to take that person into custody for deportation purposes.

DHS's use of detainers to imprison people without due process, without any charges pending, and without probable cause of a criminal violation flies in the face of our Fourth Amendment protections. Policies that allow DHS to detain people at-will are ripe for civil and human rights violations and have resulted in widespread wrongful detentions, including detentions of U.S. citizens. That is why many of the 600+ localities targeted by H.R. 3003 have decided not to execute a DHS immigration detainer request unless it is accompanied by additional evidence, a determination of probable cause, or a judicial warrant.

Unfortunately, H.R. 3003 does nothing to address the fundamental constitutional problems plaguing DHS's use of immigration detainers. Rather than fix the constitutional problems by requiring a judicial warrant, the bill perpetuates the unconstitutional detainer practices and forces the federal government to absorb legal liability for the constitutional violations which will inevitably result. This is irresponsible lawmaking. Instead of saddling taxpayers with the liability the federal government will incur from Fourth Amendment violations, Congress should end the use of DHS's unconstitutional detainer requests.

H.R. 3003 violates the Due Process Clause by allowing DHS to detain people indefinitely without a bond hearing.

Section 4 of H.R. 3003 radically expands our immigration detention system by amending Section 236(c) of the INA to authorize mandatory detention “without time limitation.” This empowers DHS to detain countless immigrants for as long as it takes to conclude removal proceedings—even if that takes years—without the basic due process of a bond hearing to determine if their imprisonment is even justified. This is a clear constitutional violation, as the federal courts have overwhelmingly held that jailing immigrants for months and years without bond hearings raises serious problems under the Due Process Clause.

Although the bill claims to provide for the “detention of criminal aliens,” it massively expands mandatory detention to people with no criminal record whatsoever, including immigrants who lack legal papers or who overstay a tourist visa. The “lock ‘em up” approach to immigration enforcement is cruel, irrational, and unconstitutional. The Supreme Court has permitted brief periods of mandatory detention only in cases where individuals are charged with deportation based on certain criminal convictions. The Court has not endorsed the mandatory lock-up of people who have never committed a crime.

KATE’S LAW (H.R. 3004)

H.R. 3004 is piecemeal immigration enforcement that expands America’s federal prison population and lines the coffers of private prison companies.

Increasing the maximum sentences for illegal reentrants is unnecessary, wasteful, and inhumane. H.R. 3004 envisions a federal criminal justice system that prosecutes asylum-seekers, persons providing humanitarian assistance to migrants in distress, and parents who pose no threat to public safety in returning to the U.S. to reunite with children who need their care (individuals with children in the United States are 50 percent of those convicted of illegal reentry).

Current law already imposes a sentence of up to 20 years on anyone convicted of illegally reentering the country who has committed an aggravated felony. U.S. Attorneys’ Offices aggressively enforce these provisions. According to the U.S. Sentencing Commission, immigration prosecutions account for 52 percent of all federal prosecutions—surpassing drugs, weapons, fraud and thousands of other crimes. Nearly 99 percent of illegal reentry defendants are sentenced to federal prison time.

H.R. 3004 would drastically expand America’s prison population of nonviolent prisoners at a time when there is bipartisan support to reduce the federal prison population. It offends due process by cutting off all collateral attacks on unjust prior deportation orders, despite the Supreme Court’s contrary ruling in *United States v. Mendoza-Lopez*. Profiteering by private prison companies has been the main consequence of border-crossing prosecutions, which the Government Accountability Office and the DHS Office of Inspector General have criticized as lacking sound deterrent support.

H.R. 3004 is an integral part of this administration’s mass deportation and mass incarceration agenda. Longer sentences for illegal reentry are not recommended by any informed federal criminal-justice stakeholders; rather they represent this administration’s anti-immigrant obsession and would expensively expand substandard private jail contracting despite the life-threatening conditions in these facilities.

In conclusion, H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 are fraught with constitutional problems that threaten the civil and human rights of our

immigrant communities, undercut law enforcement’s ability to keep our communities safe, and would balloon our federal prison population by financing private prison corporations. Rather than taking a punitive approach to local law enforcement agencies that are working hard to balance their duties to uphold the Constitution and to keep their communities safe, Congress should end DHS’s unconstitutional detainer practices or fix the constitutional deficiencies by requiring judicial warrants for all detainer requests. Congress should also repeal mandatory detention so that all immigrants receive the basic due process of a bond hearing and reject any attempt to unfairly imprison individuals who are not a threat to public safety.

For more information, please contact ACLU Director of Immigration Policy and Campaigns, Lorella Praeli.

Sincerely,

FAIZ SHAKIR,
National Political Director.
LORELLA PRAELI,
Director of Immigration Policy and
Campaigns.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), a former member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3004, Kate’s Law. This is politically driven legislation intended to create a fear of immigrants, even though repeated studies have shown immigrants commit less crimes.

It enhances criminal penalties against immigrants, the vast majority of whom have come here peacefully to rejoin loved ones. All that, and it doesn’t even do what it claims to, address the situation that led to the tragic death of Kate Steinle.

There are those who might imply that this bill came from H.R. 15, the comprehensive bipartisan immigration bill that could have passed the House if allowed to vote on the floor, but this is not true. I know, because I was one of the lead sponsors of this bill.

Our bill would have vastly improved the pathways to immigrate legally to the U.S. This bill makes no distinction between those immigrants trying to rejoin their families and those who may be prone to commit crimes.

Instead, it treats all immigrants attempting to reenter the U.S. as criminals and significantly expands sentences for persons with misdemeanors such as driving without a license or loitering. Even asylum seekers, who present themselves at the border to escape deadly gang violence in their home country, could be subject to criminal prosecution.

Turning our backs on asylum seekers and refugees doesn’t make us safer. It makes us weak, and it is just plain wrong.

We were horrified by Kate Steinle’s murder, but the provisions in this bill would not have prevented it. The man charged with killing her was convicted for multiple illegal reentry offenses, serving more than 16 years in prison. He had been caught each time he attempted to cross the border. His presence in San Francisco was not due to

lax penalties for reentry or weak border security.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided legislation ripped from the pages of Donald Trump’s mass deportation and anti-immigrant playbook.

I include in the RECORD five documents from organizations that are opposed to this bill as well as the sanctuary bill, and that is the 15,000 immigration lawyers and law professors who are members of the American Immigration Lawyers Association; the 1.6 million members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, or AFSCME; the 2 million members of the Service Employees International Union, SEIU; the Asian Americans Advancing Justice; and the Fair Immigration Reform Movement.

AMERICAN IMMIGRATION
LAWYERS ASSOCIATION,

Washington, DC, June 27, 2017.

Statement of the American Immigration Lawyers Association Opposing the “No Sanctuary for Criminals Act” (H.R. 3003) and “Kate’s Law” (H.R. 3004)

Contact: Gregory Chen, Director of Government Relations.

As the national bar association of over 15,000 immigration lawyers and law professors, the American Immigration Lawyers Association (AILA) opposes “No Sanctuary for Criminals Act” (H.R. 3003) and “Kate’s Law” (H.R. 3004). AILA recommends that members of Congress reject these bills which are scheduled to come before the House Rules Committee on June 27 and to the floor shortly thereafter. Though Judiciary Chairman Goodlatte stated that the bills will “enhance public safety,” they will do just the opposite: undermine public safety and make it even harder for local law enforcement to protect their residents and communities. In addition, the bills which were made public less than a week before the vote and completely bypassed the Judiciary Committee, include provisions that will result in violations of due process and the Fourth and Tenth Amendments to the Constitution.

At a time when over 9 out of 10 Americans support immigration reform and legalization of the undocumented, Republican leadership is asking the House to vote on enforcement-only bills that will lead to more apprehensions, deportations, and prosecutions of thousands of immigrants and their families who have strong ties to the United States. Instead of criminalizing and scapegoating immigrants, Congress should be offering workable reforms that will strengthen our economy and our country.

THE NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT, H.R.
3003

H.R. 3003 would undermine public safety and interfere with local policing.

H.R. 3003 would amend 8 U.S.C. §1373 to prevent states or localities from establishing laws or policies that prohibit or “in any way” restrict compliance with or cooperation with federal immigration enforcement. The bill dramatically expands 8 U.S.C. §1373 which is more narrowly written and prohibits local law enforcement from restricting the sharing and exchange of information with federal authorities, but only with respect to an individual’s citizenship or immigration status.

Rather than empowering localities, the extremely broad wording of H.R. 3003 would strip localities of the ability to enact common-sense crime prevention policies that ensure victims of crime will seek protection and report crimes. The bill would also undermine public safety by prohibiting DHS from

honoring criminal warrants of communities deemed “sanctuary cities” if the individual being sought by local law enforcement has a final order of removal.

Under H.R. 3003, localities that fail to comply with federal immigration efforts are penalized with the denial of federal funding for critical law enforcement, national security, drug treatment, and crime victim initiatives, including the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP), Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), and Byrne JAG programs that provide hundreds of millions of dollars to localities nationwide.

In an effort to force localities to engage in civil immigration enforcement efforts, including those against nonviolent undocumented immigrants, the bill would make it far more difficult for many localities, including large cities, to arrest and prosecute potentially dangerous criminals. The bill could even offer criminals a form of immunity, knowing that any crimes they commit in a designated sanctuary city would result, at most, in their removal from the country as opposed to criminal prosecution.

H.R. 3003 would run afoul of constitutional safeguards in the Fourth Amendment.

By prohibiting localities from restricting or limiting their own cooperation with federal immigration enforcement, H.R. 3003 effectively compels localities to honor ICE detainer requests—a controversial and constitutionally suspect practice that is nonetheless widely used by ICE. Federal courts have found that ICE use of detainers violates the Fourth Amendment, and that localities may be held liable for honoring them.

The bill also expands detainer authority by establishing that ICE may issue detainer requests for localities to hold undocumented immigrants for up to 96 hours—twice what is currently allowed—even if probable cause has not been shown. Courts have concluded that localities cannot continue detaining someone unless ICE obtains a warrant from a neutral magistrate who has determined there is probable cause, or in the case of a warrantless arrest, review by a neutral magistrate within 48 hours of arrest. The expansive provisions in H.R. 3003 would force localities to choose between detaining people in violation of the Constitution or being punished as a “sanctuary city.”

Furthermore, this bill provides government actors and private contractors with immunity if they are sued for violating the Constitution. Provisions in this bill transfer the financial burden of litigation by substituting the federal government for the local officers as the defendant. If H.R. 3003 becomes law, American taxpayers would be stuck paying for lawsuits brought by those who are unjustly detained.

The bill goes even further by creating a private right of action allowing crime victims or their family members to sue localities if the crime was committed by someone who was released by the locality that did not honor an ICE detainer request.

H.R. 3003 would violate the Tenth Amendment.

H.R. 3003 would compel states and localities to utilize their local law enforcement resources to implement federal civil immigration enforcement in violation of the Tenth Amendment’s “commandeering” principle. The Tenth Amendment does not permit the federal government to force counties and cities to allocate local resources, including police officers, technology, and personnel, to enforce federal immigration law. The federal government also cannot withhold funds from localities refusing to participate in federal efforts if the programs affected are unrelated to the purpose of the federal program, or if the sanctions are punitive in nature.

H.R. 3003 would expand detention without due process.

H.R. 3003 would increase the use of detention without ensuring those detained have access to a bond determination. Under the bill, nearly anyone who is undocumented, including those who have overstayed their visa would be subject to detention without a custody hearing. The bill also establishes that DHS has the authority to detain individuals “without time limitation” during the pendency of removal proceedings. These provisions would dramatically expand the federal government’s power to indefinitely detain individuals, and would likely result in ever growing numbers of undocumented immigrants held in substandard detention facilities.

KATE’S LAW, H.R. 3004

H.R. 3004 would expand the already severe penalties in federal law for illegal reentry (INA §276; 8 U.S.C. §1326). The number of people prosecuted for illegal reentry has grown steadily to about 20,000 prosecutions each year, and such cases comprise more than one quarter of all federal criminal prosecutions nationwide. H.R. 3004 adds sentencing enhancements for people who are convicted of minor misdemeanors and people who have reentered multiple times but have no criminal convictions. This bill will not improve public safety and will undermine due process and protections for asylum seekers. H.R. 3004 would waste American taxpayer funds by imposing severe prison sentences upon thousands of people who pose no threat to the community and who have strong ties to the country and are trying to unite with their loved ones.

H.R. 3004 would impose severe sentencing enhancements upon people with minor offenses.

H.R. 3004 would add sentencing enhancements for minor misdemeanor convictions, including driving without a license and other traffic-related offenses. Under the current version of INA §276, if a person is charged with reentering the U.S. after being removed, their punishment is enhanced by up to ten years only if they have been convicted a felony or three or more misdemeanors involving drugs or violence. Under H.R. 3004 someone who has been convicted of any three misdemeanors regardless of severity would be subject to a term of up to ten years.

This expansion would unfairly target large numbers of people who are not a threat to public safety but instead are trying to reunite with family members and have other strong ties to the United States. Currently half of all people convicted of illegal reentry have one child living in the country. Increasing sentences for illegal reentry would also waste taxpayer dollars, costing huge amounts of money to lock up non-violent people.

H.R. 3004 would punish people who attempt to seek asylum at the border.

H.R. 3004 expands the provisions of INA §276 to punish not only people who reenter the U.S. or attempt to reenter the U.S., but also people who cross or attempt to cross the border. The bill goes on to define “crosses the border” to mean “the physical act of crossing the border, regardless of whether the alien is free from official restraint.” That means that people who present themselves at ports of entry to request asylum and are taken into custody by CBP to await a fear screening would be subject to criminal charges based on a past removal, even though they are seeking refuge in the U.S.

H.R. 3004 would impose severe sentencing enhancements for people with multiple entries.

The bill would also create new sentencing enhancements for people who have reentered

the U.S. multiple times, even if they have no other criminal convictions. If someone has been removed three or more times, and is found in the United States or attempts to cross the border again, H.R. 3004 law would provide for sentencing enhancements of up to ten years. The bill makes no exception for bona fide asylum seekers, which means that people who are seeking refuge in the U.S. from atrocities abroad could be subject to a lengthy prison sentence under these provisions.

H.R. 3004 would undermine due process by blocking challenges to unfair removal orders.

The bill will prevent an individual from challenging the validity of a removal order, even if it was fundamentally unfair in the first place. The Supreme Court held in *U.S. v. Mendoza-Lopez*, 481 U.S. 828 (1987) that due process requires that a challenge be allowed if a deportation proceeding is used as an element of a criminal offense and where the proceeding “effectively eliminate[d] the right of the alien to obtain judicial review.” This provision in H.R. 3004 is likely unconstitutional and will cause grave injustice to defendants, such as asylum seekers who were deported without the opportunity to seek asylum.

AFSCME,

Washington, DC, June 28, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.6 million members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I urge you to oppose the punitive and unnecessary No Sanctuary for Criminals Act (H.R. 3003) and its companion bill that increases penalties for certain immigrants (H.R. 3004). These bills together weaken the rights of immigrants, cut funding to vital state and local programs, and further criminalize immigrants.

H.R. 3003 and 3004 are deeply flawed pieces of legislation that would add chaos to an already broken immigration system when comprehensive reform is what is needed. The bills undermine state and local policing strategies that have worked well for many communities. Implementing this “one size fits all” approach, as proposed in these bills, jeopardizes the trust that diverse communities have placed in their police force and undermines federal grants that are aimed at helping law enforcement and that support the very programs needed to reduce crime.

H.R. 3003 forces communities to devote local resources to enforcing federal immigration law and penalizes them if they don’t comply. H.R. 3004 mandates increased penalties on immigrants for reentry, which could lead to a large increase in the prison population without additional resources. This would create new financial liability for federal, state, and local governments, that are already cash strapped, at a time when funding is urgently needed for investments in public safety, infrastructure and other vital community needs.

We urge the House to reject both H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,

Director of Federal Legislative Affairs.

SEIU,

Washington, DC, June 28, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the two million members of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), I urge you to vote no on H.R. 3004 and H.R. 3003, which are currently scheduled to come to the House floor this week. These mean-spirited and unwise bills would waste taxpayer dollars, shackle local law enforcement efforts to

protect the public, and make our nation's immigration laws even milder and less reasonable than they already are.

H.R. 3004, "Kate's Law," would increase the prison population of nonviolent offenders who pose no public safety risk, without evidence that its harsh provisions would have any impact on unlawful immigration, and without any other justification of its cost or impact on prison overcrowding. Those affected would include immigrants who have only committed minor misdemeanors such as driving without a license or other traffic-related offenses, and others who have never committed any crimes besides unauthorized entry. H.R. 3004 would also penalize persons fleeing persecution who voluntarily present themselves at the border to apply for asylum, and it would short circuit the current minimal due process protections that protect persons whose previous deportation was unlawful.

H.R. 3003, the "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act," is intended to commandeer state and local law enforcement resources to perform federal deportation activities. It is one part of the ongoing effort to villainize immigrants by unfairly—and against all available evidence—painting them all with a criminal brush for the misdeeds of a few. Rather than protecting the public, the provisions of H.R. 3003 would frustrate policies by states and localities that increase public safety by encouraging cooperation between law enforcement and the communities they serve. There is mounting evidence that localities with such policies experience lower crime because they build trust between the police and those they serve, thereby inspiring the community collaboration and assistance that is a key ingredient to maintaining safe neighborhoods.

It should be pointed out that the provisions of H.R. 3003 are sufficiently radical that even those who do not support sanctuary cities should vote no. The bill would deny important law enforcement funding to localities that are unwilling to honor any and all federal immigration detainer requests, including requests that courts have said are unconstitutional. It would empower private individuals to sue a locality if they or their family are victimized by a crime committed by an individual who was released despite a federal detainer request. It would render local governments powerless to prioritize local needs over immigration enforcement, even for local agencies funded by local taxes. And, if that weren't enough, a separate provision would significantly increase the categories of individuals subject to mandatory detention and prolonged detention without bond, thereby filling local jails and private prisons with individuals who pose no danger to themselves and no flight risk.

For the reasons listed above, both of these bills should be defeated. SEIU therefore asks you to vote no, and may add votes on any of them to our scorecard. If you have any questions, please contact Josh Bernstein.

Sincerely,

ROCIO SÁENZ,
Executive Vice President.

ASIAN AMERICANS
ADVANCING JUSTICE,
June 28, 2017.

FIVE CIVIL RIGHTS ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSE
LATEST IMMIGRATION ACTIONS IN THE HOUSE
HOUSE REPUBLICANS INTRODUCE TWO ANTI-IM-
MIGRANT BILLS DURING IMMIGRANT HERITAGE
MONTH

WASHINGTON, DC.—Representative Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.) introduced a set of anti-immigrant bills that are scheduled for a vote later this week. These are the latest in a line of bills that outline a clear anti-immigrant

strategy by House leadership and this administration.

H.R. 3003 seeks to authorize the Federal Government to withhold millions of dollars in federal funding for localities with limited detainer policies, sanctuary city policies, and community trust policies aimed at complying with the Constitution and making communities safer. H.R. 3004 would expand the Federal Government's ability to prosecute people for illegal reentry into the U.S., excludes humanitarian exemptions for people fleeing violence, and heightens penalties in those cases.

Asian Americans Advancing Justice, an affiliation of five civil rights organizations, issues the following statement in response:

"Asian Americans Advancing Justice strongly opposes H.R. 3003 (the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act), H.R. 3004 (known as Kate's Law), and the passage of any immigration enforcement legislation that would increase indiscriminate enforcement, further the criminalization of immigrants, and instill more fear in already terrified communities. Approximately 40 percent of all immigrants come to the U.S. from Asia, and 1.6 million of those immigrants are undocumented. Anti-immigrant policies create a climate of fear for all immigrants, regardless of status.

We are horrified and dismayed that House leadership has chosen to line up behind the administration in its scapegoating of immigrants. Both of these bills further the administration's goals of criminalizing all immigrants and expanding mass incarceration. Since the administration failed in its attempt to strip funding from municipalities with sanctuary and community trust policies in federal court, it is looking for Congress to fulfill its anti-immigrant agenda.

There is abundant evidence that sanctuary and community trust policies make communities safer. As Arizona and Texas have shown us, forcing local law enforcement to enforce immigration laws increases racial profiling and distrust of law enforcement by communities of color.

Rapidly pushing these bills through the House as America looks toward a holiday that celebrates the best of our American ideals is clearly an effort to slide this legislation under the radar of anyone who would oppose it, including millions of Americans who support immigrants' rights.

Vilifying and punishing immigrants who may be fleeing violence or seeking a better life for their families does not make us safer, just inhumane. We call on Congress to reject this latest anti-immigrant strategy. This vote will be a test for Members of Congress to show which side of justice they are on."

Asian Americans Advancing Justice is a national affiliation of five leading organizations advocating for the civil and human rights of Asian Americans and other underserved communities to promote a fair and equitable society for all. The affiliation's members are: Advancing Justice/AAJC (Washington, DC), Advancing Justice-Asian Law Caucus (San Francisco), Advancing Justice-Los Angeles, Advancing Justice-Atlanta, and Advancing Justice-Chicago.

FAIR IMMIGRATION
REFORM MOVEMENT,
June 29, 2017.

HOUSE GOP CONTINUES CRUEL CRUSADE
AGAINST IMMIGRANTS

WASHINGTON.—Kica Matos, spokesperson for the Fair Immigration Reform Movement (FIRM), issued the statement below after the House voted on the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act and Kate's Law:

"Republicans in the House are hell bent on criminalizing the hard working immigrants

who contribute so much to our country. This week they voted on two heartless bills that do nothing more than continue to fuel Trump's deportation machine.

The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act punishes "sanctuary cities," local jurisdictions addressing immigration issues without federal interference, and expands the government's inhumane practice of indefinite detention of immigrants.

The second bill, "Kate's Law" is a thinly veiled attempt to give prosecutors more power to continue the vicious mass incarceration of black and brown people by expanding on legal penalties for re-entry. The bill also limits the already limited protections for people reentering the country for humanitarian reasons.

The attacks on brown and black people by Republicans are not going unnoticed. The people are on our side—they marched with us on May 1st, they showed up after Trump issued the first refugee ban and they called out elected officials at town halls. Our message to Congress is clear: the only solution to fix the broken immigration system is a pathway to citizenship.

These two bills are the antithesis of our values and should be condemned by everyone.

The Fair Immigration Reform Movement (FIRM) is the nation's largest immigrant-rights coalition, with grassroots organizations fighting for immigrant rights at the local, state and federal level.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN).

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and his committee for their diligent work on this extremely important and timely law.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3004, Kate's Law. Our immigration system here in the United States is the most generous in the world. Good people from all over the globe who understand the American Dream seek to join us, and we are better for it.

Alexander Hamilton, Levi Strauss, Albert Einstein, and so many others have called themselves Americans because of it. But as we continue to draw on that spirit of understanding and acceptance, we have to remember that a nation without borders is not a nation.

We have a responsibility here in Congress to be proactive and protect our communities and our citizens from unlawful and criminal immigrants, and that is what this legislation does.

Kate's Law, named in honor of 32-year-old Kate Steinle, who was shot and killed in the prime of her life by an unlawful immigrant who had accumulated seven felony convictions, been deported five different times—you have heard this many times said—aims to strengthen public safety by imposing harsher mandatory prison sentences for deported felons who return to the U.S. and increasing penalties for unlawful immigrants who have been convicted of nonimmigration-related crimes.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation just makes sense, and I am confident that we can continue to welcome the tired, the poor, the huddled masses yearning to breathe free in our country without giving free rein to dangerous convicted criminals in any of our communities.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ).

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, for almost 100 percent of the people who would go to jail if this bill is enacted, they are not criminals and have no brush with the law. They were people who lived here for years, who had no chance of coming legally in the first place, and no way to get legal once they were here. Most have lived here for 10, 20, 30 years. They live in families with children, and their children are citizens of the United States just like you and me and our children. They have mortgages and car notes.

The problems these moms and dads are trying to solve is if they get deported, how do I make sure my kids are safe in the country in which they were born, the United States? How do I keep a roof over their head and get them ready for school? How do I keep my business open or my career continuing in the U.S. where I have lived, in some cases, for decades?

That is the problem they have, and guess what, they come back after they are deported. That person, to me, is not a felon, never committed a crime. That person is not a hardened criminal, never killed anyone.

□ 1615

That is a parent fighting for their family.

So in painting a picture of all immigrants as resembling a career criminal, like the guy who killed Kate Steinle, Republicans are doing the old bait and switch.

The people we are hitting with this bill come back to the lives they have built over decades by the only means we have made available, and now we are going to add a felony and 15 years to that.

Let's give moms and dads different alternatives. The people who would go to jail if this bill were enacted would rather have come with a visa. They would get in line for hours to get legal if there were a line to get in, but there isn't, and most Americans believe we should create such a line for them. They would come back legally if they could, but they can't.

We should be looking at how to solve that problem. We should be looking at ways to eliminate illegal immigration, and stop hoping that our strategy of the last 30 years of deportation, more restriction, and more criminalization would somehow miraculously start working.

It hasn't. It won't. It is time for us to enact comprehensive immigration reform in the Congress and to fulfill our responsibility to the Nation.

Look, the question today isn't whether or not this bill is going to pass. It is going to pass. The Republicans are making it a primary purpose.

The question really, for me, is: Are Democrats going to participate? Are Democrats going to participate in allowing this to pass?

I have just got to say that I know it is difficult.

Some people say: Well, I might not come back.

It will be difficult. My constituents demand this.

Well, let me just say that when I was elected in 1986 to the Chicago City Council, I was there but a month and they had the human rights bill for the gay and lesbian community. I remember the banner headlines: "Cardinal Says 'No.'"

Here I was a Catholic all my life, an altar boy, had three of the seven Catholic rites: communion, baptism, and marriage. Ten years later, I got to the Congress and was confronted here with the Defense of Marriage Act. We passed it. There were only about 70 of us who voted against it.

But guess what. Thirty years after I took that vote for gay rights in the Chicago City Council, the Supreme Court said that marriage equality was the law of the land and discriminating against them was against the Constitution of the United States of America.

That is the way you create social justice, not by doing a poll and not by trying to figure out what the next election consequences are going to be.

I say to my Democratic colleagues: Stand up for social justice today.

It wasn't easy as a Democrat to stand up for reproductive rights for women. I remember going to church and I remember being chastised by the priest. I remember being booed by some of the congregants as I left that church. But I stood up for what I believe are women's rights. My children were chased down the street during Halloween by pro-choice people who said I didn't deserve to be trick-or-treating with my children, that I was a bad father and I was a murderer. We stood up, and women have rights in this country.

That is the way we do that, Democrats. We stand up for what is right. We don't take a poll, and we don't think of the next election. We do what is right.

The immigrant community is looking for champions today, and it is my hope that, as Democrats, we, too, will stand up. When hate visits you, you need to repudiate it. You need to repudiate it because that hate might visit you in some personal way and it might cause you to hate yourself ultimately.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a statement in opposition to the bill from the Tahirih Justice Center.

TAHIRIH JUSTICE CENTER,
Falls Church, VA, June 27, 2017.

STATEMENT OF THE TAHIRIH JUSTICE CENTER
OPPOSING THE "NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS
ACT" (H.R. 3003) AND "KATE'S LAW" (H.R. 3004)

The Tahirih Justice Center ("Tahirih") respectfully submits this statement to the United States House of Representatives as it considers "The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act" (H.R. 3003; "The Act") and "Kate's Law" (H.R. 3004). The House Rules Committee is set to review these bills today, followed by the full House in the near future. Tahirih is a national, nonpartisan organization that has assisted over 20,000 immigrant survivors of gender-based violence over the

past 20 years. Our clients include women and girls who have endured horrific abuses such as rape and human trafficking and are in dire need of humanitarian relief.

Tahirih urges members of Congress to oppose H.R. 3003 and 3004: By further entangling federal and local immigration enforcement, H.R. 3003 will not only put survivors of human trafficking and domestic violence at greater risk of criminal harm, but will embolden violent criminals who pose a danger to us all. H.R. 3004 will unjustly punish asylum seekers who sought safe haven in the U.S., but were improperly denied access to the asylum process the first time around.

H.R. 3003: The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act: The Act seeks to erase the distinction between federal and local immigration enforcement. Such measures erode immigrant community trust of police, who rely on victims and witnesses to help get dangerous criminals off the streets. When immigrants know they can call 911 without fear of deportation, it is perpetrators—not victims or their children—that are deterred and punished. Abusers and traffickers deliberately manipulate and isolate victims to limit their access to information about their legal rights. Despite longstanding protections under the Violence Against Women Act, even victims who hold lawful immigration status succumb to intimidation, and remain afraid of deportation if they come forward. For some survivors, deportation means sentencing a US citizen child to the custody of a violent abuser. Following the recent passage of a state law to increase local immigration enforcement, a client aptly noted, "This is exactly what [my abuser] has been waiting for." We are all less safe when we make it easier for perpetrators to commit crimes.

The Act will also increase prolonged detention of survivors, resulting in further traumatization, separation from young children, and limited access to legal assistance and due process. The Act also punishes localities that refuse to comply, by revoking critical funding for core programs that address gun violence, gang violence, and other criminal activity. When local agencies must "choose" between continuing these programs and compromising community trust, it is the public that pays the steepest price.

H.R. 3004: Kate's Law: Tahirih and other advocates routinely assist clients whose initial requests for asylum at the border are met with hostility, intimidation, and coercion. These individuals are unlawfully denied access to the asylum process by U.S. officials. With their lives in grave danger, women and girls in this situation have no choice but to request safe haven in the U.S. a second or even third time. They are not asking to appeal denial of their claims; rather, they are merely seeking a threshold determination that they may apply for asylum or related protections. Our domestic laws and international humanitarian obligations require that they have this opportunity. H.R. 3004 will punish women fleeing horrific abuse who persist in their quest for asylum by limiting their ability to challenge initial, unlawful removals, and by unnecessarily and unjustly subjecting them to criminal prosecution.

We appreciate the opportunity to offer this statement in opposition to H.R. 3003 and 3004, and we urge Congress to unequivocally reject these harmful bills that undermine the safety of survivors of gender-based violence.

ARCHI PYATI,

Director of Policy and Programs.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Human Rights First: American Ideals. Universal Values.

HUMAN RIGHTS FIRST,
June 28, 2017.

Re H.R. 3004—115th Congress (2017–2018).

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We write to urge you to oppose H.R. 3004 (“Kate’s Law”) and any similar legislation that would have severely negative consequences for asylum seekers and refugees fleeing persecution.

H.R. 3004 seeks to expand the scope of immigrants who may be prosecuted for unlawful reentry and further expands penalties for those who are convicted. But the criminal prosecution of asylum seekers for offenses such as illegal entry, illegal reentry, and document fraud violates U.S. treaty obligations and risks sending genuine refugees back to their countries of persecution.

For one, many asylum seekers are forced to “reenter” the United States because they were wrongfully deported in the first place through the expedited removal system. The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF), as well as Human Rights First and other groups, has long documented deficiencies and flaws in the implementation of the expedited removal process, a summary process which gives immigration officers the authority to order non-citizens deported without a hearing. In its 2005 report on expedited removal, USCIRF found that in a significant number of cases, border agents failed to follow U.S. law and refer asylum seekers to the “credible fear” process, even when USCIRF researchers were present during the secondary inspection process.

Even when border agents make the proper referral for a credible fear screening, asylum seekers are often traumatized and exhausted by their experiences in their home countries, their flight to the United States, and their arrest by U.S. authorities. They are often interviewed by telephone by an officer they cannot see and are at the mercy of interpretation problems and other arbitrary factors that hinder communication. As a result, some may incorrectly be found to not have a credible fear, and may be deported as a result. These asylum seekers must then “reenter” the United States after facing continuing persecution in their home countries to seek protection yet again.

Moreover, H.R. 3004 would redefine “reentry” to encompass an even broader group of individuals, as it will define reentry as including cases of individuals who had been previously denied admission. Human Rights First release a report in May 2017, titled *Crossing the Line*, which documents cases of asylum seekers who have been turned back at U.S. ports of entry, despite stating to border agents that they had a fear of persecution or intended to seek asylum. While DHS officials have acknowledged that border agents should be following U.S. law and referring asylum seekers to the asylum process, Human Rights First and other groups have found that this practice continues. H.R. 3004 seeks to penalize an overly broad group of individuals that would even include those who were wrongfully turned away from our ports of entry in violation of U.S. law.

Secondly, prosecuting asylum seekers for their illegal entry or presence—even in the case of “reentry”—is a violation of U.S. treaty obligations under the Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees. Article 31 of the Refugee Convention requires that states refrain from imposing “penalties” on refugees on account of their illegal entry or presence in the country where they are seeking asylum. For this reason, in

2015, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General found that prosecutions under “Operation Streamline” may place the United States in violation of its treaty obligations.

If Congress passes H.R. 3004, more asylum seekers like Maria will be subjected to wrongful criminal prosecutions.

“Maria,” a transgender woman from Honduras, who had been raped and subjected to other sexual violence, fled to the United States in 2014. U.S. immigration officials failed to respond to her requests for asylum and she was deported back to Honduras through expedited removal without ever seeing an immigration judge or having her fear of persecution assessed by an asylum officer. Facing ongoing persecution in Honduras, she fled to the United States again in 2015, and was apprehended upon entry. U.S. border agents referred her for criminal prosecution and she was convicted of illegal reentry. After she was transferred back to immigration custody, she was determined to be a “refugee” who qualified for withholding of removal. Yet, the United States had already penalized her for “illegal entry” despite being a refugee.

Please contact Olga Byrne at Human Rights First if you have any questions regarding this letter. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

ELEANOR ACER,

Senior Director, Refugee Protection.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter opposing the bill from Cities for Action.

CITIES FOR ACTION,

June 28, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,

Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,

Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: Cities for Action (C4A) is a coalition of over 150 mayors and municipal leaders that advocates for policies to promote the well-being of our foreign born residents. Our coalition, representing over 50 million residents, has a considerable interest in protecting all our residents and ensuring that immigrants are not unjustly criminalized. We are writing to you today to urge that you oppose Representative Goodlatte’s bill, H.R. 3004, Kate’s Law.

Kate’s Law expands already tough penalties for illegal reentry and allows the government to detain immigrants indefinitely without bond or a court hearing. It also mistakenly implies that illegal reentry cases are under-enforced. Indeed, illegal reentry prosecutions already account for 52 percent of all federal prosecutions. H.R. 3004 would make the criminal sentences for reentry extremely harsh. Additionally, it would impose severe sentencing enhancements on people with minor offenses who reenter the country.

H.R. 3004 would also limit the ability to challenge the validity of any prior removal order that forms the basis for a prosecution for illegal reentry, subjecting people to prosecution even in cases where the prior order was issued without due process or was otherwise flawed. In addition, the bill does not provide adequate protections for people who reenter the United States for humanitarian reasons or those who seek protection at the border, putting asylum seekers and families at risk.

Cities and counties are opposed to this bill because these measures do not improve public safety and it is based on a false premise that immigrants pose a threat to our communities. Local governments have a strong

interest in protecting all residents and maintaining public safety. Therefore, we urge you to oppose Kate’s Law and stop its passage into law at every possible turn.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter,

CITIES FOR ACTION.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter opposing the bill from the Committee on Migration of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops and the Catholic Charities USA.

JUNE 26, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We write on behalf of the Committee on Migration of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB/COM), and Catholic Charities USA (CCUSA) to express our opposition to H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004.

The Catholic Church holds a strong interest in the welfare of migrants and how our nation welcomes and treats them. Our parishes include those with and without immigration status, unfortunately some who have witnessed or been victims of crime in the United States, including domestic violence, armed robbery, and assault. We understand the importance of fostering cooperation and information-sharing between immigrant communities and local law enforcement.

We oppose H.R. 3003 because it would impose obligations on local governments that we fear—and that many of them have warned—would undermine authority and discretion of local law enforcement. This, in turn, would hamper the ability of local law enforcement officials to apprehend criminals and ensure public safety in all communities.

Furthermore, Section 2 of H.R. 3003 would deny to jurisdictions vital federal funding related to law enforcement, terrorism, national security, immigration, and naturalization if those jurisdictions are deemed to be non-compliant with H.R. 3003. The Catholic service network, including Catholic Charities, works in partnership with the federal government on a number of Department of Justice and Department of Homeland Security initiatives, including disaster response and recovery, naturalization and citizenship services, and services for the immigrant, including victims of human trafficking, and domestic violence. These services are incredibly valuable to the protection and promotion of the human person and in some instances life-saving. Cutting grants related to these important national objectives, or threat of such cuts, is not humane or just, nor is it in our national interest.

Also, we oppose H.R. 3004 as it would lead to an expansion of incarceration and does not include adequate protections for people who re-enter the U.S. for humanitarian reasons or seek protection at the border. While H.R. 3004 makes notable efforts to protect us from those convicted of violent criminal offenses, the legislation goes far beyond this goal by expanding the government’s ability to prosecute illegal re-entry cases and heightening the criminal penalties in these cases. In an era of fiscal austerity, it is vital that important judicial resources are efficiently utilized to prosecute and convict the most violent offenders of violent crimes. Expanding who is eligible to be prosecuted for entry or re-entry as well as enhancing sentencing requirements does not advance the common good nor will it ensure that communities are safer. Furthermore, we are concerned that, as introduced, H.R. 3004 would also prevent vulnerable asylum seekers and unaccompanied children, (who have presented themselves repeatedly at the U.S. border in the flight from violence), from being able to access protection, and instead face fines, imprisonment or both.

We respectfully urge you to reject these bills in favor of a more comprehensive and humane approach to immigration reform; an approach that upholds human dignity and family unity and places a greater emphasis on balancing the needs and rights of immigrants with our nation's best interests and security.

The United States has a long and proud history of leadership in welcoming newcomers regardless of their circumstances and promoting the common good. We stand ready to work with you on legislation that more closely adheres to this tradition and appreciate your serious consideration of our views in this regard.

Sincerely,

MOST REV. JOE VÁSQUEZ,
*Bishop of Austin,
Chairman, USCCB
Committee on Migration.*

SR. DONNA MARKHAM, OP,
PHD,
*President & CEO,
Catholic Charities
USA.*

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter opposing the bill from Friends Committee on National Legislation: A Quaker Lobby in the Public Interest.

FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON
NATIONAL LEGISLATION,
June 27, 2017.

FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO THE NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT (H.R. 3003) AND KATE'S LAW (H.R. 3004)

The Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) is a Quaker lobby in the public interest committed to pursuing policies that build just societies, peaceful communities, and equitable relationships among all people. FCNL looks to Congress to legislate on immigration in a manner that honors the value of immigrants and American citizens alike and urges congressional representatives to reject any legislation which would undermine immigrant families and communities. Congress is tasked with creating lasting solutions for our nation. FCNL therefore urges members of Congress to oppose H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 which together further criminalize immigrants, expand detention, undermine community well-being, and offer no legislative remedy for a punitive and outdated immigration system.

H.R. 3003 is an extreme interior enforcement proposal that would affect over 600 cities, counties, and states and raises serious fourth and tenth amendment concerns. Effective policing depends on building authentic trust between police officers and the communities they serve; blurring the lines between federal immigration enforcement and local police results in fewer reported crimes and makes communities with large immigrant populations more vulnerable. Perpetrators of crime, assault, and abuse know that these communities are less likely to report the crime if they legitimately fear it will result in the deportation or detention of an immigrant neighbor, a loved one, or themselves. Law enforcement officials and advocates for survivors of domestic violence agree that the proposals included in this bill would be damaging for the communities they serve. FCNL heeds this call to ensure safety for the most vulnerable among us, and urges members of Congress to oppose H.R. 3003.

H.R. 3004 would expand grounds for indefinite detention and decrease legal opportunities for certain migrants challenging their removal. Our call as Quakers to welcome the stranger does not rest on the legal status of

any individual. Criminalizing entire immigrant communities based on the senseless actions of a few individuals tears at the moral fabric of our society and will not make our communities safer. H.R. 3004 could prevent migrants from adequately accessing asylum and would increase family hardship through separation by offering no meaningful opportunity for family members to pursue a legal route when seeking reunification across borders. These provisions will only fuel the brokenness of our system, which is already heavy-handed on indefinite detention and dangerous deportations at great expense to U.S. taxpayers and our collective moral conscience. Thousands of faith leaders have urged members of Congress to reject similar proposals in the past and live up to our call to minister to all those in need, especially those who have been marginalized. In keeping, FCNL urges members of Congress to oppose H.R. 3004.

FCNL looks instead for legislation that proceeds from a recognition of the inherent worth of all individuals, as acknowledged in our Quaker faith, as well as in our shared Constitution, laws, and American values. We call on Congress to reform the U.S. immigration system so that it is in line with the Quaker principle to answer to that of God in everyone and ensures we live up to our legacy as a country that thrives because we are a nation of diverse peoples and immigrants. Congress has the opportunity to enact practical solutions for comprehensive reform that includes clear and workable processes for legal entry and eventual citizenship. FCNL is eager to partner on such efforts, and seek the fundamental policy changes we need to help U.S. communities truly prosper.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter opposing the bill from the NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice.

JUNE 27, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CONYERS: NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice stands in strong opposition to the "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act" (H.R. 3003) and "Kate's Law" (H.R. 3004) to be considered this week by the House of Representatives. We urge Congress to reject these bills. In a county that prides itself on being the land of welcome and opportunity, we must ensure that our immigration laws reflect our shared values.

As Congress continues to delay comprehensive immigration reform and a permanent solution for the nation's 11 million undocumented immigrants, we are left with the status quo—an enforcement-only approach that tears apart families and keeps people in the shadows. Despite the gridlock in Congress, localities across the country still have the responsibility to uphold safety and peace in their communities. To fulfill this goal, local police and residents have fostered mutual trust to root out crime and promote public safety, encouraging community members to cooperate with local authorities. The "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act" (H.R. 3003) does nothing to promote public safety and instead will make communities more dangerous while striking fear in the hearts of our immigrant families.

Likewise, "Kate's Law" (H.R. 3004) would criminalize immigrants who simply want an opportunity to succeed in the United States, and often are simply trying to be reunited with their family. Punishing immigrants for wanting to provide for their families with fines and imprisonment is harsh and cruel—we, as a nation, are called to be better than that. Again, we ask Congress to abandon the "enforcement first" policies that have been the de facto U.S. strategy for nearly thirty years, yielding too many costs and too few

results. Our antiquated system that does not accommodate the migration realities we face in our nation today does not serve our national interests and does not respect the basic human rights of migrants who come to this nation fleeing persecution or in search of employment for themselves and better living conditions for their children.

Pope Francis cautions that "migrants and refugees are not pawns on the chessboard of humanity" and he asks political leaders to create a new system, one that "calls for international cooperation and a spirit of profound solidarity and compassion." This is a holy call to embrace hope over fear. Congress should recognize the God-given humanity of all individuals and uphold our sacred call to love our neighbor and welcome the stranger in our midst. Any action that further militarizes our borders, criminalizes assistance to immigrant communities, or weakens legal protection of refugees is neither just nor compatible with the values that we, as Americans, strive to uphold.

Sincerely,

SR. SIMONE CAMPBELL, SSS,
*Executive Director, NETWORK Lobby
for Catholic Social Justice.*

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the previous administration's biggest homeland security failures were the lack of prosecution and enforcement for crimes committed by illegal immigrants. For far too long, the Obama administration failed to adequately punish illegal immigrants who committed felonies in the United States.

A simple deportation is not enough. The United States must prosecute and sentence all individuals who commit crimes and hurt Americans.

When we enforce the law, we create a deterrent mechanism for future bad behavior. Failure to enforce the law is a failure to the American people. That is why I support Kate's Law.

I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for his strong work and leadership on this issue for the safety and security of the American people.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER).

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for yielding. I appreciate his boldness in protecting the citizens of America with great legislation.

Mr. Speaker, when the father of Kate Steinle, Jim, testified before Congress, he said: "Everywhere Kate went throughout the world, she shined the light of a good citizen from the United States of America. Unfortunately, due to unjoined laws and basic incompetence of the government, the United States has suffered a self-inflicted wound in the murder of our daughter by the hand of a person that should have never been on the streets in this country."

Well, today we can resolve that.

Two years ago this weekend, Kate's life was ended when she was gunned down by a five-time deported criminal illegal alien with seven prior felony convictions.

Kate's Law would stiffen penalties, helping to stop these preventable tragedies.

Additionally, today the House will pass the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act as well.

You just heard: Will Democrats participate?

Well, 80 percent of Americans support ending sanctuary cities, and no citizen should be in danger because politicians think they are above the law.

So will Democrats participate? Will they listen to their constituents?

Eighty percent of Americans feel pretty good about this law.

Both pieces of legislation serve the basic functions of our government by keeping the people of our States and country safe from those who wish to do us harm.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER).

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule of law, of strengthening the enforcement of our immigration system, and of improving the security of our Nation's borders. The safety and security of our constituents should be our absolute top priority for this Congress.

Sanctuary cities are a direct threat to our safety. That is why I led an effort to defund sanctuary cities through the appropriations process, and those sanctuary cities and their threat to our safety is why we are here today.

What happened to Kate Steinle was a tragedy. No parent should have to go through the anguish of losing their child, especially when it could have been avoided.

Unfortunately, the deadly toll of sanctuary cities is not limited to Kate. Last year, in my own community back in Kansas, Master Deputy Brandon Collins, a Johnson County sheriff's deputy with nearly 21 years of service, was struck and killed by a drunk driver while he was performing a routine traffic stop. Deputy Collins was a devoted and caring husband, father, son, brother, uncle, and friend whose life was tragically cut short.

The drunk driver, who fled from the scene of the crash, was an undocumented or an illegal immigrant who had prior convictions for DUI in California in 2001, and was also arrested for driving without a license in 2013. He should have never been behind the wheel of that car when he killed Deputy Collins.

Despite his prior offenses, the man was able to remain in the country. He was able to be here to commit this crime because of the failure to enforce the law, and it ultimately led to Deputy Collins' death.

No nation of laws should tolerate this.

For these reasons—for Deputy Collins and the many other victims and their loved ones dealing with an un-

speakable loss—for them, I support this bill, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in its passage.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The gentleman from Michigan has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), and I ask unanimous consent that she may control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a really tough bill because this is a really difficult subject. We mourn the loss of Kate Steinle, and we have an obligation to take action to keep our streets safe. But this bill doesn't do that.

Our goal has to be to remove dangerous criminals from our streets so that they don't harm people. That has got to be our focus.

That is why I am so frustrated that we are taking out of a comprehensive immigration reform bill—which could have done just that—a provision that would have addressed this issue in a more rational way; in a way that doesn't go after people seeking asylum; in a way that doesn't say, "If you have been convicted of three nonviolent misdemeanors, you go to jail for 10 years;" and in a way that doesn't punish people who are victims of human trafficking who—if they spent time in our prisons as a result of what they were forced to do, go back to their country, come back seeking asylum—could be forced to go to jail. These victims could be forced to go to jail for 20 years.

None of that is going to keep our communities safer.

We ought to work together. I urge my Republican colleagues to work with us to move forward with comprehensive immigration reform that will include provisions—like what is in this bill—that are still humane, provisions that will help keep American citizens safe, but that don't demonize immigrants.

It is possible to do both. My friends on the other side of the aisle know that it is possible to do both, and we ought to work together to get that done. That is the best way to keep our communities safe and to respect our values as Americans.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have only one speaker remaining, and I am prepared to close.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 9 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, one of the things I think is worth addressing is the provision of this bill that changes current law relative to unlawful entry or attempted unlawful entry.

Under 8 U.S.C. 1326, this is a crime if the individual evaded detection. This has been the principle in Federal law for more than 100 years. Since 1908, the Federal courts have recognized that illegal entry and illegal reentry require entry free from something called official restraint, otherwise known as detention.

Now, this bill would change that longstanding law. The bill amends U.S.C. 1326 to make the physical act of crossing the border a crime for any individual who has been previously removed or denied admission regardless of whether the individual was "free from official restraint" when doing so.

Now, why is this a problem?

As I mentioned earlier, individuals who, for one reason or another, need to come into the United States go to a port of entry, and they ask to see the Border Patrol agent. Under this law, that is a crime.

Now, let me give you some examples of what that would mean. I will just talk about the case of Juliza, who was a Guatemalan-Indian woman. She faced violent persecution really based on her ethnicity. She was raped by family members who referred to her as a dirty Indian as they assaulted her. As she went to report this assault to the police, she was sexually propositioned by the officers.

After a family member threatened her with sexual violence and death, she fled to the United States. She sought asylum, but she was promptly deported—turned away—by the Customs and Border Patrol. Within a month of returning to Guatemala, she was drugged, raped, and thrown into a river. She fled to the United States for a second time and, once again, was turned away without seeing an immigration judge or speaking to an asylum officer.

Finally, the third time she came, her 8-year-old son had been threatened by gang members, and she was finally allowed to make her case and was granted asylum.

□ 1630

Or the case of Carla. In June of 2016, Carla, who was from Mexico, and her children sought asylum after her father, son, grandfather, and uncle were killed in a span of 7 days, targeting her family. She went to the border to turn herself in. She was turned away by CBP agents twice.

After the family sought assistance from an attorney, they went back to the border, to the port of entry, and the CBP officers finally processed them appropriately under American immigration law. This was their third attempt. The U.S. immigration judge in Texas ruled that they were indeed refugees and granted asylum.

Now, I raise these two cases because you think deported, if you are turned away at the border, it counts for removal under the law. These individuals would be felons under this bill.

Making Juliza and her 8-year-old son or Carla a felon does not save an American from crime; it just doesn't. The two are not connected. And so to think that this bill, which does such harm to asylum seekers, is necessary to save Americans from threats is simply incorrect. It is important to stand up for our long-term values in international law.

There are other ways that one could become a criminal by showing up at the border. It is not uncommon that young people who have a valid visa issued by a U.S. consulate or Embassy come. They fly into the country and they are interviewed by a Customs and Border Patrol agent.

Now, if that person on the visitor visa is a 20-year-old young man who is unmarried, doesn't have a job in the country he is from, doesn't own a home, and is from kind of a poor country, it is not all that uncommon for the Border Patrol agency to make a decision that that person is not a good risk for entry, that they might overstay their visa and not return home.

I am not questioning that exercise of judgment, but if that same individual, 20 years later, is now a doctor and he has got a J visa to come in and be a doctor in the middle of America where there is a doctor shortage, he lands at Kennedy Airport with his visa to be a doctor, that would be a felony.

So the point I am making is there is much in this bill that does nothing about crime but to make criminals of people who have done nothing wrong. That is one of the reasons why we should vote against this bill.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, we are a nation of immigrants. There is not a person who has participated in this debate today who cannot go back a few years, a few generations or several generations and find someone in their family who came here to the United States, but we are also a nation of laws. The loss of respect for the rule of law is absolutely a serious problem in this country, and the step-by-step approach to restoring respect for the rule of law and reforming our immigration laws starts with these bills, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act and Kate's Law.

We are all about today, in this legislation, enhancing public safety, securing our borders, and restoring the rule of law.

We give discretion to Federal judges—discretion to Federal judges, I would add—to make sure that people who have entered this country previously illegally and who reenter the country can be given enhanced sentences. It is not mandatory by any means, and, in fact, in many instances,

it would be better to send the person outside the country and not have the taxpayers bear the expense.

But in the case of the individual who murdered Kate Steinle and had reentered the country five times and had committed other crimes while in the United States, having that additional time that the judge could impose on that individual who was just being released for having been convicted of illegally entering the country, Bureau of Prisons should have turned him over to ICE to send him out again. But if the ICE agents wanted to, when he entered illegally the previous time, recommend that he be given more time than the sentence he just served, he would have still been in prison when Kate Steinle walked down that pier with her father and was murdered by him.

So when those on the other side say this was not preventable by this law, they are entirely wrong. This law would have prevented that if a judge had chosen to impose that additional time that we are today providing in these cases.

We also clear up some uncertainty regarding this current law, and I think it is entirely appropriate to do so. It will deal with some of the situations that those on the other side have discussed, but most importantly, it will discourage people from entering the United States illegally, particularly when they have already entered illegally earlier and have been convicted of a crime for doing so.

So, to me, this is absolutely the beginning point of restoring to law enforcement at every level in our country the necessary tools to enforce our immigration laws, to work together to keep American citizens safe, like Kate Steinle and many, many others.

Yesterday, I had the opportunity to meet with about a dozen representatives of families who lost loved ones to the criminal acts of people who were not lawfully present in the United States. And so it is also entirely true to say that, had those individuals not been present in the United States, those crimes would not have been committed, those, in most instances, murders, in all instances, killings, would not have taken place.

Therefore, when you enforce our immigration laws, unlike laws applying to American citizens who also commit crimes, in the case of people who are not lawfully present in the United States, these crimes are entirely preventable if we enforce our immigration laws. Therefore, I would urge my colleagues to support Kate's Law and the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act to make sure that we go down this road of restoring the trust of the American people in their system of government, in their protection by their government, and in their own respect for the rule of law and know that their government is upholding that with regard to other individuals as well.

This is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following additional letter of opposition to H.R. 3004. This is a letter I mentioned earlier on the bill.

NATIONAL IMMIGRANT JUSTICE

CENTER,

June 27, 2017.

H.R. 3003 AND 3004 UNDERMINE AMERICAN VALUES NIJC OPPOSES THE "NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT" AND "KATE'S LAW"

This week the House of Representatives will vote on two bills that attempt to rewrite our nation's immigration laws to reflect a dangerous philosophy of governance. For decades now, elected officials across the bipartisan divide have joined together calling for a compassionate and common sense approach to immigration legislation. These bills move us further away from that goal. H.R. 3003, ironically named the "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act," will endanger the safety of our communities by forcing local police to abandon community policing efforts and become a full partner with the administration's massive deportation force. H.R. 3004, known as "Kate's Law," will result in the unnecessary incarceration of countless immigrants for the mere act of migration.

The National Immigrant Justice Center calls on elected officials to reject such nonsensical and harmful legislation. In the face of hateful rhetoric, now is the time to stand with immigrant communities.

H.R. 3003, THE "NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT", WILL FURTHER ERODE COMMUNITY TRUST IN LOCAL POLICE AND PUT OUR COMMUNITIES IN DANGER

H.R. 3003 amends 8 U.S.C. §1373 to prohibit states and localities from enacting policies that in any way limit cooperation with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), even when federal courts have ruled such cooperation unconstitutional.

The law would strip localities of vital discretion to enact immigration-enforcement-related laws and policies that are smart and effective for their communities. Specifically, it prohibits localities from declining to comply with requests from ICE to jail individuals under detainer requests even when doing so will put them in blatant violation of binding federal court orders. Our communities are safer when residents feel safe calling for help and assisting police in investigating and prosecuting crimes. By effectively forcing localities into the business of federal immigration law, this law will preclude cities and counties from using their limited local resources to address public safety concerns in the ways they deem most appropriate and effective.

On top of the danger the bill poses to community safety, this law arguably violates the "anti-commandeering" principle of the Tenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

H.R. 3003 punishes jurisdictions for engaging in smart community policing.

The law would punish jurisdictions that choose to limit cooperation with federal immigration enforcement by stripping federal funding that fulfills vital law enforcement needs, including the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP), the "Cops on the Beat Program," the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Program, and any other grant administered by the Departments of Justice or Homeland Security that are deemed "substantially related to law enforcement, terrorism, national security, immigration, or naturalization." In addition to running further afoul of the Tenth Amendment, this law cruelly forces jurisdictions to choose between maintaining critical funds, including

for community policing, or exposing themselves to the significant legal and financial liability that accompany compliance with detainer requests under the Fourth Amendment and the Fourteenth Amendment.

H.R. 3003 upends the criminal justice system by permitting and in some cases requiring ICE to ignore criminal warrants issued by state and local jurisdictions that it deems in non-compliance with other provisions of the bill.

H.R. 3003 vastly expands ICE's authority to force localities to detain immigrants with no regard for the Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and gives local actors immunity for resulting constitutional violations.

The law makes a mockery of the Fourth Amendment by giving lip service to the notion of "probable cause" but in reality allowing ICE to ask localities to detain immigrants longer than they would otherwise be held simply on the basis of a belief that the individual is removable from the United States. The law then goes on to provide local actors immunity for resulting constitutional violations. In practice, this piece of the law essentially requires local actors to violate the constitution and then gives them immunity for doing so. It is legislative overreach at its worst.

H.R. 3003 demonizes immigrants by creating a new private right of action for victims of crime solely on the basis of the citizenship status of the perpetrator of the crime.

The law provides that an individual or surviving relative can bring a lawsuit against a state or locality if the perpetrator of the offense is a non-citizen and was released from custody pursuant to a trust policy. This provision allows the worst kind of scapegoating, manipulating individual tragedies to demonize all immigrants.

H.R. 3003 expands the already damaging "mandatory detention" provisions of immigration law, requiring no-bond detention for large categories of undocumented individuals for the duration of deportation proceedings against them.

The law thumbs its nose at the basic due process protections of our United States Constitution, explicitly approving of indefinite detention for individuals in immigration custody regardless of their community ties to the United States or necessity for detention. Specifically, the law expands greatly the categories of immigrants who are denied access to any individualized bond determination throughout their time in immigration jail. With deaths in immigration detention occurring with alarming frequency and rates of representation in detention alarmingly low, these provisions are nothing but cruel.

H.R. 3004, "KATE'S LAW," WILL FURTHER THE MASS INCARCERATION OF IMMIGRANTS—INCLUDING ASYLUM SEEKERS—BY INCREASING PENALTIES FOR THE MERE ACT OF MIGRATION

H.R. 3004 expands the existing criminal offense of illegal reentry to punish legitimate asylum seekers fleeing violence in their countries of origin.

The law expands the category of individuals punishable by section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to include even those men and women who surrender themselves at the southern border to seek protection in the United States.

H.R. 3004 senselessly expands sentencing enhancements for illegal reentry at a time when more than half of all federal prosecutions target migration-related offenses.

The law provides incredibly harsh sentencing enhancements for individuals seeking to return to the United States after a previous removal on the basis of prior con-

victions or entries. Apart from the cruel and unnecessary use of federal prison to separate families, this bill will prove exorbitant in its costs at a time when taxpayers have already footed a bill of more than \$7 billion to incarcerate migrants for migration-related offenses over the past decade.

H.R. 3004 punishes immigrants for illegal reentry even if their previous deportation orders were unlawful and deprived them of the opportunity to seek protection. This law entirely prohibits defendants in illegal reentry cases from challenging the validity of their prior deportation orders. This provision is blatantly unconstitutional and in violation of Supreme Court jurisprudence that protects against punishing immigrants on the basis of legally defective deportation orders. See *U.S. v. Mendoza-Lopez*, 481 U.S. 828 (1987). This law will criminalize, for example, asylum seekers who return to the United States after being previously denied the opportunity to present their claims for protection. Given the already anemic protections for asylum seekers at our southern border, these provisions will inevitably harm the most vulnerable among us.

A vote for H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 is a vote for hatred and a vote against community safety. NIJC calls on Members of Congress to stand on the right of history and oppose these harmful measures.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 415, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. LOFGREN. I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Lofgren moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3004 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

SEC. 3. PROTECTING VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING.

Section 276 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(i) PROTECTING VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING.—It shall not be a violation of this section for a victim of sex trafficking to voluntarily present herself or himself at a port of entry to request protection."

Mr. GOODLATTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the motion.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues across the aisle insist that today's bill is intended to keep Americans safe by enhancing penalties for criminals who reenter illegally or at-

tempt to do so. I am offering an amendment that takes Republicans at their word.

This amendment would make clear that H.R. 3004 would not be used to criminally prosecute and incarcerate sex trafficking victims merely for seeking protection at ports of entry.

As should be evident at this stage of debate, the provisions of this bill extend well beyond immigrants with criminal histories; in fact, they reach many of the most vulnerable and persecuted members of society. Perhaps most egregiously, H.R. 3004 authorizes, for the first time, the prosecution of individuals who voluntarily present themselves at points of entry to seek relief consistent with our immigration laws, and that includes individuals seeking protection as victims of sex trafficking.

Let's be clear on the law. Today, it is not a crime for an individual who has been previously denied admission or removed to voluntarily present herself at a port of entry seeking to reenter the country legally. This bill changes that by making the simple act of going to the port of entry, which itself requires the physical act of crossing the border, a felony offense for such individuals.

These are not individuals attempting to evade immigration agents. They are not trying to sneak into the United States. They are simply exercising the right to lawfully approach a U.S. port of entry to seek permission to enter.

Under this bill, the act of approaching CBP agents now becomes criminally prosecutable as an illegal reentry. Anyone with a prior removal order or even merely denied admission commits a crime by so much as stepping into the port of entry.

I mentioned the two asylee seekers a few moments ago. These are people who are fleeing danger and under our laws have the right to present their cases. Now, H.R. 3004 would do this to the women I mentioned: It would make them criminals, and it would allow for the prosecution and imprisonment for up to 2 years.

Now, even if our immigration system awarded these victims protection, such as a T visa for human trafficking, the criminal justice system could take away her liberty.

I strongly hope that my colleagues across the aisle would not seek to punish women who are fleeing from sex traffickers, because there are thousands of women who are innocent, abused, sexually trafficked by the worst of civilization, and instead of offering help to these women, this bill would put them in prison. It would prosecute them for asking, of all things, that their life be saved.

I mentioned earlier, we put in the RECORD, the opposition of the Tahirih Justice Center to this bill. They advocate for victims of trafficking and gender-based violence, and they oppose this bill with all their strength. Here is what they say, and it is a quote: "H.R. 3004 will punish women fleeing horrific abuse. . . ."

Now, I disagree with some of the elements of this bill, and I have tried to make clear why, but I take Mr. GOODLATTE at his word that he wants to make sure that we have a safe society. I think, if that is his hope, we will make clear that sex trafficking victims are not going to be prosecuted or considered criminals when they enter a port of entry and present themselves to U.S. officials.

This amendment is the chance for Republicans to show that they really are for the rule of law. It would stipulate that this bill would not subject sex trafficking victims to criminal prosecution merely for voluntarily presenting themselves at the border to request protection from the unspeakable harm that they have suffered.

I will close with this. Years ago, we worked together on a bipartisan basis to fight sex trafficking. We created the U and T visas. It was a broad bipartisan coalition. I remember now Governor Sam Brownback and others, people who are at other ends, opposite ends of the ideological spectrum, but we came together to fight sex trafficking. We should do the same thing today. Let's not forget that we can work together to do the right thing.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit not only changes the bill before us, but it also changes current law. It has long been Federal law that an alien who has been deported and who returns to the U.S. is subject to possible criminal prosecution.

□ 1645

Under this bill, an alien who has received consent from the Department of Homeland Security to return or is not required to seek consent from DHS has an affirmative defense.

Obviously, such an alien will never be prosecuted. Never has, never will. In fact, because this is current law—and the gentlewoman was the chairman of the Immigration and Border Security Subcommittee for 4 years and never offered such an amendment to current law—I see no reason to address it in this legislation.

I will say that we have all been committed in a very bipartisan fashion to combating sex trafficking. We passed several bills through this House, some with the gentlewoman's support, some without, that do indeed combat sex trafficking.

But back to the issue before us today. Criminal aliens are reentering the United States after being removed all the time. Without stronger enforcement measures in place, this government cannot provide an appropriate deterrence for these reentries.

Kate's Law takes a tough approach to dealing with criminal aliens who reenter the United States. Instead of the majority being subjected to no more than a 2-year maximum sentence, this bill takes an individual's criminal history into consideration and provides enhanced penalties accordingly. While the 2-year sentence may not deter illegal reentry, a potential 25-year sentence certainly would.

Nothing can bring Kate Steinle back and nothing can absolutely prevent such crimes from occurring in the future. This legislation is meant to honor her memory and clearly demonstrate that this Congress will act.

This legislation is another step in bringing stronger enforcement measures to improve our immigration enforcement capabilities. Longer sentences for those criminal aliens who reenter the United States illegally is an important aspect of that mechanism.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this motion to recommit, vote for the underlying bill, and to truly deter criminal aliens from reentering the United States.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Secretary of the Senate be directed to request the House to return to the Senate the bill (S. 722) "An Act to provide congressional review and to counter Iranian and Russian governments' aggression."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to recommit on H.R. 3003;

Passage of H.R. 3003, if ordered;

The motion to recommit on H.R. 3004; and

Passage of H.R. 3004, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 3003) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify provisions relating to assistance by States, and political subdivision of States, in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 181, nays 230, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 341]

YEAS—181

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Adams | Galleo | O'Halleran |
| Aguilar | Garamendi | O'Rourke |
| Barragan | Gonzalez (TX) | Pallone |
| Bass | Gottheimer | Panetta |
| Bera | Green, Al | Pascrell |
| Bishop (GA) | Green, Gene | Payne |
| Blumenauer | Grijalva | Pelosi |
| Blunt Rochester | Gutiérrez | Perlmutter |
| Bonamici | Hanabusa | Peters |
| Boyle, Brendan | Hastings | Peterson |
| F. | Heck | Pingree |
| Brady (PA) | Higgins (NY) | Pocan |
| Brown (MD) | Himes | Polis |
| Brownley (CA) | Hoyer | Price (NC) |
| Bustos | Jackson Lee | Quigley |
| Butterfield | Jayapal | Raskin |
| Capuano | Jeffries | Rice (NY) |
| Carbajal | Johnson (GA) | Richmond |
| Cárdenas | Johnson, E. B. | Rosen |
| Cartwright | Kaptur | Roybal-Allard |
| Castor (FL) | Keating | Ruiz |
| Castro (TX) | Kelly (IL) | Ruppersberger |
| Chu, Judy | Kennedy | Ryan (OH) |
| Ciциlline | Khanna | Sánchez |
| Clark (MA) | Kihuen | Sarbanes |
| Clarke (NY) | Kildee | Schakowsky |
| Clay | Kilmer | Schiff |
| Cleaver | Kind | Schneider |
| Clyburn | Krishnamoorthi | Schrader |
| Cohen | Kuster (NH) | Scott (VA) |
| Connolly | Langevin | Scott, David |
| Conyers | Lawrence | Serrano |
| Cooper | Lawson (FL) | Sewell (AL) |
| Correa | Lee | Shea-Porter |
| Costa | Levin | Sherman |
| Courtney | Lewis (GA) | Sinema |
| Crist | Lieu, Ted | Sires |
| Crowley | Lipinski | Slaughter |
| Cuellar | Loeb sack | Soto |
| Davis (CA) | Lofgren | Speier |
| Davis, Danny | Lowenthal | Suozi |
| DeFazio | Lowey | Swalwell (CA) |
| DeGette | Lujan Grisham, | Takano |
| Delaney | M. | Thompson (CA) |
| DeLauro | Luján, Ben Ray | Thompson (MS) |
| DelBene | Lynch | Titus |
| Demings | Maloney, | Tonko |
| DeSaulnier | Carolyn B. | Torres |
| Deutch | Maloney, Sean | Tsongas |
| Dingell | Matsui | Vargas |
| Doggett | McCollum | Veasey |
| Doyle, Michael | McEachin | Vela |
| F. | McGovern | Velázquez |
| Ellison | McNerney | Visclosky |
| Engel | Meng | Walz |
| Eshoo | Moore | Wasserman |
| Españillat | Moulton | Schultz |
| Esty (CT) | Murphy (FL) | Waters, Maxine |
| Evans | Nadler | Watson Coleman |
| Foster | Neal | Welch |
| Fudge | Nolan | Wilson (FL) |
| Gabbard | Norcross | Yarmuth |

NAYS—230

| | | |
|----------|-----------|------------|
| Abraham | Amash | Babin |
| Aderholt | Amodei | Bacon |
| Allen | Arrington | Banks (IN) |

Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)

NOT VOTING—22

Beatty
Beyer
Bishop (UT)
Carson (IN)
Chaffetz
Cummings
Frankel (FL)
Gosar

□ 1707

Mrs. HARTZLER, Ms. STEFANIK, Messrs. DUFFY, HUNTER, and LAMBORN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. VELA, DOGGETT, HOYER, SWALWELL of California, SHERMAN, and COHEN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 341, I was not present because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 195, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 342]

YEAS—228

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy

Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy

McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao

Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack

NAYS—195

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

NOT VOTING—10

Chaffetz
Cummings
Gosar
Long

□ 1714

Mr. REICHERT changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, 2017, I was not present for the vote on H.R. 3003. Had I been present, I would

Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
King
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Scott (VA)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan

Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 342 (Final Passage of H.R. 3003).

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 342.

KATE’S LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 3004) to amend section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to re-entry of removed aliens, offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 193, nays 232, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

YEAS—193

- Adams, Evans, McNeerney
Aguilar, Foster, Meeks
Barragan, Frankel (FL), Meng
Bass, Fudge, Moore
Beatty, Gabbard, Moulton
Bera, Gallego, Murphy (FL)
Beyer, Garamendi, Nadler
Bishop (GA), Gonzalez (TX), Neal
Blum, Gottheimer, Nolan
Blumenauer, Green, Al, Norcross
Blunt, Rochester, Green, Gene, O’Halleran
Bonamici, Grijalva, O’Rourke
Boyle, Brendan F., Gutierrez, Pallone
Brady (PA), Hanabusa, Panetta
Brown (MD), Hastings, Pascarell
Brownley (CA), Heck, Payne
Bustos, Higgs (NY), Pelosi
Butterfield, Himes, Perlmutter
Capuano, Hoyer, Peters
Carbal, Huffman, Peterson
Cardenas, Jackson Lee, Pingree
Carson (IN), Jayapal, Pocan
Cartwright, Jeffries, Polis
Castor (FL), Johnson (GA), Price (NC)
Castro (TX), Johnson, E. B., Quigley
Chu, Judy, Jones, Raskin
Cicilline, Kaptur, Rice (NY)
Clark (MA), Keating, Richmond
Clarke (NY), Kelly (IL), Rosen
Clay, Khanna, Ruiz, Roybal-Allard
Cleaver, Kihuen, Ruppertsberger
Clyburn, Kildee, Rush
Cohen, Kilmer, Ryan (OH)
Connolly, Kind, Sanchez
Conyers, Krishnamoorthi, Sarbanes
Cooper, Kuster (NH), Schakowsky
Correa, Langevin, Schiff
Costa, Larsen (WA), Schneider
Courtney, Larson (CT), Schrader
Crist, Lawrence, Scott (VA)
Crowley, Lawson (FL), Scott, David
Cuellar, Lee, Serrano
Davis (CA), Levin, Sewell (AL)
Davis, Danny, Lewis (GA), Shea-Porter
DeFazio, Lieu, Ted, Sherman
DeGette, Lipinski, Sinema
Delaney, Loeb, Sires
DeLauro, Lofgren, Slaughter
DelBene, Lowenthal, Smith (WA)
Demings, Lowey, Soto
DeSaulnier, Lujan Grisham, Speier
Deutch, M., Suozzi
Dingell, Lujan, Ben Ray, Swalwell (CA)
Doggett, Lynch, Takano
Doyle, Michael F., Maloney, Thompson (CA)
Ellison, Carolyn B., Thompson (MS)
Engel, Maloney, Sean, Titus
Eshoo, Matsui, Tonko
Espaillat, McCollum, Torres
Esty (CT), McEachin, Tsongas
McGovern, Vargas

- Veasey
Vela
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Waltz
Wilson (FL)
Waters, Maxine

NAYS—232

- Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lefcoske
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messier
Mitchell
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Murray (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
O’Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Pascarella
Pell
Peters
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rooney, Francis
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—8

- Chaffetz
Cummings
Gosar
Long
Napolitano
Nunes
Scalise
Stivers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1720

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 257, noes 167, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 344]

AYES—257

- Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Cuellar
Culberson
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messier
Mitchell
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Murray (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
O’Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Pascarella
Pell
Peters
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rooney, Francis
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| Speier | Upton | Williams |
| Stefanik | Valadao | Wilson (SC) |
| Stewart | Wagner | Wittman |
| Swalwell (CA) | Walberg | Womack |
| Taylor | Walden | Woodall |
| Tenney | Walker | Yoder |
| Thompson (PA) | Walorski | Yoho |
| Thornberry | Walters, Mimi | Young (AK) |
| Tiberi | Weber (TX) | Young (IA) |
| Tipton | Webster (FL) | Zeldin |
| Trott | Wenstrup | |
| Turner | Westerman | |

NOES—167

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Adams | Gabbard | Panetta |
| Aguilar | Gallego | Pascrell |
| Amash | Garamendi | Payne |
| Barragán | Gonzalez (TX) | Pelosi |
| Bass | Green, Al | Perlmutter |
| Beatty | Green, Gene | Peters |
| Bera | Grijalva | Pingree |
| Beyer | Gutiérrez | Pocan |
| Bishop (GA) | Hanabusa | Polis |
| Blumenauer | Hastings | Price (NC) |
| Blunt Rochester | Heck | Quigley |
| Bonamici | Himes | Raskin |
| Boyle, Brendan | Hoyer | Rice (NY) |
| F. | Huffman | Richmond |
| Brady (PA) | Jackson Lee | Rosen |
| Brown (MD) | Jayapal | Roybal-Allard |
| Brownley (CA) | Jeffries | Ruiz |
| Bustos | Johnson (GA) | Rush |
| Butterfield | Johnson, E. B. | Ryan (OH) |
| Capuano | Kelly (IL) | Sánchez |
| Carbajal | Kennedy | Sarbanes |
| Cárdenas | Khanna | Schakowsky |
| Carson (IN) | Kihuen | Schiff |
| Castor (FL) | Kildee | Schneider |
| Castro (TX) | Kilmer | Schrader |
| Chu, Judy | Krishnamoorthi | Scott (VA) |
| Cicilline | Larsen (WA) | Scott, David |
| Clark (MA) | Lawrence | Serrano |
| Clarke (NY) | Lawson (FL) | Sewell (AL) |
| Clay | Lee | Shea-Porter |
| Cleaver | Levin | Sherman |
| Clyburn | Lewis (GA) | Sires |
| Cohen | Lieu, Ted | Slaughter |
| Connolly | Liebsack | Smith (WA) |
| Conyers | Lofgren | Soto |
| Correa | Lowenthal | Suoizzi |
| Costa | Lowey | Takano |
| Crowley | Lujan Grisham, | Thompson (CA) |
| Davis (CA) | M. | Thompson (MS) |
| Davis, Danny | Luján, Ben Ray | Titus |
| DeGette | Maloney, | Tonko |
| Delaney | Carolyn B. | Torres |
| DeLauro | Maloney, Sean | Tsongas |
| DelBene | Matsui | Vargas |
| DeSaulnier | McCollum | Veasey |
| Deutch | McGovern | Vela |
| Dingell | McNerney | Velázquez |
| Doggett | Meeks | Visclosky |
| Doyle, Michael | Meng | Walz |
| F. | Moore | Wasserman |
| Ellison | Moulton | Schultz |
| Engel | Nadler | Waters, Maxine |
| Eshoo | Neal | Watson Coleman |
| Espallat | Neal | Welch |
| Evans | Nolan | Wilson (FL) |
| Foster | Norcross | Yarmuth |
| Frankel (FL) | O'Rourke | |
| Fudge | Pallone | |

NOT VOTING—9

| | | |
|----------|------------|---------|
| Chaffetz | Long | Nunes |
| Cummings | McEachin | Scalise |
| Gosar | Napolitano | Stivers |

□ 1726

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 341, No. 342, No. 343 and No. 344 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 3003. I would have also voted "nay" on the Final Passage of H.R. 3003—No Sanctuary for Criminals Act. I would have also voted "yea" on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 3004. I

would have also voted "nay" on H.R. 3004—Kate's Law.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, on the legislative day of Thursday, June 29, 2017, I was unable to cast a vote on a number of rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

Rollcall 341—"Nay."

Rollcall 342—"Yea."

Rollcall 343—"Nay."

Rollcall 344—"Yea."

URGING THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA TO UNCONDITIONALLY RELEASE LIU XIAOBO, TOGETHER WITH HIS WIFE LIU XIA, TO ALLOW THEM TO FREELY MEET WITH FRIENDS, FAMILY, AND COUNSEL AND SEEK MEDICAL TREATMENT WHEREVER THEY DESIRE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 67, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 67

Whereas Liu Xiaobo has inspired untold numbers of people in the People's Republic of China and globally for his courageous stands for democracy, the protection of human rights, and peaceful change in China;

Whereas, on December 9, 2008, a diverse group of more than 300 Chinese scholars, writers, lawyers, and activists issued Charter 08, a manifesto calling on the Chinese Communist Party to abandon authoritarian rule in favor of democracy, the guarantee of human rights, and the rule of law;

Whereas Liu Xiaobo was one of the original drafters of Charter 08 and was taken into custody one day before the manifesto was released;

Whereas in December 2009, a Beijing court sentenced Liu Xiaobo to eleven years in prison for "inciting subversion of state power", in part for his role in Charter 08;

Whereas in recognition of Liu Xiaobo's long and non-violent struggle for fundamental human rights in the People's Republic of China, he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in October 2010;

Whereas Liu Xiaobo's wife Liu Xia, has been held in extralegal home confinement since October 2010, two weeks after her husband's Nobel Peace Prize award was announced, and has reportedly suffered severe health problems over the years which required hospitalization;

Whereas in May 2011, the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention issued opinions declaring that the Chinese Government's imprisonment of Liu Xiaobo and the detention of Liu Xia both contravened the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

Whereas Liu Xiaobo was diagnosed with terminal liver cancer in May 2017 and granted permission to access medical treatment

outside of prison and is currently hospitalized in China;

Whereas, according to news and family reports, Liu Xiaobo's cancer has metastasized and the Chinese Government has refused requests by his family to transfer him to Beijing for medical treatment; and

Whereas Liu Xiaobo currently cannot freely meet with friends and family or seek medical care outside of China: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes Liu Xiaobo for his decades of peaceful struggle for basic human rights and democracy in the People's Republic of China;

(2) urges the Government of the People's Republic of China to unconditionally release Liu Xiaobo, together with his wife Liu Xia, to allow them to freely meet with friends, family, and counsel and seek medical treatment wherever they desire; and

(3) urges the Administration to seek humanitarian transfer from the People's Republic of China for Liu Xiaobo, together with his wife Liu Xia, so that he can seek medical treatment in the United States or elsewhere overseas.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 60

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 60.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 353

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 353.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 60.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 60.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 2017, TO MONDAY, JULY 3, 2017

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Monday, July 3, 2017.

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

There was no objection.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY RICHARD "THE KING" PETTY

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, our country will celebrate our independence and the rebuke of the British monarchy. Even still, we know across America, but especially in the great State of North Carolina, we have our own king, who turns 80 on Sunday.

Richard "The King" Petty is the most decorated and respected driver in the history of motor sports. His legendary 43 car dominated race tracks for decades. He has even been awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President George H.W. Bush.

More importantly than Mr. Petty's work on the track are the lives that he has impacted. The Petty family, through the work of multiple charities and the impactful Victory Junction Camp, has served children with disabilities in incredible ways.

Mr. Petty, you and Kyle and the rest of the family even showed what grace and dignity looks like in the loss of a grandson.

We wish you a happy birthday today, Richard "The King" Petty. Thank you for all you do for the people of North Carolina, and I will be looking for that hat, those sunglasses, and that bright smile for years to come.

TRANSFORM STUDENT DEBT TO HOME EQUITY

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Transform Student Debt to Home Equity Act.

Today, 40 million Americans have Federal student loan debt totaling \$1.3 trillion. Additionally, at the end of 2016, 17.2 million habitable homes sat vacant in our country.

These two trends are intertwined. Student debt is prohibiting millions and millions from buying their first home. We must find a solution, or thousands more will be saddled with sunk debt depriving them of building wealth through building home equity.

The Transform Student Debt to Home Equity Act offers us a road forward. This bill allows the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Federal Housing Finance Agency to start a pilot program that connects creditworthy Federal student debt holders with habitable homes for sale from the Federal ledger.

By recalculating financing terms and interest rates, some student debtors can transition their debt into homeownership. Eventually creditworthy participants would pay off debt and help strengthen neighborhoods simply by maintaining their home mortgage.

We must use our power and resources to transform debt to equity. Transforming a student debt to home ownership is a pathway forward for the aspiring generation.

I encourage my colleagues to support our measure, and let us unleash the stranglehold of debt on the next generation and allow them to build wealth through homeownership.

CONGRATULATIONS CASSY LESTER AND ALL ART COMPETITION WINNERS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today this House welcomes the winners of the Congressional Art Competition to the Nation's Capitol. Students from all over the country have traveled to Washington to proudly display their works of art in the tunnel to the Capitol for the next year.

The Congressional Institute hosts the nationwide competition each year to showcase and inspire the artistic talent of high school students from each congressional district. I am proud of the 37 students from my district who submitted entries.

I am thrilled to welcome our first-place winner, Cassy Lester of Reynoldsville, for her acrylic painting titled "Chocolate Lab." Cassy attends Jeff Tech, and it is an honor to recognize a career and technical education student as our winner this year.

She was honored with her fellow winners from the States across the Nation at this afternoon's luncheon, and earlier today, I was able to give Cassy and her family a tour of the Capitol.

Congratulations to Cassy and all of this year's winners. We are grateful to have your art brighten the walls of the tunnel of this Capitol for the year ahead.

HONORING ANDREW ROGERS

(Mr. SCHRADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give special recognition to Andrew Rogers, the last surviving member of the heroic 1941 Willamette University Bearcats football team. The 1941 season was a tremendous success

for the team, going 8–2, capturing the Northwest Conference title.

But we remember that Bearcats historic season for far more than just athletics. At the end of the season, Willamette University was invited to play the University of Hawaii on December 6, 1941.

The following morning, the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor began. Rogers, the entire team, and visiting Willamette supporters volunteered to guard the Punahou School for 10 days while others helped with the injured.

After the attack on Pearl Harbor, Rogers volunteered to join the United States Marine Corps, where he served as an infantry platoon leader for the 3rd Marine Division throughout the Second World War. He served meritoriously during the final phase of the recapture of Guam, as well as during the Battle of Iwo Jima.

Rogers reminds all Americans of the impact we can have when we step up in times of need. His military service during a dark, uncertain time in our history is another shining example of the Greatest Generation.

I am proud to share his story and offer this small piece of recognition for all that Andrew Rogers has done for this great country.

NO CITY IS ABOVE THE LAW

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act.

Many cities across America have adopted sanctuary policies over the past few years. This is an obvious disregard of Federal law and puts American lives at risk.

In my home State of Georgia, sanctuary cities have been outlawed since 2009. Last year, Georgia's law was amended to require local governments to certify they are cooperating with Federal immigration officials in order to get State funding.

The way I see it, the law is the law. Sanctuary cities' policies are dangerous to all American communities as they can shield unlawful and criminal immigrants from Federal immigration enforcement. President Trump promised to end sanctuary cities, and this is the first step toward keeping that promise.

How many more innocent American lives need to be stolen because our immigration laws are not being enforced?

No person or city is above the law, and that is why my colleagues and I passed this very important bill today.

**OPPOSE DANGEROUS SENATE
VERSION OF TRUMPCARE**

(Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the dangerous and shameful Senate version of TrumpCare.

According to the new Congressional Budget Office estimate, this bill will leave 22 million Americans without insurance by 2026. In my district, that amounts to over 91,000 of my constituents, and over 2 million Floridians in total.

TrumpCare would allow insurers to charge seniors up to five times more than younger people.

In addition, we have more than 1.3 million Americans who are in nursing homes, and 62 percent of those pay for their stay and their care with Medicaid dollars, including three in five Floridians who are in a nursing home.

The majority promised Americans that they would fix TrumpCare in the Senate. Instead, 13 men made a backroom deal and they left seniors out of it. Make no mistake, while billionaires reap huge tax breaks in this bill, older middle class Americans will suffer.

I urge my Republican colleagues to find their backbone—and look for their hearts while they are at it—and stand up for our seniors.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are not to applaud.

**CONGRATULATING JOANNA
HARLACHER ON AWARD-WINNING
WEBSITE**

(Mr. SMUCKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a student from my district who has achieved something truly remarkable.

More than half a million students from around the world participated in this year's National History Day contest, each one making a film, exhibit, website, or other presentation on this year's theme, which was "Taking a Stand in History."

Joanna Harlacher, a graduate of Donegal High School, took first place for her website. Her website focused on someone we all know and love: fellow Pennsylvanian Fred Rogers. Joanna used to watch reruns of his PBS show and wanted to showcase his impact on Americans during his life and his career.

I would also like to recognize retired Donegal teacher Elizabeth Lewis, who helped Joanna create the award-winning website.

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't be prouder to represent this exceptional young woman and thousands of students across my district who impress us each and every day.

Congratulations, Joanna Harlacher, her family, Mrs. Lewis, and Donegal High School on this globally recognized accomplishment.

**HONORING JUDGE RYAN
REINHOLD**

(Mr. O'HALLERAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with respect and admiration that we honor Judge Ryan Reinhold for his outstanding legacy and service to the State of Arizona.

This week, Ryan retires after 41 years as Navajo County justice of the peace, municipal court judge, White Mountain Apache tribal judge, and Navajo County constable.

Throughout his career, he has been known for his tireless efforts to benefit his community in every aspect. I want to take a moment to share some of the highlights of his career.

Ryan was first selected as justice of the peace in 1978. In 1984, he received the Kenneth L. MacEachern Award for Outstanding Non-Lawyer Judge in the United States. He was reelected five times and honorably led the court for 22 years before retiring in 2000.

He was appointed Navajo County constable for precinct six in 2003 and elected in 2006.

He has led hundreds of volunteers as the district chairman of the Boy Scouts of America, and he serves as the president of the Blue Ridge High School Scholarship Fund and Lions Club.

In retirement, I hear that he plans to be making regular scuba diving trips, traveling the world, and spending quality time with his beloved family and friends—all well deserved.

Mr. Speaker, Ryan Reinhold is a pillar of his community and has done so much for Arizona. I extend my best wishes as Ryan begins the next chapter of his life.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, AMERICA

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, July 4, 1776, Philadelphia, 56 misfits, rebels, and freedom fighters all filled a small room with the intent to form a new nation. They pledged their lives, their honor, and their futures on one simple idea: that all people are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among those are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

As these ideas were put forth on paper, it was clear to the Founders that governments are instituted among men to preserve those rights. In that hot room, these 56 men put together the first foundation of our government, declaring independence from King George III.

From July 4, 1776, forward, the term "independence" has defined America.

After 7 long, grueling years of war, America gained that independence.

So Tuesday, as Americans across the Nation watch parades packed with patriotic red, white, and blue and families gather for picnics, hot dogs, barbecue, and fireworks, all small towns and big towns throughout the country will remember and pay tribute to our Founders who instilled those three principles in our government: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The Stars and Stripes are forever. Happy birthday, America. Happy Fourth of July.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 1745

**THE SENATE'S BETTER CARE
RECONCILIATION ACT**

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, this week, it was confirmed that the Senate's Better Care Reconciliation Act is not just mean, it can't even be passed by the majority party.

The nonpartisan CBO revealed that if that bill did pass, in our Nation, 22 million people would lose their healthcare coverage over the next 10 years. That means in my district, on the central coast of California, 49,000 people would lose their insurance, and 16,000 people would lose their coverage they gained due to the Affordable Care Act.

So because of that score, the Senate couldn't pass the bill, and they delayed the vote on it. So now, we have the time. So now, let's slow down. Let's do something the American people are yearning for. Let's come together, Republicans and Democrats, not just to repair our Nation's healthcare, but to find bipartisan solutions for what is best for all of our constituents and all of our communities for healthcare all across our country.

**EDEN PRAIRIE BOYS BASEBALL
CHAMPS**

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Eden Prairie Boys Baseball team on becoming high school State champs recently. They secured a 5-1 win over Forest Lake.

After a challenging first four innings, the Eagles, led by senior pitcher Jack Zigan, came back to win their very first State Championship since 2010. Jack threw a complete game, surrendering only three hits and one unearned run, with an impressive 11 strikeouts.

This marked the end of a fantastic season for the Eagles, who finished the year 18-9 after entering the State tournament without a seed. They were never expected to get this far. They

were never expected to win, but they defeated the number 1, the number 2, and the number 4 seed teams by a combined score of 25-2.

So, Mr. Speaker, once again, I would just like to congratulate this hard-working team of student athletes, their coaches, and their parents for their State Championship win. This really does go to show that perseverance and hard work pay off.

RECOGNIZING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF HONG KONG'S TRANSFER TO CHINA

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, in 1984, before the United Kingdom handed Hong Kong over to China, the Chinese Government promised “a high degree of autonomy” for the territory in the Joint Declaration on the Question of Hong Kong: providing for an independent executive, legislature, and judiciary; ensuring the freedom of speech, press, assembly, and religion; prohibiting the central government from interfering into the affairs that Hong Kong administers on its own according to the Basic Law; and pledging a path to universal suffrage.

In 1997, when the handover occurred, America was hopeful that the people of Hong Kong would achieve the free, democratic future they deserved. But 2 decades later, we see China’s promise of “one country, two systems” is not being met. The Chinese have not honored that promise, and the British Government has ignored it.

Since 2014’s “Umbrella Revolution,” the people of Hong Kong have faced a barrage of unjust and harsh restrictions on their freedoms. Hong Kong’s pro-Beijing government is slapping democratically elected opposition lawmakers with expensive lawsuits in a backhanded attempt to disqualify them from their seats.

Peaceful activists are being rounded up and detained by the hundreds for exercising their right to protest the new government.

Five booksellers were abducted, smuggled across the border to China and forced to confess—so-called confess—their so-called crimes on national television, simply because their employer sold books critical of Beijing.

And, just this week, the democracy activists and heroes of the “Umbrella Movement,” Joshua Wong and Nathan Law, were arrested while peacefully protesting the visit of Chinese President Xi Jinping, where they unfurled a banner in support of Liu Xiaobo.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend this body, especially our colleague, Congressman CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey, for the resolution that he put forth earlier, a resolution that recognized Liu Xiaobo’s contribution to democratic freedoms as a global hero, and urging the Chinese Government to allow him to seek medical care wherever, including in the United States.

In mainland China, Mr. Speaker, the Chinese Government continues to jail journalists, human rights lawyers, those fighting to practice their own religion, and democracy activists at an alarming rate. And the Chinese Government is brutally trying to erase the religion, culture, and language of the Tibetan people.

America has a moral duty to speak out in defense of the legitimate political aspirations of the people of Hong Kong. If we do not speak out for human rights in China because of economic concerns, then we lose all moral authority to talk about human rights in any other place in the world.

As we mark this solemn 20th anniversary, we must stand up for all who are demanding the promises of “one country, two systems” be honored.

INTRO—JOINT DECLARATION

In 1984, before the United Kingdom handed over Hong Kong to China, the Chinese government promised ‘a high degree of autonomy’ for the territory in the Joint Declaration on the Question of Hong Kong:

—providing for an independent executive, legislature and judiciary;

—ensuring the freedom of speech, press, assembly and religion;

—prohibiting the central government from interfering in the affairs that Hong Kong administers on its own according to the Basic Law;

—and pledging a path to universal suffrage.

In 1997, when the handover occurred, America was hopeful that the people of Hong Kong would achieve the free, democratic future they deserved.

But two decades later, we see China’s promise of ‘one country, two systems’ is not being met. The Chinese have not honored that promise, and the British have ignored it.

RECENT CRACKDOWN

Since 2014’s ‘Umbrella Revolution,’ the people of Hong Kong have faced a barrage of unjust and harsh restrictions on their freedoms.

Hong Kong’s pro-Beijing government is slapping democratically-elected opposition lawmakers with expensive lawsuits in a backhanded attempt to disqualify them from their seats.

Peaceful activists are being rounded up and detained by the hundreds for exercising their right to protest the new government.

Five booksellers were abducted, smuggled across the border to China and forced to confess their so-called crimes on national television—simply because their employer sold books critical of Beijing.

WONG ARREST

And, just this week, the democracy activists and heroes of the ‘Umbrella Movement,’ Joshua Wong and Nathan Law, were arrested while peacefully protesting the visit of Chinese President Xi Jinping—where they unfurled a banner in support of Liu Xiaobo.

This egregious attempt at smothering free speech is alarming, illegal and deserves the swift condemnation of the international community.

We must honor the protestors’ chant—‘the world is watching’—and condemn the arrest of Wong and the other demonstrators.

Unfortunately, Beijing shows absolutely zero signs of ceasing its aggressive campaign of intimidation against democracy and human rights activists.

CLOSE

In Mainland China, the Chinese government continues to jail journalists, human rights lawyers, those fighting to practice their own religion and democracy activists at an alarming rate.

And the Chinese Government is brutally trying to erase the religion, culture and language of the Tibetan people.

America has a moral duty to speak out in defense of the legitimate political aspirations of the people of Hong Kong.

If we do not speak out for human rights in China because of economic concerns, then we lose all moral authority to talk about human rights in any other place in the world.

As we mark this solemn anniversary, we must stand up for all those who are demanding the promises of ‘one country, two systems’ be honored.

THE LAST BATTLE FOR DEMOCRACY IN VENEZUELA

(Mr. FASO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, as we plan to celebrate Independence Day on the Fourth of July, it is important for us also to recognize a human rights tragedy and an abomination of democracy as totalitarian rulers of Venezuela are suppressing their people in our southern hemisphere.

To call attention to this tragic situation where thousands of people are being suppressed, where armed mobs are running around the streets intimidating people, and where Venezuelans cannot achieve the basic necessities of life, I include in the RECORD an article that recently appeared in *The Wall Street Journal*, “The Last Battle for Democracy in Venezuela,” and to call attention to the human rights tragedy which is occurring in South America.

[From *The Wall Street Journal*, June 23, 2017]

THE LAST BATTLE FOR DEMOCRACY IN VENEZUELA

Under Nicolás Maduro, a county that had been one of Latin America’s wealthiest is having its democratic institutions shredded amid rising poverty and corruption

(By David Luhnow and José de Córdoba)

Almost two decades after Venezuela’s late president, Hugo Chávez, came to power in an electoral landslide, his country’s transformation seems to be taking an ominous new turn. A country that was once one of one America’s wealthiest is seeing its democratic institutions collapse, leading to levels of disease, hunger and dysfunction more often seen in war-torn nations than oil-rich ones.

Mr. Chávez’s successor, President Nicolás Maduro, has called for a National Constitutional Assembly to be elected on July 30 to draft a new constitution, in which ill-defined communal councils will take the place of Venezuela’s traditional governing institutions, such as state governments and the opposition-dominated Congress. The new assembly appears to be rigged to heavily represent groups that back the government.

The Maduro government says that the new assembly will find a peaceful way forward for

a country enduring an economic depression and standing on the brink of civil conflict. The government says it is building on the legacy of Mr. Chávez, a military man who vowed to fight corruption, dismantle the venal old political establishment and be a voice for millions of poor Venezuelans. But the opposition, which is boycotting the assembly vote, calls it a naked attempt to end democracy and turn the country into a Cuba-style communist autocracy. The government's own attorney general calls the vote illegal.

The 545-member assembly, a modern-day soviet, would hold unlimited power while it writes a new governing charter, which could take years. Meantime, the assembly is widely expected to scrap next year's presidential elections.

"This is the last battle for democracy in Venezuela," says David Smilde, a Venezuela expert at Tulane University.

For the U.S., the prospect of a new Cuba sitting atop trillions of dollars of oil reserves is profoundly unpleasant. For the past decade, Venezuela has aligned itself with Russia, China, Iran and Syria. Whether it thrives or implodes, Mr. Maduro's petrostate could cause far greater headaches to the U.S. and Latin America than isolated Cuba. An implosion could mean bigger shipments of cocaine to Central America and the U.S., as well as a massive increase in the current flow of tens of thousands of refugees already fleeing the country for the U.S., Colombia, Brazil and elsewhere. And a consolidation of power could let Mr. Maduro deepen his partnership with U.S. adversaries.

The Trump administration has criticized Mr. Maduro's plans to change the constitution, urging "respect for democratic norms and processes." The U.S. has called for Venezuela to free political prisoners, respect the opposition-controlled congress and "hold free and democratic elections."

Mr. Maduro's move has aggravated Venezuela's political crisis. The opposition, sensing a do-or-die moment, plans to ramp up daily street protests. Some 80 people have died in such demonstrations in the past three months, and the president is unlikely to ease off on the tear gas, rubber bullets and water cannons. "Maduro's ultimate aim is to turn Venezuela into Cuba. And we will not accept being put in that cage," says Julio Borges, the head of the opposition-dominated National Assembly.

Venezuela's momentous new step isn't taking place amid the kind of revolutionary euphoria that Mr. Chávez may have imagined before he died of cancer in 2013. Rather, it is being pushed by an unpopular government trying to keep power amid an economic implosion.

By year's end, Venezuela's economy will have shrunk by nearly a third in the past four years—a plunge similar to Cuba's after the fall of the Soviet Union, and one rarely seen outside of conflict zones. In a nation estimated to be sitting on as much oil as Saudi Arabia, it is common to see poor families rummaging through garbage for food, even as the wealthy pack nearby gourmet restaurants.

Inflation was estimated by the International Monetary Fund at 720% this year; it is expected to surpass 2,000% next year. Shortages are so acute that three out of four Venezuelans lost an average of 18 pounds last year, according to a survey by Venezuelan universities. Diseases not seen there in decades, such as malaria, are back.

"The government is desperate because they know the next presidential election will be their last," says César Miguel Rondón, a popular radio host. When the host recently tried to leave Venezuela on a business trip to Miami with his family, he had his passport

seized. "I'm a hostage in my own country," he said.

Amid the economic crisis and protests, the government has headed down an increasingly authoritarian path. It has raised the number of political prisoners over the past year to 391, according to the Venezuelan human-rights group Foro Penal—nearly four times the total from a year ago. Most are being tried in military courts. And the government is seeking to remove its rebellious attorney general through a case in the supreme court. The government didn't answer requests for comment.

The so-called Bolivarian revolution has become less about ideology and more about money. Venezuelans often call it a "roboación" rather than a "revolución," using the Spanish word for robbery. If Cuba is an ideologically motivated communist dictatorship, Venezuela is something different; as oil-rich as Saudi Arabia, as authoritarian as Russia and as corrupt as Nigeria.

Spectacular accusations of drug trafficking and corruption have sullied Mr. Maduro's own family. Two nephews of Venezuela's first lady, Cilia Flores, are awaiting sentencing in New York after being found guilty last year of conspiring to import 800 kilos of cocaine to the U.S. through Honduras. They pleaded not guilty.

The interior minister, Gen. Néstor Reverol, has been indicted in the U.S. for drug trafficking; Vice President Tarek El Aissami is on the U.S. Treasury Department's kingpin list for allegedly protecting drug traffickers; and the head of Venezuela's supreme court is on another Treasury blacklist far gutting the country's democratic institutions. They all say that they are innocent and accuse the U.S. of trying to destabilize Venezuela.

In some ways, analysts say, the extent of these accusations has made a negotiated solution to Venezuela's crisis more difficult. "The regime's connection to crime and drugs is what makes it difficult for them to give up power," says Harold Trinkunas, an expert on Venezuela at Stanford University. "Many have to be worried that if they step down, they will be put on a plane to the U.S."

In Cuba, the Castro dynasty has kept power despite decades of disastrous economic policies due to devotion to the charismatic Fidel, popular achievements such as universal free health care, ideological loyalty to Marxism, discipline enforced by security forces, and the nationalist frisson of facing off against the U.S. In Venezuela, aside from a similar devotion to Mr. Chávez, the glue that has held the regime together is simpler: oil-soaked corruption on an epic scale.

Former planning minister Jorge Giordani, one of Mr. Chávez's closest confidantes, said in 2015 that of an estimated \$1 trillion in oil revenue received during the Chávez years, two-thirds had been distributed to workers through subsidies and cash transfers. The rest, more than \$300 billion, had "fallen through the cracks," he said. Mr. Giordani quit Mr. Maduro's government in disgust in 2014 and now lives in a quiet neighborhood of Caracas.

This year, the U.S. Treasury Department put Samark López, a Venezuelan businessman, on a blacklist, accusing him of being a frontman for Vice President El Aissami, an alleged drug trafficker. Announcing the seizure, Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin said that the U.S. had frozen assets worth "tens of millions" of dollars when it seized a slew of properties and firms owned or controlled by Mr. López in the U.S., the U.K. and elsewhere. In a statement, Mr. López denied any wrongdoing and called the accusations "politically motivated."

The government didn't respond to requests for comment, but in the past, Mr. Maduro and other officials have dismissed accusa-

tions of corruption, economic mismanagement and repression as part of an "economic war" being waged by Venezuela's private sector, in cahoots with the U.S., to destabilize and overthrow the socialist government.

As in many petrostates, oil accounts for 95% of Venezuela's foreign-currency earnings. Since the government administers the oil, one sure way to get ahead is not by creating a new business but by getting close to the government to secure access to oil rents. Venezuelans call the enterprising class following this model "los enchufados"—the plugged-in ones.

The path to power in Venezuela is often said to run through the army and oil. Once in power, the populist Mr. Chávez went after the oil, eventually firing 19,000 employees of the state-run oil firm *Petróleos de Venezuela* to stack the company with his yes-men. After a brief and unsuccessful coup against him in 2002, he also cleaned out the barracks, handing over indoctrination and training to his Cuban allies.

In the following years, oil prices rose sharply, and Mr. Chávez spent lavishly. He saved none of the windfall, ran large budget deficits even at peak-oil prices, raided the country's rainy-day oil fund, and borrowed heavily, first from Wall Street and then from the Chinese and the Russians. He handed out billions of dollars worth of cut-rate oil to Cuba, Nicaragua and even Boston and London to show off Venezuela's growing energy clout.

The number of government employees doubled, to five million, and spending skyrocketed. Printing so much money caused inflation, so the government set prices, sometimes below the cost of production. Companies that refused to sell at a loss were seized, aggravating shortages. Less local production made the country ever more reliant on imports.

But once the price of oil began to drop in 2014, Venezuela could no longer afford the imports, which have fallen from \$66 billion in 2012 to about \$15.5 billion this year. And there is little domestic industry left to pick up the slack.

"It is classic Latin American populism on steroids, and now we have the worst hangover in history," said Juan Nagel, a Venezuelan economist living in Chile.

Beyond some new public housing, little was built. Mr. Chávez left Venezuela littered with the bones of ambitious, half-finished public-works projects. Among them was a \$20 billion scheme to build a train network, which now lies abandoned. In Caracas, a new subway line ended up being just one additional stop on an existing line, prompting local wags to call it the Centi Metro (centimeter) rather than just a plain Metro.

Unperturbed, the flamboyant leader focused on projects like changing Venezuela's time zone by half an hour. He renamed the country the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. And to mark the shift in Venezuela's political course, he changed the direction of a wild stallion on the country's coat of arms, making the horse gallop left instead of right.

Mr. Chávez's revolution attacked the old elites, sending nearly two million Venezuelans—and billions of dollars—packing in the past 10 years. But in their stead rose a new elite: the so-called Boliburgueses, or Bolivarian bourgeoisie, who enjoyed a life of premium wines, Scotch and cars as poverty levels rose.

"You don't see that in Cuba or Vietnam. But here, you see Hummers, private jets and obscene new mansions," says Miguel Pizarro, an opposition leader whose father was a Marxist guerrilla in Venezuela and whose mother served in Mr. Chávez's first political party in the mid-1990s. "These guys literally bought the homes where Venezuela's elite lived, tore them down and built even bigger ones."

Few enjoyed la dolce vita of Caracas more than Wilmer Ruperti, a businessman who earned Mr. Chávez's loyalty in 2002 when he helped break an oil strike. Mr. Ruperti was a familiar sight in Caracas, riding in an armored Jaguar accompanied by two North Korean bodyguards. The magnate cemented his friendship with Mr. Chávez by buying a pair of Simón Bolívar's pistols for \$1.7 million in a New York auction and presenting them to the Venezuelan leader.

Last year, Mr. Ruperti paid the multi-million-dollar legal fees for the criminal defense of Mr. Maduro's nephews. At the same time, Mr. Ruperti's firm won a \$138 million contract from the state oil company. Mr. Ruperti said it was his patriotic duty to pay the nephews' legal fees as a way of relieving the pressures on Mr. Maduro. He denied any link between the payment of the fees and the state oil-firm contract.

Corruption helps the government maintain political control. And no tool has been more effective than exchange controls, initially adopted by Mr. Chávez in 2002 during a national strike to control capital flight. Fifteen years later, they have reshaped Venezuela's economy and given the government enormous power to pick who gets dollars from the country's oil wealth—often at absurdly low rates.

For instance, firms and others who import food get dollars at the official rate of 10 bolivars. But they can turn around and sell those dollars on the black market for 8,300 bolivars.

Venezuela's army recently got the rights to set up its own mining and oil companies, and the armed forces are in charge of most critical imports. In 2016, 18 generals and admirals were tasked with importing key foods and sanitary items. One brigadier general was put in command of acquiring black beans; another was charged with acquiring toilet paper, feminine napkins and diapers. Logically, an admiral was placed in charge of acquiring fish.

No one knows how much money has been lost. Mr. Giordani estimated that a third of the \$59 billion that the government handed out to companies to bring imports into the country in 2012 might have ended up in fraudulent schemes.

"It's a terrible economic model, but it's great for politics and power," says Asdrúbal Oliveros, a prominent Venezuelan economist.

The opposition and the regional governments don't know how to turn the tide. An Organization of American States resolution this week urging Venezuela to return to democracy was supported by every major country in the hemisphere but blocked by Venezuelan allies like Nicaragua and a handful of statelets like St. Kitts and Nevis.

Many in Venezuela hope that parts of the army haven't been tempted by money and will want to honor the country's democratic past. Ibsen Martínez, who helped write some of the country's most beloved soap operas, says that hope is likely in vain.

"The army is now a criminal organization," he said in an interview from Bogotá, where he now lives in exile. "But in every culture, there are mythical creatures. In Venezuela, it is the idea of an institutional military man, who will come out like Captain America to resolve everything." That instinct, he added, led to Mr. Chávez in the first place.

His revolution's mournful impact can be seen everywhere. Venezuela's national baseball league now plays to empty stadiums and is considering suspending this year's season. The Teresa Carreño theater, an architectural masterpiece in Caracas, used to produce some of the region's best operas and dramas; it now mostly hosts government rallies. In the nearby Caracas Museum of Contem-

porary Art, water drips into buckets near paintings by Picasso and Mondrian. The museum is so empty that a thief replaced a Matisse portrait with a fake without anyone noticing for several years.

Alberto Barrera, the author of a biography of Mr. Chávez who now lives in Mexico City, thinks that the time is fast approaching when he and the opposition may need to say goodbye to their hopes. "I wonder when I will wake up and realize, 'They beat us.' That it's all over and the county I knew is gone," he said.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, it is vitally important that we stand up on this Fourth of July, not just for democracy here in the United States, but for democracy in other parts of the world as people are struggling.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, and Happy Fourth of July to all of our countrymen around the United States of America.

TRUMPCARE IS A DEVASTATING BILL

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as we go home to commemorate the birth of this Nation, to wish all well, we would hope we would be able to go home by feeling comfortable that the administration was taking care of the American people.

We have come to find out that the EPA is reversing a decision of the Obama administration to allow a pesticide by the name of—trade name Lorsban, that is chlorophyll-based, to be utilized on fruits and vegetables.

I understand the needs of farmers, but there are documented studies that indicate that it may have a significant impact on the brain function of little children as young as 7 years old.

Where is the care of the Nation by this administration?

And then, they are planning a healthcare bill that will see this young lady lose her healthcare.

In my district, 89,000 people will lose their insurance when they cut \$854 billion out of Medicaid; 16,000 will be children.

Where will the hospitals survive if they are closed in rural and urban America, and where will the seniors be when their nursing home puts them out because the Medicaid that has been for working seniors but now retired in nursing homes who rely on Medicaid?

The TrumpCare bill in the Senate is a devastating bill. We need to have an administration that takes care of the American people.

RECOGNIZING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UTICA OBSERVER-DISPATCH

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 200th anniversary

of the Utica Observer-Dispatch. Founded in 1817, the Utica OD was one of only 421 papers in the country, and the fifth newspaper founded in New York State.

For the past 200 years, the Utica OD has kept our region informed through quality reporting on important issues impacting our local community.

As an unwavering member of the fourth estate, the Utica Observer-Dispatch had a leading role in exposing the inner workings of our once organized crime-influenced city. For this dedicated service on this very issue, and its campaign for justice against corruption, the Utica Observer-Dispatch was awarded the Pulitzer Prize in 1959.

I commend the Utica OD for its 200 years of steadfast reporting, and I encourage the Observer-Dispatch and its committed members of the fourth estate to continue with its stated mission, to keep our citizens informed through impartial investigative reporting.

Also, on a personal note, when I was a teenager, I actually delivered the Utica Observer-Dispatch, and it was an honor to do it and a small way for me to start off my earning a living.

So I just want to thank the Utica OD and congratulate them again on 200 years.

THERE IS NO HEART IN THE SENATE HEALTHCARE BILL

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the Senate version was supposed to be the one, according to the President, with heart. There is no heart in this bill.

Sixty percent of my constituents live in Los Angeles County which, in total, has about 5 percent—one county in the country has about 5 percent—of this country's Medicaid recipients. The proposed Senate bill cuts to Medicaid would put more than a quarter of those currently receiving Medicaid assistance in L.A. County, nearly 900,000 people, at risk for losing health insurance.

This is not a healthcare bill. This is a tax cut for the wealthy, dressed up to look like serious legislation. The rich get richer, while everyone else is left to get poorer and sicker.

This is not who we are as Americans.

A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

(Mrs. MURPHY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today, I will become the first House Democrat in Congress to introduce a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. My bill will prohibit the Federal Government from spending more than it receives except in the case of war or recession.

Democrats and Republicans may not always agree on the best way to balance the budget, but we all care about our country and our children, and both are at risk unless we rein in our unsustainable deficits and debt.

In 45 of the last 50 years, the Federal Government spent more than it received. The Federal debt has ballooned to over \$14 trillion. That is 77 percent of GDP, a figure that is expected to reach 150 percent in 30 years if we do not change course.

Just as every family is expected to balance their budget, so, too, should the Federal Government. This is about taking responsibility and making tough decisions, exactly what our constituents elected us to do.

A balanced budget amendment will compel Congress to walk the walk, not just talk the talk, when it comes to being responsible stewards of taxpayer dollars. I hope my colleagues on both sides of aisle will support this bill.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and have an opportunity, in this great deliberative body, to bring up the subject matters of my choice, and the purpose is to inform you and the American people.

Before I go into the topics that I am prepared to speak of, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

MEANINGFUL ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 115TH CONGRESS

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for kindly yielding and allowing me to take a few minutes to have a little bit of reflection with the American people as we head into the Fourth of July weekend.

Mr. Speaker, despite widespread cynicism from Washington elites and those in the media, the 115th Congress and President Trump have taken meaningful action over the past 6 months to improve the lives of hardworking Americans.

According to a recent analysis, this Congress has been the most productive in the modern era. By June 8, we had passed 158 bills, compared to the 60 bills by the 103rd Congress under Bill Clinton, 67 bills by the 107th Congress under President Bush, and 131 bills by the 111th Congress under President Obama.

President Trump has signed 39 bills into law, including 14 bills passed under the Congressional Review Act, stopping harmful regulations handed down by the previous administration. According to one analysis, repealing these rules could save the economy millions of hours of paperwork, nearly \$4 billion in regulatory costs to the

Federal agencies, and an astounding \$35 billion in regulatory costs for the private sector.

We sent to the President, and he signed, legislation to bring accountability to the Veterans Administration. And the House has acted to stop ObamaCare's job and freedom-crushing mandates, and acted to put a critical safety net program on a sustainable path.

The House also voted to repeal and replace Washington's Financial Control Law, Dodd-Frank, to get capital flowing to our small businesses and to improve choices for consumers.

The past 6 months have been a strong start, and I look forward to the House continuing its work to advance important goals of strengthening our economy and creating jobs.

CELEBRATING OUR NATION'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, every year at this time, our Nation celebrates our birthday. It is the perfect time to reflect on the founding of our country and the principles that made our Nation exceptional.

□ 1800

At the height of the Cold War with the Soviet Union, President Kennedy, in his inaugural address, reflected on our founding principles.

JFK said: "And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the State, but from the hand of God."

President Kennedy understood the words of our Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

A little more than 100 years before President Kennedy's inauguration, our 16th President, Abraham Lincoln, defended the Declaration and taught all those around him, as well as future generations, how to revere and embrace unwaveringly the sacred and transcendent truths expressed in this monumental document.

Lincoln said in 1858: "Now, my countrymen, if you have been taught doctrines conflicting with the great landmarks of the Declaration of Independence, if you have listened to suggestions which would take away from its grandeur, and mutilate the fair symmetry of its proportions; if you have been inclined to believe that all men are not created equal in those inalienable rights enumerated by our chart of liberty, let me entreat you to come back. Think nothing of me, take no thought for the political fate of any man whomsoever, but come back to the truths that are in the Declaration of Independence. You may do anything with me you choose, if you will but heed these sacred principles."

Today, Mr. Speaker, let us recommit to the principles set forth in our Dec-

laration, that all are endowed by your Creator with certain unalienable rights, among them the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And let those who have admired the leaders of our country who have reasserted these principles, from Lincoln to Kennedy, join together and continue to fight for the protection of these God-given rights, especially the first right, "the right to life."

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me this opportunity to speak. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for having extended to me this opportunity to share these thoughts with the American people.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his presentation in bringing this topic together in a way that he has. And in his method of addressing the Declaration of Independence on the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, I would expound on that as well.

Life is the most paramount. It is a priority right, and our Founding Fathers knew what they were doing. They set up life as the first priority, liberty as the second priority, and the third priority was the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. Speaker, I will start from the bottom because, of the three, I think it deserves the most explanation. That pursuit of happiness is often viewed as maybe a fun tailgate party or a bliss of some kind or maybe a barbecue outdoors with the family, the things that we love. That is the enjoyment of our life.

The pursuit of happiness, as it was understood by our Founding Fathers, came from the Greek word "eudaimonia." And that is spelled, E-U-D-A-I-M-O-N-I-A. And under the Greek word "eudaimonia," it means developing the whole human being. And it is not just the mental well-being, but it is developing the intellectual human being, the physical human being, the knowledge base that is there, and the spirit within us, and our theology and our souls—the whole package of what we are as human beings, developing that to the maximum, these God-given gifts, developing them for his glorification, and that is the concept of the pursuit of happiness that our Founding Fathers understood.

So the principle is that we have a right to pursue happiness, developing our whole human being, which includes the human enjoyment that we think of when we say pursuit of happiness.

But no one in their pursuit of happiness can trample on someone else's liberty because liberties are God-given. And the liberties that we have cannot be subordinate to the pursuit of happiness, but they are subordinate to the life of others because life is the most sacred.

Human life is sacred in all of its forms. It is the number one paramount right. So the protection of human life is the principle and is the highest priority in the Declaration of Independence.

And the liberties that we have—freedom of speech, religion, the press, the right to keep and bear arms, a jury of our peers, no double jeopardy, the whole list in the Bill of Rights—those are God-given liberties, as conceived by our Founding Fathers and enshrined in the Bill of Rights, and, of course, in our Constitution.

The rights that we have cannot be trampled upon or subordinated to someone else's pursuit of happiness. Life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, a well-thought-out, prioritized list in our Declaration that gives us the inspiration that was the foundation for our Constitution and the principles of our lives in America today.

So I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his explanation of this and for giving me an opportunity to flesh this out a little bit in the concepts of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

But the segue that he has served up to me is this: that our debates today here in this Congress on the immigration bills that have now just passed the Congress have been focused on the right to life—the right to life versus the criminals that took the liberty to take them. They have violated the very foundations of our Declaration, and, of course, they violated our laws in a number of ways.

But I think, especially, of the onset of this discussion, and I think of Sarah Root. And her legislation that is Sarah's Law was introduced by me in this Congress. I have a copy of this bill today. We introduced it last year also, but in this Congress, it became H.R. 174, and it came about, and then we incorporated it into the broader bill today that we call the sanctuary cities legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Sarah Root had just graduated from Bellevue University in Omaha. Her hometown is Modale, Iowa. She had just finished her graduation the day before with a perfect 4.0 grade point average, and her major was in criminal investigation. She would, today, be investigating criminals if it hadn't been for the criminal that killed her the day after she graduated.

And the individual who is responsible here, Eswin Mejia, who ran her over, ran into her vehicle on the streets with triple the blood alcohol content that is legal. Eswin Mejia was on a first-name basis with at least two of his immigration attorneys. When he was taken into custody, interestingly, as bad as the accident was, Sarah was rendered unrecognizable and she was on life support for a little while while the parents were deciding what decision to make.

And she was also an organ donor. Sarah saved six. And many days I wear this bracelet that says, "Sarah Root saved six." And this bracelet hangs on the antlers in my man cave. And when I walk down there in the morning, I often say a prayer for all of those bracelets that are hung on the antlers in my man cave that represent those individuals whose lives have been lost

at the hands of criminal aliens who were unlawfully present in the United States and perpetrated violence against generally American citizens but others that are generally those that are at least lawfully present in America.

Sarah Root was one of those victims, a stellar young lady with a 4.0 grade point average and a fresh diploma from Bellevue University; her whole life and a world ahead of her, and run down on the streets.

Her father came to testify here in the Judiciary Committee in Congress, and he said: "The judge bailed Eswin Mejia, this perpetrator, out of jail for less money than it cost to marry my daughter, and he was back home in his home country before we could bury my daughter."

Those were some of the most powerful and moving and memorable words that I have heard in my time here in Congress. We think Eswin Mejia went back to Honduras, his home country. He had been incarcerated before. He had been encountered by law enforcement before, and they turned him loose on the streets.

This happens again and again in America every day, local law enforcement picking up people that are unlawfully present in America, violating our immigration laws. The law requires that they be placed into removal proceedings. That is the law, but they turn them loose anyway and turn them out on the streets because we have sanctuary cities and sanctuary cities policies. Some local jurisdictions that don't have a written policy, but they just simply—it is a practice that they have evolved into accepting.

So when I say every one of the Americans who died at the hands of someone who is unlawfully present in America, illegal aliens, generally speaking, every one of those are a preventable death. If we enforced the law, they wouldn't have been in America in the first place to commit the crimes they committed against our American citizens, our innocent people like Sarah Root, this beautiful young lady with a perfect grade point average, the world ahead of her, a happy, joyful young lady that, today, would be living, loving, laughing, and learning and contributing to our society. But she is in her grave today because Eswin Mejia got triple drunk, was unlawfully in the United States, and ran her car down and killed her on the streets and absconded for a \$5,000 bond.

What we did with Sarah's Law—this is H.R. 174, the original language—and I wanted to assure the family of Sarah Root that this language is incorporated into the bill we passed today. It is incorporated into sanctuary cities legislation that we passed today. And what it does is it prohibits the judge from releasing an illegal alien on bond if they have been charged with or subject to a homicide or a crime where there is serious bodily injury.

Once this issue came up in Omaha, Nebraska, and the public knew about

this, we tried to unseat the judge that released this criminal that may have done damage again. But the judge that had let him out on \$5,000 had a similar case. The next time, the bond went way up into six or even seven figures. So I think he got the message, but the public got the message, too.

And I don't know whether he will be able to hold his seat or not, but we have got to bring the right things. We have got to put the fixes in place. You would think we would have a judge that would understand this, yet, somehow in the political culture of America, we are watching criminal aliens be turned loose on the streets over and over again.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, sitting in on immigration hearings in the Judiciary Committee. This is over a number of years now, and I suppose there are a couple of people in this Congress that have sat through more, not many. The witnesses would be—every week or so we would have a hearing and there would be witnesses that would testify about how many people died in the Arizona desert trying to sneak into America. And that number would be 200 in a year, 250 in a year, maybe the next year it went to 300. I remember that number going to 400 or more who died in the Arizona desert on the way into trying to sneak into America.

Finally, with this parade of witnesses that were experts on why we ought to open the border so they didn't have a difficult time getting into America—that is the lunacy that we have heard in the debate today over on this side of the floor, from my view, Mr. Speaker.

I began to ask the witnesses this question: You are an expert on immigration and you have come to testify on how many didn't make it through the desert. Could you tell me how many Americans died at the hands of those who did make it through the desert?

And I would ask the witnesses—generally four witnesses—and they would go down the line: I don't know the answer; I don't know the answer; I don't know the answer.

And that went on for a while.

And the fourth witness in one of those days was a former INS agent, Michael Cutler. And we are just a few years after September 11, 2001, when I asked him this question: How many Americans died at the hands of those who made it through the desert?

Which is the phrase to imply how many Americans died at the hands of those who were unlawfully present in America.

And Michael Cutler's answer was: I don't know the answer to that, but I can tell you it is in multiples of the victims of September 11.

Now, think of that. Three thousand Americans were killed that day. Multiples of that would be at least 6,000. If he is right—and he is confident he is right, and now I am confident he was right—that started me thinking.

□ 1815

So shortly after that, I commissioned a GAO study. That GAO study dug down deeply into the records that we had access to.

It is hard to get this Congress to compare apples to apples, so I began to ask the questions: Of the people in the prisons of America, what are they in prison for? How many of them are criminal aliens?

We did a report on that. They sliced and diced it and narrowed it down. It never actually became apples to apples, but it did come down to this substantial number that has been supported a couple of other times in other studies, in one subsequent that I had done in 2011. The number is very close to 28 percent of the inmates in our Federal penitentiaries are criminal aliens—28 percent.

So it is reasonable to do a calculation and an extrapolation off of this, if 28 percent of these inmates are criminal aliens, what percentage of the murders are they committing? What percentage of the rapes are they committing? What percentage of the violent crimes are they committing? Or are they in jail for just simply violating a law of immigration? You will find out very few are in prison for violation of immigration law.

They are the reflection on criminal aliens. They are similar, a very similar, if not identical, proportion of the crimes that are committed by others.

So when you put that on there and hit the calculator—I am not going to speak those numbers into the RECORD here, Mr. Speaker, because it is shocking and stunning how many Americans have lost their lives at the hands of people who shouldn't have been here in the first place—Sarah Root included, Kate Steinle included, and many more.

A few days after Sarah Root was killed, I sent out a tweet that just said: Sarah Root would be alive living and loving life if the President had not violated his oath and ordered ICE to stand down.

That is what happened during the 8-year period of time President Obama asserted that he had this thing called prosecutorial discretion. Now, that is something that is established in law, at least in precedent, but it has to be done on an individual basis, and he delivered it in a blanket basis. Janet Napolitano delivered the document. I questioned her on it in the committee.

They decided that prosecutorial discretion can be defined. They created four categories of people and essentially granted amnesty to all of them and turned them loose. They turned criminals loose on the streets in America—36,007 of them in one bunch. Some of them were murderers out on to the streets of America.

You can see what happens to the crime in this country. If you are importing people from the most violent countries in the world, and when they are encountered by law enforcement turning them loose, or if they are

picked up for a taillight or speeding or getting in a fight or shoplifting, whatever the case may be, failure to signal, running a stoplight, they are picked up for that.

When local law enforcement encounters them, they look at their identification. They ask them a few questions. It isn't hard to figure out whether they are legal or not. Some are good enough liars. But any time that law enforcement encounters people unlawfully present in America, they are to put them in removal proceedings, and ICE is to do it. Yet thousands have been turned loose on the streets.

At least 300 cities in America have established sanctuary policies that they turn them loose. Some of the cities have passed policies that refuse to allow their law enforcement to even gather information or accept information on illegal aliens that they encounter.

So, for example, this is how bad it is even in a place like Iowa. One of my staff people who was involved in a car accident that was caused by an illegal alien who had no license and had no insurance but he did have an illegal job in the town where he caused the accident crashed into my staff and wrecked my staff's car.

So when I got the phone call on that, I turned to my then-chief of staff who is a lights-outs, University of Chicago School of Law lawyer. I said: I want you to go to this town and stay there until you can get this resolved. And I want to find out: What can we get accomplished to enforce the law?

This was our opportunity to learn if a Member of Congress' staff can be run into by an illegal alien without a driver's license and without insurance with an illegal job in town and owning a car, and I have a topnotch lawyer chief of staff to go up there and communicate with law enforcement to try to bring the law enforcement in place so we could at least deport the guy.

After 3 or 4 days up there and a number of phone calls from me down here, I finally got the message back that finally convinced me we couldn't crack through the code of local law enforcement to be able to deport the individual who was clearly illegal. He was unlawfully working—no driver's license and no insurance.

The practice of simply staying out of immigration law because they were local law enforcement and didn't want to touch it was so ingrained that we could not move the bubble off the center.

Finally, I said: Okay, we have got other people to take care of. We are not going to get this solved, so let's turn our focus back to other things.

That is so very frustrating. I tell this, Mr. Speaker, to let the world know the frustration of families who had a loved one who was killed by illegals and watched them turned loose on the streets, and then have them abscond and go back to their home country or go back into the shadows and hide.

That is the thing that happened with Sarah Root. Today, we did honor to her and her life by passing Sarah's Law as part of the sanctuary city law. How utterly appropriate to bring a ban on sanctuary cities, to pass it off the floor of the House, and wrapped up in the same bill is Sarah's Law to respect her; her life; the sacrifice of her life; the sacrifice of her mother, Michelle; her father, Scott; and her only sibling, her brother, Scotty, who carries the whole load now for the next generation—all of that.

Finally, Congress did some justice for Sarah Root. It is only a small piece of justice. It is the least we can do, but it is the right thing for us to do. What her family wants is that no other families have to suffer like they have suffered.

This is the story of Sarah Root whose name was elevated on the national stage by President Trump. As much as I push things out of this Congress, I don't come close to having as big a megaphone as Donald Trump. So I want to thank the President of the United States for picking up the case of Sarah Root when he came to Iowa to campaign for the nomination of the Presidency of the United States.

When he began to make his immigration cases and lay out the platform for his immigration policy, I noticed that it mirrored mine very closely. I mentioned to him one day: Mr. President, I have market tested your immigration policy for 14 years in Iowa. It shouldn't have been a surprise that they understand these issues. They support the rule of law, they support securing the border, they support building a wall, and they support banning sanctuary cities. That is not just Iowa values, that is at least heart of the heartland values.

Those are American values—American values that want to live in a country that has the rule of law, a country where our children can be safe, and where they can play in the streets and they don't have to be looking over the shoulder; or a mother or a father doesn't have to keep them indoors because the streets are too dangerous.

This morning, we have heard from Jamiel Shaw who has been in to this Congress and testified before my committee maybe as far as back as 8 or 9 years ago. He is from Los Angeles. His son, who was a star football player, Jazz Shaw, was shot down and killed by an illegal alien gang member who went on the hunt that day with an assignment, as I understood it, to go shoot a Black person.

Jazz Shaw was murdered on the streets close enough to his father, Jamiel's, house that his father said this morning on FOX News that he could hear the gun shots. He went out there to see his son laying on the street in the blood pooling in the street. A ghastly murder for the sake of what? A gang challenge and a race label.

That would not be the case if that murderer had been deported back to his

country. It would not be the case if he came back in and we picked him up a second time.

Under Kate's Law, the killer of Jamiel Shaw's son would not have been in America if we had had Kate's Law and had enforced Kate's Law because he had been encountered before and had been deported.

This is the evil murderer, Juan Francisco Lopez-Sanchez. This is the beautiful young lady, 32 years old, Kate Steinle, who was down on the wharf in San Francisco with her father enjoying a day and was simply shot down and killed for no reason and at random by this individual who had been five times deported and convicted of something like seven different felonies in this country.

Under Kate's Law, that jacks that penalty up. He would have been locked up for a good, long time if that law had been in place, or the sanctuary city legislation we passed today outlawing sanctuary cities. They would be turning over these kinds of criminals to ICE where they would get their just sentence in Federal penitentiary and then be deported.

But even though we have these laws now passed, and if the Senate takes them up and passes them into law, the President will sign them. We are confident of that. He asked that these bills be brought before the House of Representatives as soon as possible. Of course, that was today. So if these acts that we passed today become law, then many Americans will be saved from the kind of carnage that we have heard about in case after case.

When I saw the story come through of Kate Steinle, I looked at that. It was the most tragic story. Here is a clip of what I sent out that day. This is July 3, 2015. It is a picture of Kate Steinle. The message in the tweet is: A 100 percent preventable crime—dated July 3, as I said, 2015—100 percent preventable crime. Just enforce the law. This will make you cry, too, and it happens every day. Every day in America, there are Americans that die at the hand of illegal aliens.

I recall the case in Cottonwood, Minnesota, where an illegal alien who had been encountered by law enforcement before and turned back on the streets of our country who didn't have a driver's license, didn't have insurance, and should have been deported at least once and probably more times than that ran a school bus off the road in southwest Minnesota.

Four kids in that school bus were killed. Two of them were siblings. Three families lost children in that bus accident where the bus was run off the road by the illegal criminal alien.

The dialogue that came from the left—the people that we heard debate over here today and voted against every one of these bills—was: this doesn't have anything to do with illegal immigration. It has got nothing to do with that. It is just the happenstance of life. In every society, there

are car accidents, there are murders, there are rapes, there is assault, there is battery, and there is grand theft.

Every society has that to some degree, but every single victim of a criminal alien that is in deportable category is a preventable crime. I have made that case over and over again for years, Mr. Speaker. But I made the point. They will say that it was just an accident, it was happenstance, and it has nothing to do with immigration.

My district director looked at me. He is a mild-mannered, soft-spoken, and judicious kind of a person. He said: If they believe that, if they say that, then you say to them: then you go up there to Cottonwood, Minnesota, and tell their parents that their children would still be dead if we had deported the illegal that ran the bus off the road.

That hits home to me, too, Mr. Speaker. It rings so true. Any family that is suffering the loss of a loved one—the Steinle family, the Root family, and so many other families, the families in Cottonwood, Minnesota, the families in Omaha, and the families around in my district—those families know that if he had enforced the law then their child or their husband would still be alive.

So as part of the sanctuary city legislation that we moved through here today, and as in Kate's Law just passed—I need to make sure that I state that—and in Sarah's, they would both be alive today living, loving, laughing, learning, contributing to our society, sharing joy, and giving joy.

There is another case that I have just picked up. A teen charged in an Iowa woman's death may have fled the country. Authorities say a teenager who was at the wheel of a car that was involved in a crash in Omaha last month that killed an Iowa woman—that is Sarah—has missed a court hearing and may have fled the country.

Well, that is a little memo that says: He absconded, we think, to Honduras. He may be living in the shadows.

Here is another story, and that is addressed, Mr. Speaker, by legislation that was brought by ANDY BIGGS of Arizona. I thank him for advancing this legislation, also.

This is the story of Grant Ronnebeck. He was 21 years old. He was gunned down in January of 2015, while working at a QuickTrip in Mesa, Arizona. The man charged with killing him, Apolinar Altamirano, was 29 years old, in the country illegally, and had been released by Immigration and Customs Enforcement even though he had previously been convicted of a felony burglary charge.

Now, why are we turning people loose in the streets of America to walk the streets again when they were deportable before they committed the felony burglary charge, convicted of a felony burglary charge, and then turn them loose again? Does the judge decide that somehow he has a right to be in America? That is a clear deportation requirement.

I recall when we had John Ashcroft as the Attorney General. He testified before the committee that when they released criminal aliens on to the streets without bond with a date set for a hearing, 84 percent of them didn't show up.

□ 1830

And that was before President Obama sent the message that it didn't matter. Those numbers have gone up, not down.

Here is another one. This was just another ghastly, tragic story that happened in Omaha. Louise Sollowin died in July of 2013. Three days after the attack in her home, according to Omaha police, an officer sent to the south Omaha house Sollowin had lived in for 71 years found her body covered in blood in her bedroom about 9 a.m.

The officer said Sergio Martinez-Perez, 19—I am going to skip some of this, because it is too nasty to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—was passed out there, having raped the 93-year-old woman. Authorities believed that Martinez-Perez entered the home through an unlocked door. He, too, was an illegal alien who had been encountered by law enforcement and was released and went out to rape and murder.

So when the President said that we have people who do these things among those who have come from some of those countries, that is clearly true. A lot of good people also, but we need to have the rule of law. We need to enforce the rule of law.

And when they are coming from these other countries that have corruption but don't have the benefit of the rule of law and the respect for the law that we have, they are importing those low standards in here.

We must sustain the rule of law, restore the respect for the rule of law. If we do that, we will sustain ourselves as a First World country. If we fail to do so, if we lose the rule of law, then we will devolve into a Third World country eventually. The core of this from the beginning for me, Mr. Speaker, has always been to restore the respect for the rule of law.

Ronald Reagan signed the amnesty act in 1986. I give him credit for at least naming it—calling it what it was, an amnesty act. It was a reward for law breakers. The cabinet around him encouraged him to sign the amnesty act.

Me, you know, I kicked my filing cabinet the day I heard on the news that he had signed it, and I kicked a dent in it because—well, out of frustration was why.

But I believe Ronald Reagan would see with clarity that you can't reward law breakers and think that somehow you are going to be able to put that behind you and that the law will be enforced and respected from that point forward.

There were to be a million people that received amnesty in 1986. Ronald Reagan signed the amnesty act, and it

became 3 million people because they probably counted a little wrong, and there was a lot of fraud, a lot of people who presented themselves and alleged that they were to be included. This was a faster track to citizenship for them.

Three million people received amnesty in 1986, and I said then that none of them should have, that they should not be rewarded for breaking the law. Yet they got their amnesty.

The signature that Ronald Reagan put on that amnesty legislation was supposed to be in exchange for enforcement of the law, but the law didn't get enforced. The amnesty was delivered triple what was expected. And I knew then that we would have a long, hard slog restoring the respect for the rule of law, but I have set about doing that since that period of time.

More than 30 years later, we are here on the floor strengthening the rule of law after all this time, after the amnesty that has been advocated by others.

Each decade we seem to have to have a battle. They want to come with what they now call comprehensive immigration reform. Just about anybody in America knows if you say "comprehensive immigration reform," you really mean amnesty.

I say to them: Just be honest. If you think amnesty is a good idea, why do you say all those three words when you can say "amnesty" and be honest? People know what you mean. If the public is ready for amnesty, then you can pass it. If we are not, you can't.

The American people understand this intuitively, that we have got to stop the law-breaking and that we cannot be rewarding those who break the law.

Now, there are those who think that we should somehow find a path of amnesty for those individuals identified unconstitutionally by Barack Obama in his DACA program—Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. They aren't all innocent little waifs who have been brought in by their mother against their will, as many would say. Instead, many of them are prime gang-age recruitment, young men.

I have gone down there and watched that flow of epic humanity coming out of Central America, coming through Mexico, some from Mexico—a diminishing number from Mexico—coming into the United States. The numbers we looked at were 81 percent male. And if they are under 18, they are coming on their own—if they are 14, 15, 16 or 17 years old. And they don't always tell you the truth either, Mr. Speaker.

So this large group of people are prime gang-age recruitment youth. And these youth are coming from some of the most violent countries in the world. And 11 of the 13 most violent countries in the world are south of the Rio Grande, and one of those countries is not Mexico. So when they come into America, they bring with them the violence and the culture that is part of it, and we can expect our crime rates to go up.

The people from the inner cities, who generally sit over on that side of this Congress, want to get them out of places like El Salvador and Guatemala and put them into the inner cities, in places like east St. Louis and Detroit and Newark, and a number of other cities where the violent crime rate is very high, to get them away from the violence that is part of their neighborhood. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that we may be putting them into neighborhoods that are more dangerous than the countries that they come from, but we don't log those crime statistics very clearly because it is so sensitive to the people in the inner city, they don't want to talk about it.

So crime has been pervasive in these countries. They are sending young men especially that are prime gang-age recruitment. They are being recruited to MS-13. Judge Jeanine Pirro said the other day that 30 percent of them become MS-13 members.

Mr. Speaker, let me inquire, if I could, the amount of time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that response.

I wanted to roll through what our sanctuary cities legislation does that we just passed today, and it goes a pretty good, long, comprehensive way.

I pointed out that I brought the first sanctuary cities legislation into this Congress that I could find a record of. It was in 2005 when I brought an amendment through the Homeland Security appropriations to cut all funding to sanctuary cities. 2005. And then along the way, each opportunity that was there, I brought an amendment to cut off funding to sanctuary cities. Most of the time it was in the Judiciary, the justice appropriations bill. And I see a number of them here scattered in my memo that I asked staff to put together.

So as far back as 12 years ago, I have been working to end Federal funding going to sanctuary cities that defy local law enforcement. And we have gotten resistance from the other side of the aisle consistently. Barack Obama was never going to sign anything like that, but I kept beating the drum every year to cut off funding to sanctuary cities.

Finally, I introduced the legislation on sanctuary cities in 2015, and then again at the beginning of this Congress. And Chairman BOB GOODLATTE was gracious enough to pull that together so we could bring it to the floor today. And we have had a lot of cooperation from many others on this.

I see the first date I introduced the sanctuary cities legislation as a stand-alone bill was November 4 of 2015, and here we are today finally passing it.

I thought I had been at it for a long time, Mr. Speaker, and it added up to 12 years that I have been actively engaged, at least—maybe 14—until I talked to Congressman LOU BARLETTA

from Hazleton, Pennsylvania, who, as a mayor in 1999, began to raise the issue and made it a national issue. He was selected to this Congress. He has been at it 18 years. Others have been at this a long time, too.

So many of us are grateful today that the sanctuary cities language has passed and that Sarah's Law, Kate's Law, all of that that I was able to introduce into this Congress has passed out of the House of Representatives and messaged to the Senate. And I hope the Senate picks it up.

The sanctuary cities language does this:

It bans their policies, for starters, Mr. Speaker.

It blocks the Department of Justice grants to the sanctuary cities that defy Federal law and refuse to cooperate with Federal law enforcement on immigration. And those grants would be generally grants that have to do with law enforcement that would be effected by DOJ.

It allows the Department of Homeland Security to refuse warrants from the sanctuary cities. The sanctuary cities might serve a warrant to someone in custody, and DHS can say: We are not going to hand this person over to you because we are pretty confident you are just going to turn them loose on the streets.

So that piece in there is a protection that keeps some from being released.

And then it requires ICE to take custody of these criminal aliens within 48 hours of the notice that comes from the State or local government that would have them picked up.

It also establishes a good faith provision that holds local government harmless for honoring ICE detainers.

Now, that is something that was undermined on February 25 of 2015 by then-Acting Director of ICE, Dan Ragsdale, who sent a letter out that just simply advised local law enforcement that an ICE detainer is a suggestion, not an order.

Well, the law and the rule says that it is an order, not a suggestion. This statute clarifies it and firms it up with respect to detainers.

And then if a local jurisdiction is sued by, say, the ACLU, as they are wont to do, it gives them a protection, and it lets the Department of Justice and the Federal Government substitute itself for local government, and it holds local government harmless when it comes to the case of ICE detainers.

Here is a very powerful piece, Mr. Speaker, and it is this: the sanctuary cities legislation passed today, H.R. 3003, provides a cause of action against any jurisdiction that releases an alien who subsequently commits a felony.

Now, that is a powerful provision, and it is something that moves me in my heart. As a former crime victim, it occurred to me when they announced the name of the case that I wasn't involved in that equation at all even though it nearly destroyed my business, and I began to think about how this is.

Our criminal law comes from old England. And in old England, if you committed a crime—the king owned everything. If you killed one of his serf, you killed the king's serf. That was the murder that took place. If you shot a deer, you shot the king's deer. If you stole something, it was a violation against the crown.

And we transferred the criminal law into America, and the State has replaced the crown. So when you commit a crime, that crime is committed against the State as if you had killed one of the king's deer, but it doesn't consider the victim hardly at all. We are doing a little better in recent years, but this allows the crime victims to have a recourse, Mr. Speaker. And I think we will hear a lot about this provision in the sanctuary cities law as this moves over to the Senate.

I think we made a lot of progress today. It has been a good day to do honor to the lives of Sarah Root, a beautiful young lady whose mother is here in this Capital City today and speaking and testifying and doing radio and meetings.

And one day I hope we hunt down Eswin Mejia, the killer of this beautiful young woman. And one day I hope we have the relationship with his home country where they will hunt him down and extradite him to the United States of America. That is, of course, a law we need to have in a civilized world.

And Kate Steinle, I thank not only Matt Salmon for bringing this forward, but Bill O'Reilly and the President of the United States.

Something this President has done is he asked the family members of the victims of criminal aliens in America to step up on the stage with him around the campaign trail over and over again. One would think that they were props for a campaign. That kind of criticism flowed out. But here is what he has really done: he illuminated the pain that they went through over and over again. When he came back to Iowa on a "thank you" tour, he had some of the crime victims there. He brought them up on the stage. You can tell by the look in his eye that they moved him.

He has said the thing that moved him the most in the entire campaign were the families who had an illegal kill their daughter, their son, their family member. That moved him the most. He has done honor to that.

He has asked that we bring this legislation to the floor. We have done so. We have passed it out of the House.

And the President, yesterday, met with a dozen or so of these families at the White House. He will continue to push this legislation till it becomes law. And I expect at the bill signing ceremony, these families will be invited back to the White House and they will get a closure on the pain that they are going through this day.

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

□ 1845

HONORING WILBERT AUSTIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor Reverend Wilbert Austin of Waco, Texas, who passed away on June 19, 2017.

Wilbert grew up poor in a small shack in the southern part of Waco in a racially segregated area called Sandtown. His father was a day laborer who picked cotton for a living, while his mother was a laundress and cafe worker. Wilbert used to play by the old rendering plant that was next to the cemetery in Sandtown.

Even in their poverty, Wilbert's parents were able to raise five children. His meager upbringing is something that would shape him for the rest of his life and molded him into a great servant.

During his life, Wilbert worked many jobs, including working for a glass bottle manufacturer, Owens-Illinois, and as a leader of the local chapter of the NAACP. During his time at the NAACP, he was known for advocating for civil rights in Waco. Always seeking to make Waco a better place, he would often make sure that children and families had a safe area to play and enjoy by keeping out drug dealers, doing so on a face-to-face basis, if needed.

Wilbert was a passionate advocate for his Christian faith and decided to share his faith in the pulpit. He became a pastor of Moody's Peaceful Rest Baptist Church, where he would serve for 38 years. He was known to his congregation and around Waco as someone with a servant's heart. Wilbert would mow lawns for the elderly and collect gift cards at Christmas to distribute to needy families.

In 1974, Wilbert led an effort to change local city government, and that made him an important part of Waco's history.

In the 1950s, the city had adopted an at-large district after an African-American individual nearly won a city council seat. As a result of his tireless and dedicated efforts, Waco dropped the at-large system and divided its city into five districts, with each district having a single elected representative. His perseverance changed the at-large system because it did not fairly represent the electoral choices of the African-American areas of Waco.

Though he never believed he would run for city council, Wilbert's desire to serve eventually led him to campaign for a seat. Wilbert showed great perseverance as he ran for city council five times, ultimately winning a seat in 2006.

He went on to serve as the councilman for District One for 11 years before

having to step down earlier this year due to declining health. Today's Waco is a diverse and inclusive city because of his community service.

Wilbert was also a devoted and loving husband to his late wife of 50 years, Annie Pearl Austin, who passed away from breast cancer in 2012. Annie was supportive of her husband's efforts to help Waco and would often tell her children: "No matter what or why he's out in the public, always love your dad and support him." They were blessed with 5 children, and they were the grandparents to 10 grandchildren.

During the last years of his life, Wilbert fought a battle with cancer that he ultimately lost. Throughout his battle, he never lost sight of where he was going. In a farewell address at his retirement party, Wilbert stated: "I'm all packed up. When you hear of my passing, don't grieve for me. I'm just another soldier going home to be with the Lord."

Mr. Speaker, Wilbert Austin worked tirelessly to better our central Texas community and did so by serving his congregation, his community, reducing crime, and serving in elected office.

He is loved by our community and certainly left an enduring impression on the greater Waco area. He will forever be remembered as a community leader, pastor, civil rights activist, servant, husband, father, grandfather, and friend.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Austin family. We also lift up the family and friends of Wilbert in our prayers.

I have requested that a United States flag be flown over the United States Capitol to honor the life and legacy of Reverend Wilbert Austin.

As I close today, I urge all Americans to continue praying for our country during these difficult times, for our military men and women who protect us from external threats, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

HONORING GENERAL JOE HANOVER

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor General Joe Hanover of Woodway, Texas, who passed away on May 22, 2017.

Joe was born in McGregor, Texas, on February 10, 1918. He grew up in a farming community and attended grade school in Wheelock before graduating from Franklin High School in 1938.

Wheelock was a special place to Joe because it is where he met the love of his life, Lucille, in the first grade.

During his high school years in Franklin, Joe became interested in engineering, an interest that would guide much of the rest of his life. Upon graduation from high school, Joe went to Texas A&M University in College Station, where he would go on to earn a bachelor of civil engineering degree in 1940. In 1941, he married Lucille and started his engineering career by working for the Texas Highway Department in Hearne.

World War II interrupted Joe's early career and family life, as he was called

into Active Duty in 1941. He was commissioned into the U.S. Army 10 months prior to Pearl Harbor and still carried his original orders to report to Camp Wallace, Texas, until the day he passed away.

During his service in World War II, George served in the European theater, notably in Belgium and France. He served in the 54th Coastal Artillery, a division that had 3,000 African-American soldiers in it.

At the conclusion of the war, Joe was given command of a German prisoner of war camp in Marseilles, France. In an interview with the local newspaper, Joe was quoted as saying: "I started as a commander of Black soldiers, fighting against the world's greatest racist, Adolph Hitler, and finished as the commander of a prison holding German soldiers who had tried to carry out Hitler's plans."

Joe's enlistment lasted 5 years, and he was given orders to go home in February 1946. He also joined the Army Reserve, from which he retired in 1971 with the rank of brigadier general. When he returned to the United States, he went back to work for the Texas Highway Department, embarking on a career that would last for more than 35 years.

Joe worked on numerous projects throughout the State and is best known in College Station for overseeing the completion of the University Drive overpass. On the 50-year anniversary of the opening of that structure, the City of College Station declared March 21 of each year going forward to be Joe Hanover Day.

Texas A&M played a large role in Joe's life, and he was known for his great love of the university. He regularly attended Fightin' Texas Aggie sporting events, especially baseball and football games. When recounting the best days of his life, Joe would routinely tell you that the day he married Lucille and the day he was baptized were the two greatest days of his life.

Mr. Speaker, Joe Hanover fought in service of our country and worked tirelessly to better the Bryan-College Station area. He is loved by our community and certainly left an enduring impression on the Brazos Valley. He will be forever remembered as a hero, community leader, husband, and friend.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Hanover family. We also lift up the family and friends of Joe Hanover in our prayers.

I requested that a United States flag be flown over the Capitol to honor the life and legacy of General Joe Hanover.

As I close today, I urge all Americans to continue praying for our country during these difficult times, for our military men and women who protect us from external threats, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

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

PERSECUTION OF CHRISTIANS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to talk about persecution, worldwide, of people of the Christian faith. We don't hear much about Christian persecution through world media, and I think it is important that Americans understand that persecution of minority religious groups throughout the world continues, and especially continues against Christians.

Each month, Mr. Speaker, 332 Christians are killed, 214 churches are destroyed, and 772 forms of violence are committed against Christians. Once again, every month, 332 Christians are killed, 214 churches are destroyed, and 772 forms of violence are committed against individuals of the Christian faith.

In 2013, Christians faced persecution in 102 out of 190 countries. For the second year in a row, Christians are the most persecuted religious group in the entire world.

In 2016, 90,000 Christians were killed for their faith worldwide. In 2016, roughly 600 million people were prevented from practicing their faith through intimidation, forced conversions, bodily harm, or even death. Many Christians are brutally murdered simply for their belief in Jesus.

Oppression is not limited to Christians worldwide. Religious minorities throughout the world are restricted in their practices or persecuted for their beliefs. Eighty-two countries, worldwide, require people in minority religious groups in that country to register with the government, while 99 countries restrict their practicing of religion.

Here are the top 10 Christian persecution countries in the world.

It is no surprise that North Korea is number one on the hit list that wants to punish and persecute Christians. Little Kim takes delight in torturing people, especially people of religious beliefs, including Christians. Christians are often sent to prison camps for just owning a Bible. Those Bibles are smuggled in through other countries, but generally they come from South Korea.

Approximately 80,000 to 120,000 are imprisoned in labor camps for their religious beliefs. That is 80,000 to 120,000 people are in prison camps, labor camps, because of their religion in little Kim's dictatorship of North Korea.

So, number one is North Korea. I will give you the other nine, Mr. Speaker.

Somalia is number two; number three is Afghanistan; Pakistan is number four; Sudan is number five. Of the 10 worst countries for Christian persecution, number six, no surprise, is Syria. Iraq is number seven; Iran is number eight; Yemen is number nine; and Eritrea is number 10 of the top 10 countries that persecute Christians for simply believing in the Christian faith.

The Pew Research Council says 95 percent of the countries in the Middle East and North Africa have instances of government harassment or use of force against religious groups; 75 percent had instances of government harassment against even Muslims, people that believe differently than the government faith.

In Asia, there has been an uptick in persecution by governments in Islamic extremism. Christians in this region are targeted by national religious movements—the Muslim, the Hindu, and the Buddhist—in countries like Pakistan, India, and Myanmar. Christians around the world routinely face blasphemy laws for simply speaking about their faith.

A country that I haven't mentioned yet is Communist Vietnam. Yes, Mr. Speaker, whether we leave off that phrase Communist Vietnam, they are still a communist country, an atheistic country. New laws led by the government punish anyone who dares to practice their religion or speak out against the authoritarian regime.

New laws are being used to crack down on citizens' basic human right of the right to believe and practice their religion. New rounds of arrests this year are proof.

Human Rights Watch says 110 people are prisoners of conscience or imprisoned in harsh conditions after unfair trials. These prisoners are not criminals, but the government thinks they are criminals because they practice their religion. They are advocates for human rights and social justice. They are pastors and priests. They are in jail for believing in the Almighty. Pastor Nguyen Cong Chinh has been in prison in Vietnam since 2011.

□ 1900

Mr. Speaker, I might add here that prisons in Vietnam haven't changed much over the years. It is still a Communist country, and when you go to jail in Vietnam, you are in a prison like no other. Those prisons still exist, and they house people because the government puts people of Christian faith in jail.

Pastor Nguyen has been tortured and beaten. He has no contact with his family. They give him food, and they make fun of him because in the food they give him, they break up glass and put the glass in that food.

He is being held in solitary confinement, and all because he took a stand for Christianity and he told officials—and he told officials from the United States—about his treatment in jail. The security officials not only give him physical torture, they give him mental torture as well.

His wife has also suffered for her faith. Last year, she was beaten and jailed while peacefully campaigning for religious freedom.

You see, Mr. Speaker, when they go out in Vietnam and advocate the human right of religious freedom, the Government of Vietnam persecutes

them for that—beats them, tortures them, and puts them in jail. Americans need to be aware of what is taking place in this country and others.

His wife suffered for her faith, but she continued to preach the word even against this evil injustice.

Even to this day, the Vietnamese Communists harass her as well as her husband who is incarcerated.

Indonesia is the world's largest Muslim majority nation. But there are communities of Hindus and Christians and Buddhists. These three groups of religious individuals are persecuted because they are not the faith of the government.

There is an alarming shift in tolerance. Indonesia used to claim and be, to some extent, tolerant of other religious faiths other than the Muslim faith. They were proud of that. But there is a shift in the government to not tolerate religious minorities.

Recently, the governor of Jakarta was sentenced to prison for 2 years for blasphemy against the Muslim faith. His charge is based on statements the governor made about the Koran that were seen as offensive to Islam, therefore offensive to the government, and there he goes, off to jail in Indonesia.

Religious tolerance and free speech is being lost, while in Indonesia hard line Islamic forces are encouraging this persecution.

Pakistan. Pakistan is a country I have talked about frequently on this House floor, but Pakistan churches have been bombed and people have been killed.

In one town, a 14-year-old Christian boy, because he was a Christian, was beaten and set on fire. Persecution of the young. Persecution of the elderly. All because of their religious faith.

In Pakistan, Pakistan not only persecutes Christians, they persecute other Muslims who don't agree with the government position on Islam, including the Murji'ah.

In the Middle East, Egypt has recently come under scrutiny because of the increase in attacks from Islamic extremists who target Christians.

In May, gunmen forced Coptic Christian pilgrims from buses, took them out of the buses, and executed 28 of them because they were Coptic Christians.

Palm Sunday this year, twin bombings on Christian churches in Egypt killed almost 50 people. A man cloaked in explosives snuck through security and detonated his bomb, killing 28 and wounding 70.

At the same time, another suicide bomber attacked St. Mark's Church in Alexandria, Egypt, killing another 17 people, and injuring scores more.

Over a 3-day period in 2013, Coptic Christians experienced the worst attack against their churches in 700 years in Egypt. Forty churches were destroyed, and more than 100 other sites were severely damaged.

One boy was beaten to death for wearing a cross around his neck. He is

walking down the street, he has got a cross around his neck, and, lo and behold, he is attacked, beaten to death because of his religious belief.

Tens of thousands of Coptic Christians have fled the country. Well, no kidding. They are leaving because their lives depend on it.

ISIS has decimated ancient Christian communities in the Middle East as well. We have this issue of governments persecuting Christians or allowing persecution to exist. But alongside this, we have this terrorist group ISIS that it is part of their mission wherever they are in the world to kill people who don't agree with their religion. And, of course, that includes Christians as well.

In Iraq, before there was ISIS, there were approximately 300,000 Christians who lived in Iraq. No one knows how many remain today, but hundreds of thousands have left the country or been killed.

In Mosul, for example, 10 years ago, about 35,000 Christians lived in Mosul—10 years ago. Now there are 20, maybe 30 Christians. They have been killed, tortured, or fled the country.

ISIS' campaign to destroy historic sites and monuments of Christians is now something that the world media is talking about. ISIS destroyed the monastery of St. Elijah outside Mosul. This monastery stood there in Mosul for 1,400 years, and here comes the terrorist group ISIS that tears it down because it is a site where Christians practiced Christianity.

ISIS has been so fervent in their killing of Christians that this House even passed legislation stating that ISIS is committing genocide against Christians. And they are.

So you got ISIS in different parts of the world. One of their goals is to kill religious folks who disagree with them, especially Christians. And to some extent, they have been very successful at that.

When we talk about destroying and eliminating ISIS, we need to remember that we will eliminate their genocide against Christians as well, if we destroy ISIS.

In Iran, Open Doors USA ranked the persecution level of Christians in Iran as extreme. Religious police move about the city kind of like the Gestapo, and when they suspect Christians are gathering for worship, they raid the homes, arrest the leaders, and destroy Bibles. That is what the religious police, the Gestapo police as I call them, in Iran do.

Iranians who come to study in the United States and become a Christian, they can't go back to Iran. They go back to Iran, Iran puts them in jail, and they suddenly disappear. Converts to Christianity face charges of apostasy and possible death sentences if they ever return. People who become Christians in Iran, who make that choice as a believer, also know that their days are numbered in Iran if the religious police catch them.

In Libya, the Islamic State captured and beheaded 21 people because they were Christians. I don't think that we should be insensitive to this act of beheading folks altogether because of their religious faith. We shouldn't be insensitive because it continues on in Libya as well.

In Libya, where they murdered the 21 people, the victims' families wanted to build a church in their honor. Well, as they were building the church, they were beaten by people who were of the Muslim faith to make sure that that church did not exist. And that is Libya.

In Syria, the head of the Franciscans in the Middle East has reported that of the 4,000 inhabitants of the village of Ghassanieh, no more than 10 people remain in that town, and they have been killed by Assad's thugs and the militant groups like ISIS. Christians have really got it bad in Syria because everybody is after them. You got ISIS that is after them, and then you got Assad the dictator, the brutal dictator, he kills them as well.

Moving on, I want to mention Russia. Russia seems to be something everybody wants to talk about. Why don't we talk about Russia and what they are doing to Christians today.

I went to the Soviet Union back in the 1980s, when it was the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union persecuted people who were religious at all. I mean, if you owned a Bible, you are going to jail. If you tried to worship, you are going to jail. They constantly did that under the Soviet regime of people of any religious faith. Primarily it was Orthodox Christians, and it was also Jews.

The wall came down, and now we have Putin in charge. The world needs to understand that Putin is moving in the direction of persecuting people of religious beliefs just like when he was a member of the KGB under the Soviet Union. Putin. I call him the Napoleon of Siberia. So what are they doing?

Well, they are starting out with laws requiring missionaries to have a permit, and they make house churches illegal. What is a house church? A house church is where two or three are gathered together in a house in the Lord's name and try to worship. You can't do that. That is against the law.

If you are going to worship, you have to get a permit to worship in a structured building, and only certain religious groups get a permit to even practice any religion. That is difficult in itself. So you have to be in a structured building approved by the government, and that particular denomination or religious faith has to have a permit to do so.

If you are in Russia, you cannot practice religion online. You know, that online happens all over the world except if you are in Russia, you are not going to be able to promote any type of religion or you are going to jail. This is the greatest threat to Christianity in Russia since the Soviet days. We haven't heard much about that. We

have heard other things, but this is something that we need to be aware of, the persecution of people because of religious faith.

One of my daughters recently went to Russia, and she experienced and saw this very thing that I am talking about. No home church worship services, only structured buildings where you have the Russian police watching what takes place. So they are moving in a direction like they were under the Soviet days of persecuting people who have religious faith.

Putin is taking Khrushchev's—I am older than you are, Mr. Speaker. I remember when Khrushchev was here. He made the comment when he was the dictator of the Soviet Union that Christianity will never exist in the Soviet Union. It cannot. I don't think it can be legislated out, but Khrushchev was determined to make sure that Christianity and other religious faiths did not exist in the Soviet Union. Of course, I believe it will continue whether or not Christians are persecuted anyway.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have always thought that people from Texas should get more time because we talk slower, and might even think slower. But, anyway, I appreciate the 12 minutes, and I will use it.

Mr. Speaker, I am a cosponsor, and other Members are cosponsors, of a bill that will provide expedited visa protection and processing for Christians and Yazidi refugees from the Middle East. They are targets of genocide in Iraq, Syria, Pakistan, Iran, and Libya, and we hope to expedite visas for those people who are trying to flee religious persecution.

Hopefully, the President of the United States will address the issues of human rights violations in Vietnam. Members of Congress, including myself, have asked the President to address this when he deals with the country of Vietnam.

And, of course, there is other legislation sponsored by Mr. TRENT FRANKS from Arizona which calls upon the U.S. to use its influence in the United Nations to condemn the ongoing sexual violence against women and children of religious faith.

These young women and girls are being sexually assaulted because of their religious faith or their religious beliefs. A lot of that is being done by ISIS.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of other things.

Watchdog groups report that each month 332 Christians are killed by their faith and 214 churches and Christian properties are destroyed. Of course Christians, like other religious minorities, have been persecuted for years. A little history is in order here, Mr. Speaker.

In this country, we have religious freedom. We are a nation that believes that all people should have religious freedom.

When our Forefathers got together and they declared independence from Great Britain, which we will celebrate next Tuesday, and they got together and they wrote the Constitution, they added 10 Amendments to the Constitution.

The First Amendment of the Constitution is not first by accident. It is first because it is the most important of all rights, and there are five rights in the First Amendment. The first right in the First Amendment is the most important right. Here is what it is, and I will read just a portion of the Constitution, Mr. Speaker: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Religious freedom is the number one right of Americans. It doesn't just say to believe what you want to believe. It says you have the right to practice it, to get out there and practice it, even in public, number one.

Number two, "Congress shall make no law . . . prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress. . . ."

There are five rights in the First Amendment. The first one: religious freedom.

Many, many people came to this new world seeking religious freedom. That is why they came here, primarily Christian religious freedom. They were being persecuted in Europe. They came to the United States and made sure that we do not persecute people of religious faith.

The opposite is true. It is a right. I feel very strongly, as I think most people do, that it is the first right, and it is the most important right. And it is a human right. It is not just a right for Americans. It is a right for all people.

People in Syria, Iran, North Korea, Yemen, and all those countries I mentioned, those people—who we don't know who they are—have the right, the human right, of religious freedom. That is a basic right of all people everywhere. I hope that we as a people encourage other people and governments throughout the world: Let folks worship the way they want to worship because it is a human right, and, I believe, that we have gotten it from the Almighty.

And the last thing I would comment on is we need to be careful in this country that we don't end up persecuting by legislation or by the judiciary, infringing upon the First Amendment, the first right, of the free exercise of religion. That is a story for another day, Mr. Speaker.

So, as we get close to the Fourth of July, the Declaration of Independence—our ancestors got together and said they wanted freedom, and they

pledged to themselves and to others their sacred honor. Many of them lost everything, the war between us and England, the biggest and most powerful empire that had ever existed. It took over 7 years, but it was worth it.

That is why the Fourth of July is important, because it is a declaration of independence. And it is also, as Thomas Jefferson said in the Declaration of Independence, a statement of human rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that governments are instituted among men to secure those rights.

Mr. Speaker, on the Fourth of July, we need to remember our country, remember the people who lived here and gave us this country, and it is our job to make sure we keep it.

And that is just the way it is.

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

DEVASTATING IMPACTS ILLEGAL MARIJUANA GROW OPERATIONS ARE HAVING ON OUR NATION'S PUBLIC LANDS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I have a presentation here, but, first, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), my friend, who has a very important topic to cover as well. I appreciate his friendship and his strong leadership on the things that really count around here.

LIU XIAOBO RESOLUTION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my very good friend from California for his graciousness in yielding me this time and for his wonderful work as a Member of Congress on human rights and pro-life issues. I thank him for that leadership.

Mr. Speaker, tonight, I rise and note to my colleagues that the news of Nobel Peace Prize winner Liu Xiaobo's diagnosis of terminal liver cancer was a jarring shock to everyone who admires this champion of freedom and democracy.

Tonight, the House has under consideration an urgent resolution, a truly urgent resolution, H. Con. Res. 67, which I introduced, joined by Ms. PELOSI, and several of the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, she and I together, some bipartisanship in a place where we have had little of it lately. But here we are joined, and we are joined very strongly on behalf of Liu Xiaobo and his dire, dire situation, and that of his wife.

The legislation urges the Government of the People's Republic of China to unconditionally release Liu Xiaobo, together with his wife, Liu Xia, to allow them to freely meet with friends, family, and counsel, and seek medical treatment wherever they desire.

The operative language of the resolution makes it very clear that it recognizes Liu Xiaobo for his decades of

peaceful struggle for basic human rights and democracy and, again, urges that he be able to seek medical care, including treatment in the United States or wherever else he would like to receive it.

I want to thank Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY. This resolution was introduced yesterday. The majority leader made sure that this legislation came to the floor just a few hours ago to ensure that we went on the record as a Congress showing our solidarity of Liu Xiaobo and his wife and our deep, deep compassion and concern for the plight that he finds himself in.

I want to thank Speaker RYAN, who also expressed strong concern for Liu Xiaobo, and, of course, NANCY PELOSI and STENY HOYER because this required bipartisan support to bring it up on the UC; and also ED ROYCE, the chairman of the full Committee on Foreign Affairs, the famous gentleman from California, and, of course, the ranking member, ELIOT ENGEL.

Mr. Speaker, in February of 2010, I led a bipartisan group of lawmakers nominating Liu Xiaobo for the Nobel Peace Prize and, at the same time, nominating two other persecuted Chinese human rights advocates, Chen Guangcheng and Gao Zhisheng, to be joint recipients of this most prestigious award. Others, including the great Vaclav Havel, also pushed for Liu to get this important recognition which we had hoped would help push the human rights agenda in China.

The Nobel Peace Prize Committee agreed and awarded the Nobel Peace Prize to Liu Xiaobo for his “long and nonviolent struggle for fundamental human rights in China.”

I attended the Oslo ceremony, at the invitation of the family, along with Leader PELOSI. It was a moving ceremony, Mr. Speaker. The now famous empty chair spoke volumes about the Chinese Communist Party’s abiding fear that human rights and democracy will undermine its power. There, on the stage, was this chair without the recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize.

After that, I held several hearings both in the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations and also on the Congressional-Executive Commission on China, which I co-chair with MARCO RUBIO. And again, we always had a picture of the empty chair where Liu Xiaobo should have been rightly honored and hopefully freed to pursue the righteousness of his human rights work.

He said, in absentia, that day: “Freedom of expression is the foundation of human rights, the source of humanity, and the mother of truth. To strangle freedom of speech is to trample on human rights, stifle humanity, and suppress truth.”

Chinese authorities have gone to great lengths to stifle Liu Xiaobo’s ability to speak truth to power. In 2009, he was given an 11-year prison sentence for “inciting subversion of state power.”

His wife, Liu Xia, also was detained in de facto form “house arrest” since 2010. She is in urgent need of medical care, as well, having been hospitalized for a heart condition. Over the past year, authorities have allowed her to visit her husband only on a very few occasions.

According to Chinese authorities, Liu’s conviction was based on Charter 08, a treatise signed by over 300 intellectuals and activists. That document states that freedom, equality, and human rights are universal values of humankind, and that democracy and constitutional government are the fundamental framework for protecting these values.

Sadly, Liu Xiaobo and Liu Xia, his wife, are not alone in facing unjust repression. As of September 2017, the Congressional-Executive Commission on China, which collects and maintains probably the most effective and comprehensive political database for any country—and this is on China—contains information on at least 1,400 cases of known political or religious prisoners.

According to the annual report, the government of President Xi Jinping has engaged in an extraordinary assault on the rule of law, human rights, ethnic minority groups, and civil society in recent years.

Under Xi’s leadership, the Chinese Government has pushed through new laws and drafted legislation that would legitimize political, religious, and ethnic repression, further curtail civil liberties, and expand censorship of the internet. And the whole issue of the one child, now maybe two child per couple policy, coercion and population control, continues to harm women and children with extreme hurtfulness. It is just beyond the pale of what a government should be doing to its own people.

It is tempting to be pessimistic about China’s future and the future of U.S. relations. Frankly, I am not pessimistic, despite the circumstances, because I do believe Liu Xiaobo is the future, and people who have his belief in fundamental human rights.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by just saying I believe that someday China will be free; someday the people of China will be able to enjoy all of their God-given rights, and a nation of free Chinese men and women will honor and celebrate Liu Xiaobo as a hero. He will be honored, along with all of the others like him, who have sacrificed so much for so long for freedom.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. SMITH for standing up for that important issue and making that known. So, I thank him, and I appreciate him joining with us tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss the devastating impacts that illegal marijuana grow operations are having on our public lands—even private lands, as well.

As pictured here, this is not an uncommon scene in my district in northern California, in many of the Western

States, or anywhere where people think they can get away with it, where someone may not be paying attention. We see that very often on our Federal lands because, honestly, regretfully, they are not managed very well and they are not managed very often.

We hope to see that turn around under this new administration, this new leadership, that U.S. Forest Service lands have more attention to them, that they are managed more with timber harvest, thinning, things of that nature, to make the forests healthier.

This certainly does not cause a healthier situation for our forests, as you see pictured here, the amount of damage that can come from that. I will tell you a little bit about it here.

The devastating effects inflicted on the habitat and wildlife due to the non-permitted water diversions, extensive grading of the terrain—which, people in agriculture and construction have to get permits to do grading—and use of illegal toxicants and pesticides purchased outside of the United States—chemicals, products you can’t even use here, that haven’t been subjected to an EPA label process that ag chemicals and household chemicals have to do—this is what is coming in and being used on our public lands, poisoning them, poisoning the wildlife, and making it very dangerous for any people that might go in there.

According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, many threatened and endangered species which we are bending over backwards to try to recover, to try to protect, have tested positive for these poisons and other contaminants used at these illegal grow sites.

□ 1930

Preliminary tests of game animals, including birds and deer, have also tested positive for these illegal pesticides, again, that are banned by the EPA, not allowed to be used in the United States, haven’t been subject to the labeling requirements that are legal materials that we use in agriculture and other things that they have gone through.

So it is difficult to understand how the Federal Government can spend extensive resources going after farmers, ranchers, miners, whoever for doing legal operations. In agriculture, it might be disking or plowing. In mining, it might be panning for gold or normal mining operations.

So we have people cultivating their land for food. We have people extracting minerals that are needed for our daily lives, whether it is paving a road, driveway, concrete, whatever it might be. We have people legally doing these actions. They are the ones who have been—at least until recent months with the new administration—harassed with rules that hadn’t even been subject to congressional attention.

But at the same time, until recent months, this blatant criminal activity has been allowed to stand.

Is it because law enforcement can’t go into those—areas they are not authorized?

I know local law enforcement is really interested in doing this. But it has been a hands-off approach by some of our Federal officials who have either not wanted to put the resources together or haven't had the wherewithal to put enough of the resources together to go out and enforce on these foreign nationals doing these devastating things to our lands and the danger they cause.

What good are these Federal laws and statutes if we do not properly enforce the law to protect our public lands?

We are protecting, on one hand, again, the wrong people by inaction; and we are criminalizing normal activity, people farming, ranching, mining, et cetera. The priorities have been backwards. I hope to see a big change in that with the new direction of the new administration.

As if the environmental effects are not disturbing enough, the safety of the general public is at risk. Heavily armed drug cartels are using our National Forest to engage in large-scale illegal grow operations. You can see the haul on some of the weapons that have been taken from some of the raids that have been successfully done. This is pretty dangerous stuff.

Somewhere in the picture are people who have grenade-launching devices, if I am not mistaken.

So what kind of situation do we have going on where this kind of heavy armament is coming into our forests?

And on the other hand, law-abiding, Second Amendment-loving Americans are subject to confiscation, threatening high cost of ammunition, multitudes of anti-gun rhetoric that, again, makes you ask the questions: Who are we protecting and who are we criminalizing?

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, for example, has been forced to temporarily close refuge units during hunting season to protect the public from stumbling on to an illegal grow that might be guarded heavily by these criminals with these weapons.

In 2012, the DEA's Domestic Cannabis Eradication/Suppression Report indicated more than 10,000 or more illegal firearms seized nationwide in raids. This is the people's property. The public should be able to hunt, fish, camp, recreate with their families on it as they wish, safe from this criminal activity.

Unfortunately, the number of illegal grow sites on Federal lands continues to rise at an alarming rate. Even in States that have legalized marijuana for recreational use, like California—regrettably—and Colorado, they still are doing the illegal grows in lands that are in States that have so far legalized marijuana.

According to the U.S. Forest Service, in 2016, the Pacific Southwest region saw a 52 percent increase in marijuana production on Forest Service lands compared to a previous year.

So maybe the answer hasn't been in legalizing marijuana grows. The activity is still going on. It is still a sought-

after market for those people who want to be using it.

While the statistics seem staggering, it is believed that the true number of illegal grows on Federal lands is actually much higher than that 10,000 figure, much higher than what has been documented, much higher than the 52 percent increase that we are talking about.

So with the heavy rainfall that the Western States saw this winter—thankfully, we have gotten the rain—the regions are expecting an even higher surge of illegal marijuana production on the people's public lands.

The law enforcement capabilities of the U.S. Forest Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Land Management are not currently equipped to handle an issue of this high magnitude. These law enforcement officers are doing what they can with the resources allotted and the permission they are allowed by their higher-ups, but we need much more additional means and support to develop a coordinated approach to enforce against these foreign nationals and others that are doing these illegal grows, despite what the public might be wanting with legalized marijuana in their own grows.

While confronting the challenges of illegal marijuana cultivation in our National Forests is a large undertaking, it is important that we face this head on. Strong enforcement needs to come from the Federal Government that is supposed to be overseeing these lands. So we are talking about scenes like this right here. This is what is allowed to happen.

That is why criminalizing people doing legal activities, such as farming, ranching, mining, what have you, for tiny, very narrow occasional violations, this is what is being fostered out there. Look at this. The trash that is allowed to happen; empty chemical containers; everything else involved in the grow; people camping up there illegally, because the Federal Government, until recently, does not seem to have an interest in enforcing against these illegal grows.

Protecting our public lands from these destructive environmental threats, making sure our National Forests are safe for the public's use, for the habitat, for the wildlife, these are of key importance. This is what the public demands that we do. It is our job to keep the public safe and the lands, as well, in good stewardship. Much more needs to be done.

The Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, they have immediate jurisdiction over these. They need to allow and partner with local law enforcement as well, who knows the lands better than anybody in Washington, D.C., ever would.

And I don't need to remind you once again that marijuana is still classified, Federally, as an illegal drug. So these States—no matter how the voters have been duped, coerced, overwhelmed with dollars at the ballot box and on cam-

paigns, this is still an illegal drug. It is an illegal activity that has been going on.

So I hope what we are hearing from the Department of Justice—they will be looking really hard at whether this is even a legal activity in States that have been legalizing marijuana, and the harmful effects it is going to have on society as this stuff gets more powerful, more potent, and more available to kids.

We have a job to do. It all starts right here: taking care of these lands, the habitat and environment for wildlife that we all care about, the habitat for people, and the water quality.

What is going to come out of here as the water runs downstream through this stuff? What is that going to mean for our streams, rivers, lakes, to the water supplies that the people draw from here, that the animals draw from here?

It is not good. So the Federal Government needs to take a stronger approach, whether it is DOJ, in concert with the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture, and that input from local law enforcement in local communities. This could be a very good team operation if we are allowed to do it and we aggressively go after that.

I am seeing the seeds of that in the conversations that are coming out of our agencies here in Washington, D.C. Let's push forward on that and let's hear from the American public on making this happen as well.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 3, 2017, at 11 a.m.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

KAREN C. HANDEL
RALPH NORMAN

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1805. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Joseph W. Rixey, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1806. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Thomas J. Trask, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1807. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing nine officers to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1808. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michelle D. Johnson, United States Air Force, and her advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1809. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting the Air Force's proposed Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of India, Transmittal No. 17-33, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1810. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting the Air Force's proposed Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Australia, Transmittal No. 17-12, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1811. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-106, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1812. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-122, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1813. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-132, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1814. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-138, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1815. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-003, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1816. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-004, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1817. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-007, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1818. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-011, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1819. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-019, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1820. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-023, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1821. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-034, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1822. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-013, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1823. A letter from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-064, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1824. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, transmitting the 2016 management report of the Federal Home Loan Bank of New York and financial statements, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1825. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Agency Response for the period of October 1, 2016, to March 31, 2017, in accordance with Sec. 5 of Public Law 94-452, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1826. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Interior, transmitting notification that the Department issued payments to eligible local governments under the Payments In Lieu of Taxes (PILT) Program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1827. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Waterfront Construction [Docket No.: 160830798-7517-02] (RIN: 0648-BG32) received June 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1828. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the Court's annual report to Congress concerning intercepted wire, oral, or electronic communications, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2519(3); Public Law 90-351, Sec. 802 (as amended by Public Law 111-174, Sec. 6(3)); (124 Stat. 1217); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 3104. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants to States to support the establishment and operation of grocery stores in underserved communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 3105. A bill to establish a Federal Task Force to Support Grandparents Raising Grandchildren; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to

the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 3106. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to publish a maximum contaminant level goal and promulgate a national primary drinking water regulation for perfluorinated compounds (including perfluorooctanesulfonic acid and perfluorooctanoic acid), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. REED, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 3107. A bill to reauthorize the diesel emissions reduction program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD (for himself, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 3108. A bill to strengthen Federal consumer protection and product traceability with respect to commercially marketed seafood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself, Mr. RUSH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BOST, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KINZINGER, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 3109. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1114 North 2nd Street in Chillicothe, Illinois, as the "Sr. Chief Ryan Owens Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ROYCE of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. TROTT, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. KIHUEN):

H.R. 3110. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to modify the term of the independent member of the Financial Stability Oversight Council; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 3111. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of dental, vision, and hearing care under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):
H.R. 3112. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an option to claim a delayed retirement credit in a partial lump sum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 3113. A bill to require the chief election officials of the States to provide voter registration forms at certain naturalization proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. AMASH (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BRAT, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BUCK, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 3114. A bill to abolish the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NOLAN (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. EMMER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 3115. A bill to provide for a land exchange involving Federal land in the Superior National Forest in Minnesota acquired by the Secretary of Agriculture through the Weeks Law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. WOODALL):

H.R. 3116. A bill to allow railroad employees to remain on duty as necessary to clear a blockage of vehicular traffic at grade crossings; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia (for himself, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. COLE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H.R. 3117. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Energy, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality from considering the social cost of carbon, the social cost of methane, or the social cost of nitrous oxide, in taking any action, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. DESANTIS, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. YOHO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 3118. A bill to prevent further access of Iran and Hizballah into the Western Hemisphere, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Ms. BASS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILMER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 3119. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants to local educational agencies to encourage girls and underrepresented minorities to pursue studies and careers in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3120. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the volume of future electronic health record-related significant hardship requests; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MESSER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. EVANS, Ms. MENG, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BERA, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CRIST, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. WALZ, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 3121. A bill to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. RENACCI):

H.R. 3122. A bill to protect individuals who are eligible for increased pension under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs on the basis of need of regular aid and attendance from dishonest, predatory, or otherwise unlawful practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 3123. A bill to award a Congressional gold medal, collectively, to the First Rhode Island Regiment, in recognition of their dedicated service during the Revolutionary War; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. REED, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 3124. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the occurrence of diabetes in Medicare beneficiaries by ex-

tending coverage under Medicare for medical nutrition therapy services to such beneficiaries with pre-diabetes or with risk factors for developing type 2 diabetes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 3125. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Ebenezer D. Bassett, the first African-American diplomat; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 3126. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to individuals for legal expenses paid with respect to establishing guardianship of a family member with disabilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia):

H.R. 3127. A bill to amend section 111 of the Clean Air Act to exclude energy efficiency projects, pollution control projects, and reliability projects from the definition of a modification; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia):

H.R. 3128. A bill to amend section 111 of the Clean Air Act to clarify when a physical change in, or change in the method of operation of, a stationary source constitutes a modification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HECK (for himself, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. COLE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. KILMER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. TORRES, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 3129. A bill to direct the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund to perform an outreach program for the new markets tax credit to underserved communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 3130. A bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to promote active citizenship, including volunteerism, community dialogue, and service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Foreign Affairs, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 3131. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to conform citizen suits under that Act with other existing law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. COHEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr.

CICILLINE, Ms. BASS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 3132. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to promote accuracy, integrity, and security in the administration of elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia):

H.R. 3133. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to reduce unnecessary permitting delays by clarifying associated procedures to increase economic development and support coastal restoration programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 3134. A bill to direct Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Director of Federal Housing Finance Agency to develop a program to provide assistance to creditworthy borrowers with Federal student debt in purchasing certain foreclosed homes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California):

H.R. 3135. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to make grants to consortia of States and communities to hire individuals to coordinate the Community Rating System program under the National Flood Insurance Program for the States and communities who are members of the consortia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. BYRNE):

H.R. 3136. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit fellowship and stipend compensation to be saved in an individual retirement account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 3137. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 to increase the participation of women in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics occupations; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. TORRES, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 3138. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat Indian tribal governments in the same manner as State governments for certain Federal tax purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 3139. A bill to provide that silencers be treated the same as firearms accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOBBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHEA-POR-TER, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MAXINE

WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 3140. A bill to establish a National and Community Service Administration to carry out the national and volunteer service programs, to expand participation in such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 3141. A bill to require a Federal agency to include language in certain educational and advertising materials indicating that such materials are produced and disseminated at taxpayer expense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Mr. DELANEY):

H.R. 3142. A bill to establish the Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia):

H.R. 3143. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to make certain strategic energy infrastructure projects eligible for certain loan guarantees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. WALDEN):

H.R. 3144. A bill to provide for operations of the Federal Columbia River Power System pursuant to a certain operation plan for a specified period of time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MESSER (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. HULTGREN):

H.R. 3145. A bill to provide the legal framework and income tax treatment necessary for the growth of innovative private financing options, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, Armed Services, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia:

H.R. 3146. A bill to direct the United States Trade Representative to initiate negotiations with the Government of the Republic of Turkey to seek to enter into a bilateral free trade agreement with Turkey; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 3147. A bill to amend the PROTECT Act to make Indian tribes eligible for AMBER Alert grants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NOLAN (for himself and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 3148. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for limitations on duty hours for yardmaster employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3149. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide credits for the production of renewable chemicals and investments in renewable chemical production facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 3150. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to helicopter crash resistant fuel systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POLIQUIN:

H.R. 3151. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to reduce waste, fraud, and abuse in the supplemental nutrition assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. HECK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 3152. A bill to require full spending of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, to provide for expanded uses of the Fund, and to prevent cargo diversion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 3153. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide uniform standards for the use of electronic signatures for third-party disclosure authorizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 3154. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 relative to the powers of the Department of Justice Inspector General; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 3155. A bill to amend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 to modify the authorized uses of certain county funds and to extend the deadline for participating counties to initiate projects and obligate funds; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 3156. A bill to establish the Water Science Centers within the United States Geological Survey; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SUOZZI:

H.R. 3157. A bill to improve the handling of instances of sexual harassment, dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking at the United States Merchant Marine Academy and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently

determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 3158. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the authorities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire, recruit, and train employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 3159. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the taxable estate by the value of certain family-owned business interests; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HECK, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 3160. A bill to transform neighborhoods of extreme poverty by reforming the public housing demolition and disposition rules to require one-for-one replacement and tenant protections, and to provide public housing agencies with additional resources and flexibility to preserve public housing units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 3161. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include biomass heating appliances for tax credits available for energy-efficient building property and energy property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida (for herself, Mr. COOPER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CORREA, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. COSTA):

H.J. Res. 107. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LEE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HECK, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Ms. ADAMS):

H. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the overtime rule published in the Federal Register by the Secretary of Labor on May 23, 2016, would provide millions of workers with greater economic security and was a legally valid exercise of the authority of the Secretary under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Res. 422. A resolution urging adherence to the "one country, two systems" policy as prescribed in the Joint Declaration between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and the Government of the

People's Republic of China on the Question of the Hong Kong; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DELANEY, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HOYER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. BASS):

H. Res. 423. A resolution condemning in the strongest terms the unprovoked and racially motivated murder of Lt. Richard W. Collins III in College Park, Maryland, on May 20, 2017, expressing concern for the rising tide of racist and hate-based activities being committed on our college campuses, and reaffirming our support for inclusion, diversity, and safety in our higher education institutions in the wake of these attacks; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H. Res. 424. A resolution congratulating the National Air Traffic Controllers Association (in this resolution referred to as "NATCA") on the celebration of its 30th anniversary and recognizing its members' vital contributions to the United States and our National Airspace System; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MENG, and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 425. A resolution supporting the protection of the name Harlem; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CORREA, Ms. LEE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. NORCROSS, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GALLEGOS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PANETTA, and Ms. TITUS):

H. Res. 426. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of Defense should review section 504 of title 10, United States Code, for purposes related to enlisting certain aliens in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia:

H. Res. 427. A resolution protecting Religious Freedom in America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. NOR-TON, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. KIND, Mr. PETERS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. EVANS, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. LANCE):

H. Res. 428. A resolution expressing support for the designation of "National Eating Disorders Awareness Week" and supporting the goals and ideals to raise awareness and understanding of eating disorders; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H. Res. 429. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the need for Congress to have the power to implement and enforce limits on when money can be spent on campaign activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

73. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 67 memorializing the Congress to pass legislation or adopt policies allowing Louisiana to manage the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery out to two hundred nautical miles off the coast of Louisiana; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

74. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 136, memorializing the Congress to review federal laws, rules, regulations, and procedures to ensure that veterans and their family members have convenient access to military service and medical records; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

75. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 120, memorializing the Congress to take such actions as are necessary to support the domestic beef industry; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Agriculture.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 3104.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 3105.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3106.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The General Welfare Clause:

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution grants Congress the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 3107.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states that "The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 3108.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section, 8.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 3109.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7

"The Congress shall have Power To . . . establish Post Offices and post Roads . . ."

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 3110.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 3111.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 3112.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3113.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The General Welfare Clause:

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution grants Congress the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 3114.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the implied power to repeal laws that exceed its constitutional authority as well as laws within its constitutional authority.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 3115.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution, which gives Congress the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3116.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia:

H.R. 3117.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3118.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 3119.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 3120.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 3121.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; Article I, Section 8, Clause 12: To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years. Article I, Section 8, Clause 13:

To provide and maintain a Navy.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 3123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 3124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 3125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 3126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 3127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:
H.R. 3159.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. CONST. art. I, §1
By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:
H.R. 3160.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 and Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WELCH:
H.R. 3161.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:
H.J. Res. 107.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article V of the Constitution, which provides as follows:
“The Congress, whenever two thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states, or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress”

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 40: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 113: Mr. PANETTA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. TORRES, and Ms. HANABUSA,
H.R. 173: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 233: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. GALLEGU, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 299: Mr. MCEACHIN.
H.R. 305: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 367: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 422: Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 449: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 489: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 490: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 502: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 525: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 545: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 619: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 631: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 664: Mr. MACARTHUR and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 721: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 747: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 754: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HULTGREEN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. LOBIONDO,

Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 767: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 778: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 785: Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 807: Mr. VELA, Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 820: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FASO, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 825: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 846: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 873: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CORREA, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. REED.
H.R. 911: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 930: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. REED.
H.R. 959: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 986: Mr. BLUM.
H.R. 1017: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 1057: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1058: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1094: Mr. MEEKS and Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 1116: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 1141: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1143: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1173: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 1225: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 1231: Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 1251: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 1261: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1264: Mr. HURD and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1276: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1318: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1361: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 1413: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 1421: Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1456: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. DENT.
H.R. 1472: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1494: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DESANTIS, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 1511: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1528: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1539: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 1550: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 1554: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 1568: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 1575: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1661: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1676: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. CRIST.
H.R. 1683: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1686: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 1697: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 1698: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. BACON.
H.R. 1699: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 1731: Mr. DENT and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1772: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 1777: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 1810: Mr. REED.
H.R. 1820: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 1881: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1889: Ms. MENG, Mr. NOLAN, and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
H.R. 1904: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 1928: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 1960: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1963: Mr. MAST.
H.R. 1987: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1989: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JONES, and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2010: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2049: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2061: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 2069: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 2076: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 2092: Mr. MARINO and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2142: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2147: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 2150: Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. HECK, Mr. BACON, Mr. KINZINGER, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2152: Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 2158: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 2228: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 2259: Mr. BEYER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 2287: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia and Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 2309: Mr. DEFAZIO and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2315: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2327: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 2341: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 2386: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 2394: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 2418: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2422: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2431: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 2482: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 2501: Mr. MACARTHUR and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2515: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 2519: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. FLORES, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. CHENEY, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 2550: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2595: Mr. COFFMAN and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 2603: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 2633: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 2646: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 2651: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
H.R. 2670: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2687: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 2695: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2696: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2701: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2711: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2712: Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 2732: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. DUNN.
H.R. 2740: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2746: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2777: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2826: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 2827: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 2838: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2839: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2851: Mr. MARINO and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2854: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2858: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 2862: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 2870: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 2871: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 2901: Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2902: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2909: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 2913: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2915: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 2918: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 2948: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. EMMER, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. WILIAMS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2967: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2989: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 2994: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 2996: Mr. BABIN, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 2997: Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. FASO, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MAST, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 2999: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3000: Mr. TROTT and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 3030: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. KINZINGER.

H.R. 3031: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3040: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 3059: Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. DEMINGS,

Ms. BASS, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 3087: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 3088: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 3097: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. COLE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. YOHO, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BRAT, Mr. NUNES, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. COOK, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 3101: Mr. CORREA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. EVANS.

H.J. Res. 31: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.J. Res. 102: Mr. WELCH.

H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. BARTON.

H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Con. Res. 57: Mr. NUNES.

H. Res. 15: Mr. EVANS.

H. Res. 28: Mr. EVANS and Mr. JONES.

H. Res. 128: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MAST, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. WALZ, and Mrs. WAGNER.

H. Res. 220: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 257: Mr. OLSON.

H. Res. 259: Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. KEATING.

H. Res. 271: Mr. LAMALFA.

H. Res. 274: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. CICILLINE.

H. Res. 279: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee and Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Res. 296: Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 307: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. GOSAR.

H. Res. 317: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H. Res. 376: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H. Res. 399: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. OLSON,

H. Res. 400: Mr. COSTA, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. KATKO, Mr. SANFORD, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H. Res. 407: Mrs. HARTZLER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 60: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H. Res. 353: Mrs. HARTZLER.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 2017

No. 112

Senate

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, source of all goodness, use our lawmakers today for Your glory. Make them undaunted people who strive to know Your will and experience Your power. Provide them with exactly what they need to accomplish Your purposes. May they receive Heaven's approbation for their faithful service to You and country. Lord, transform their intractable problems with solutions from Your throne. We commit the work of this day to You, receiving Your strength to honor Your Name.

And, Lord, we thank You for the faithfulness of our summer pages. Bless these young people as they prepare to leave us.

We pray in Your generous Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The President pro tempore.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1460

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1460) to provide for the modernization of the energy and natural re-

sources policies of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Rao nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Neomi Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until the cloture vote will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, Senators and the White House are continuing discussions on the path forward for bringing relief from ObamaCare and its collapsing markets. We have made good progress, and we will keep working. As we do, our focus will remain on the major ObamaCare problems that continue to hurt Americans all across our country.

Under ObamaCare, premiums have skyrocketed. Over the past several years, ObamaCare has caused premiums to climb by an average of 105 percent in the vast majority of States on the Federal exchange, and it has caused them to triple in some States.

Next year, ObamaCare is expected to raise premiums again, as high as 30 percent or greater in States like Connecticut and Virginia, by as much as 40 percent or greater in Maine and Iowa, and by as much as an astonishing 80 percent in New Mexico. Obviously, Americans deserve a lot better than that.

Under ObamaCare, choices have diminished, even disappeared, in States all across our country. ObamaCare has left 70 percent of counties with little or no insurance options on the exchanges this year. Even worse, next year, dozens more counties could have zero choice at all—potentially leaving thousands trapped, forced by law to purchase ObamaCare insurance but left without the means to do so. For instance, as we learned just yesterday, as many as 14 of Nevada's 17 counties could now be left without any insurance options under ObamaCare at all in 2018. Americans deserve a lot better than that.

Under ObamaCare, mandates have forced families into plans they don't want or can't afford, preferred doctors have become less accessible to many

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S3837

patients, and plans have grown less desirable but more extensive. Americans deserve better than that. That is why we are continuing to work hard. Fixing ObamaCare's failures and protecting families from its consequences is not an easy task.

It is disappointing that our Democratic colleagues made clear early on that they were not interested in joining our efforts in a serious, comprehensive manner, especially given how many of their constituents have been hurt by the law they themselves voted for and continue—continue—to defend. The Republican conference continues to work through solutions to help those who have been hurt by this failing system because, as we can all agree, ObamaCare's status quo is simply unsustainable and unacceptable. We have to act, and we are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING ARTHUR J. JACKSON

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, we lost another great American this month with the passing of Arthur J. Jackson. He received the Medal of Honor in 1945 for his service in the Pacific theater of World War II. His name may not be as familiar as it once was. In retirement, he lived a quiet life. I didn't want to let his death pass without paying tribute to him, his family, and the extraordinary acts of courage with which he defended our country. Although, to be sure, "extraordinary" doesn't really describe the half of it.

It was September 1944, and Private Jackson, a 19-year-old Ohio native, was serving with the 3rd Battalion, 7th Marines, 1st Marine Division on the island of Peleliu. Their mission sounded simple enough: Take the island as quickly as possible, inch ever closer to retaking the Philippines, and ultimately defeat Japan.

Simple it wasn't. His platoon was hailed by a steady stream of fire from a heavily fortified position. To charge forward would be to march toward certain death, and that is exactly what he did. He attacked a pillbox, holding about 35 enemy soldiers, and as his Medal of Honor citation reads, "[P]ouring his automatic fire into the opening of the fixed installation to trap the occupying troops, he hurled white phosphorus grenades and explosive charges brought up by a fellow Marine, demolishing the pillbox and killing all of the enemy."

The enemy fire continued unabated, his cover was light at best, and yet Private Jackson proceeded to storm one position after another—wiping out a total of 12 pillboxes and 50 enemy soldiers. It was a stunning act of bravery. I can only imagine the pride of President Truman when he pinned the Medal of Honor on Private Jackson's uniform. I can only imagine the awe of his fel-

low Americans as they showered him with ticker tape in a New York City parade to celebrate.

Yes, Arthur Jackson was one of the greats, and like with many great men, his career had a somewhat tragic ending. After a stint in the Army, he re-joined the Marines and was stationed at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, in September 1961. It was only months after the Bay of Pigs and just over a year from the Cuban Missile Crisis. Tensions were high; suspicions were too.

On one night, then-Captain Jackson discovered a Cuban busdriver in a restricted part of the base. He wasn't supposed to be there, nor was he authorized to be there. The man had been identified as a spy for Fidel Castro's regime but was allowed to keep his job for the time being. Captain Jackson and a fellow officer escorted the man to a back gate to see him off the premises, only to discover the gate was locked. While the other officers went off to find tools, Captain Jackson pried the lock open, and, suddenly, the man lunged at him, aiming for a sidearm. Captain Jackson fired back in self-defense and killed the man on the spot.

Instead of reporting the man's death, however, he and some of his fellow Marines buried the body on the base. Many decades later, he told a newspaper columnist he feared, if he reported the death, he would be tried in a Cuban court and possibly tortured.

He had hoped no one would find out, but word got out, and he was forced to leave the Marine Corps. He ended life as a mail carrier in California. It was a disappointing end to an until-then brilliant career. This was a man who loved his country, who put everything on the line to defend it, and if one night that love blinded his judgment, it only shows the intensity of his commitment.

Arthur Jackson went on to work for the Veterans' Administration in San Francisco before moving to Boise, ID, in 1973. He lived out the remainder of his life there, where he was beloved by the community. As a neighbor of his put it, "He flies the U.S. flag and the Marine Corps flag every day. It bothers him if someone flies a dirty or tattered flag. He tells them to take it down and replace it."

A little thing with a big meaning: Arthur Jackson showed as much love for the flag as he did for our country, and now we lost him to the ages. We still have his memory, his example, his stories of derring-do, which will inspire future generations of Americans for decades to come.

REMEMBERING JOE DALE BURGESS

Mr. President, I attended the signing ceremony at the White House last week for the VA Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act. It was a happy occasion, but I received some sad news.

A son of Arkansas who served in uniform passed away earlier this year at the far-too-young age of 31. His name was Joe Dale Burgess. Though he was not widely known, he was especially

well loved by all who did know him. Today I want to recognize him briefly for his service.

Joe Dale served in the U.S. Army—specifically, Delta Company, 2-506th Infantry Battalion, 101st Airborne Division; 2-506th, the same unit in which I served in Iraq.

In March, 2008, he was deployed to Khost Province in Afghanistan, where he took the fight to the enemy for 12 straight months. He was a fearless soldier, but his platoon leader says what he will probably be best remembered for is being an awful comedian. He loved to crack jokes and play pranks, even though, as his best battle buddies attest, he didn't show a particular talent for either of them. He always got laughs, and he always lifted their spirits. When you are living in a war zone, I can tell you that counts for a lot.

But in his battle buddies' minds, Joe Dale means more than memories of sharing a few laughs. What stands out is his humility. His platoon leader says he was completely selfless. He did whatever was asked of him—no matter how unpleasant, no matter how tedious, how irritating, or how dangerous. He never lost sight of the mission. He never forgot why he was there, and it made an impression. Ask any one of his battle buddies what they think of Joe Dale, and you will not get a bad word out of them, not one in the whole bunch. His platoon leader says: "We would all gladly serve with him again." That is a pretty good measure, the quality of a troop.

I am sorry to say Joe Dale, who endured a tour of duty that cost the lives of seven soldiers in his company, died in April of testicular cancer. It had spread to his spine, which after several surgeries left him paralyzed. He suffered several other afflictions: PTSD, pain in his joints, trouble sleeping. He didn't ask for care or a disability rating from the VA until it was too late.

It seems so unfair that this man—a man who braved the mountains of the Hindu Kush, a man who was awarded the Combat Infantryman's Badge and the Army Commendation Medal—ultimately succumbed to disease at home at such a young age. In fact, it seems almost cruel because he left behind a fiancée, Alice Hart, and a 2-year-old daughter, Zoe Hart-Burgess. I suppose we must remember that the Lord God in Heaven has His own purposes, and He works in His own mysterious ways.

To see the outpouring of love for this man—a quiet man, a humble man, a man whose only ambition was to serve his country—it tells you, indeed, that Joe Dale Burgess was one impressive man. May he rest in peace.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY). The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Neomi Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Deb Fischer, Steve Daines, Luther Strange, Bob Corker, Thom Tillis, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott, Johnny Isakson, Richard C. Shelby, Michael B. Enzi, Richard Burr, John Hoeven, David Perdue, Roy Blunt, Todd Young.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Neomi Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 59, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 155 Ex.]

YEAS—59

| | | |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Alexander | Flake | Murkowski |
| Barrasso | Gardner | Nelson |
| Blunt | Graham | Paul |
| Boozman | Grassley | Perdue |
| Burr | Hatch | Portman |
| Capito | Heitkamp | Risch |
| Carper | Heller | Roberts |
| Cassidy | Hoeven | Rounds |
| Cochran | Inhofe | Rubio |
| Collins | Isakson | Sasse |
| Corker | Johnson | Scott |
| Cornyn | Kennedy | Shelby |
| Cotton | King | Strange |
| Crapo | Lankford | Sullivan |
| Cruz | Lee | Thune |
| Daines | Manchin | Tillis |
| Donnelly | McCain | Toomey |
| Enzi | McCaskill | Wicker |
| Ernst | McConnell | Young |
| Fischer | Moran | |

NAYS—36

| | | |
|--------------|------------|---------|
| Baldwin | Feinstein | Merkley |
| Bennet | Franken | Murphy |
| Blumenthal | Gillibrand | Murray |
| Booker | Harris | Peters |
| Brown | Hassan | Reed |
| Cantwell | Heinrich | Schatz |
| Cardin | Kaine | Schumer |
| Casey | Klobuchar | Shaheen |
| Coons | Leahy | |
| Cortez Masto | Markey | |
| Duckworth | Menendez | |

| | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Stabenow Tester | Van Hollen Warren | Whitehouse Wyden |
|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|

NOT VOTING—5

| | | |
|------------------|------------------|--------|
| Durbin Hirono | Sanders Udall | Warner |
|------------------|------------------|--------|

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 59, the nays are 36.

The motion is agreed to.
The Senator from Alaska.

TRIBUTE TO SOLOMON "SOL" ATKINSON

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, every week I have been coming down to the floor of the Senate to talk about a special Alaskan, someone in my State who, through their hard work and community service, whether to their neighbors or to their country, makes Alaska a better place for all of us. We call these people the Alaskans of the Week. Learning about these individuals and sharing their stories with my Senate colleagues, Alaskans, and Americans who watch what we do here or who are in the gallery, is probably one of the best parts of my week every week.

Like most of my colleagues, I will soon be going home for the Fourth of July. We will celebrate this very special holiday with our families and our communities. Some of us will go to barbecues or march in parades or attend other community gatherings. Some of us will gather in spots across our State and watch fireworks. Personally, I will be with my family catching king salmon at my family's ancestral fish camp up on the Yukon River, one of my favorite places in the entire world.

Regardless of where we are, all of us will certainly feel a swell of pride for our country. We will remember the hard-fought battles that brought us independence, and we will remember those who have served and sacrificed to keep our country the land of the free and the home of the brave. They are the heroes among us, and Alaska is chock-full of these heroes.

Today I want to recognize one of them, a very special hero who is our Alaskan of the Week—Solomon Atkinson, who spent nearly his entire adult life serving our country with honor and dignity and now serves his community in Alaska tirelessly.

Let me tell you a little bit about Sol and his illustrious career in the military. Sol was born in 1930 to Harris and Elizabeth Atkinson in Metlakatla, AK.

Metlakatla is on Annette Island on the Inside Passage, where so many Americans take cruises to see the glaciers and the whales. It is home to the only federally recognized Indian reservation in our State.

Sol could have continued to live in Metlakatla, where he was a commercial fisherman as a young man, but, like so many patriotic Alaskans, he chose to leave his home and join the military. Sol joined the U.S. Navy, and for 22 years—from 1951 to 1973—he had by anybody's standards a remarkable patriotic military career.

In 1953, Sol volunteered for the Navy's legendary Underwater Demolition Team and was deployed to the Pa-

cific, including Korea. Some history buffs will know and recall that the Underwater Demolition Team, the UDT, was the precursor to the present-day Navy SEALs—frogmen, as they liked to call themselves. In fact, Sol was on the very first Navy SEAL team created by President Kennedy in 1962, and I have a copy of the SEAL Team One plank owners certificate, commissioned on January 1, 1962, with Sol's name proudly displayed.

So Sol became a Navy SEAL—the first Navy SEAL, literally. He became a SEAL team training instructor, training new Navy SEAL recruits. He was affectionately referred to as "the Mean Machine" by the Navy SEALs. He also had the honor of training 48 astronauts, including Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Jim Lovell, just to name a few, in underwater weightlessness simulations. His prized possession is a framed plaque bearing the signature of all those astronauts, all those American heroes whom he trained.

Sol completed three combat tours in Vietnam. By the time he retired from the military, he had earned numerous awards and medals for personal valor, including the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart. But what is truly remarkable about Sol is that after he retired from the Navy, he moved back home to Metlakatla and continued to serve his country and serve his community. He served on the Indian Community Council, on the school board, and as mayor of Metlakatla. He has also been very involved in veterans affairs and was the president of the first veterans organization on the island and was instrumental in starting that organization. He has spent years reaching out to his fellow veterans to make sure they receive the benefits, honor, and dignity they earned.

Jeff Moran, the superintendent of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Metlakatla, said this about Sol:

I could go on and on regarding the wonderful things that Sol has done for his community. We would not be here today without his leadership and knowledge [and commitment].

I, too, can go on about Sol. Many Alaskans can go on about Sol and all the things he has done. But I also want to mention, particularly on the eve of the Fourth of July, that he is part of a long tradition in my State of Alaskan Natives who have served in the military, who have served our country even during darker times in our history when many Alaskan Natives were discriminated against and denied basic rights.

On the eve of the Fourth of July, we celebrate America's independence but also in particular those who have fought for that independence over the last 200 years. As I mentioned, one proud element of my great State is that we have more veterans per capita than any State in the country, and Alaska Native veterans serve at higher rates in the U.S. military than any

other ethnic group in the country—something I like to refer to as a special kind of patriotism because they have been doing this for decades, like Sol—even at times, as I mentioned, when the country hasn't always treated that group of patriotic Americans with the respect and dignity they deserve. Sol personifies this special patriotism.

The SEALs who served with him wrote this about him in a tribute:

Sol's story will continue to be told by the men he trained, by the officers who relied on him, by the Frogmen who all respect him. An officer, a gentleman, an athlete, a friend, Sol Atkinson is all of these, but of all of these traits, he is first a Frogman.

We can see the pride the Navy SEALs have for Sol, a plank owner for the entire organization.

In conclusion, I will add that he is a patriotic Alaskan through and through, and I thank him for all he has done for Alaska, for our veterans, and for America.

Sol, congratulations on being our Alaskan of the Week. Happy Fourth of July to you, to Alaska, and to all the men and women in our military and the citizens of our great Nation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, from all indications, our Republican friends continue to negotiate amongst themselves, behind closed doors, to revive the healthcare bill they had to pull from the floor on Tuesday.

I would suggest to my friends on the other side that there is no tweak or change or modification that will fix what is wrong with this Republican healthcare bill. The core of the bill is the problem. The American people are opposed to tax cuts for the wealthy and the reduction of the social safety net of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

The Republican TrumpCare bill is built on a crumbling, decrepit foundation, and that is because it is based on the premise that special interests and a very small number of wealthy Americans deserve a tax break while millions of Americans—middle class families, older Americans in nursing homes, folks with a preexisting condition—ought to receive less healthcare at a higher cost.

That idea is so backward, so out of step with what America wants and what actually works, it can never succeed, no matter how it is tweaked.

The one thing my Republican friends are latching on to—that their bill will

bring down average premiums several years down the line—is really a bait and switch. The bait is lower premiums, but the switch is higher deductibles and copays so that, in the end, the average American pays more than they would have otherwise. They are luring people in with a lower premium, but then they have to pay such a high percentage of their medical costs, the insurance policy is virtually worthless.

The Republican TrumpCare bill tells insurers they can offer much less generous healthcare plans than under the current system, even allowing States to opt out of covering essential benefits like treatment for opioids, mental health coverage, prescription drug coverage, and maternity care.

The result of these changes is that insurers may charge smaller premiums on some plans, but they will cover way less and, in fact, the deductibles and copays will go up—way up—in order to make the difference. So this isn't: Oh, you are not paying for some esoteric item; your insurance policy will pay for virtually nothing at the beginning if you have a high deductible.

The CBO report estimates that for an average 40-year-old with an income of \$26,500 a year, looking at insurance on the marketplace, deductibles would increase by thousands. If that 40-year-old decided on a “bronze” plan, for instance, their deductible would be \$6,000 a year, the CBO estimates. That is \$5,200 more than under current law. So we know what that means: They have to pay the first \$6,000 of healthcare, no matter what your insurance policy is. What good is that? Not much. Good for the insurance industry, maybe; not good for the average citizen. Some of my colleagues on the other side are claiming they want lower premiums, but if those lower premiums come with higher deductibles and higher copays, nobody benefits. It is a bait and switch.

What the Republican bill gives with one hand in this area, it more than takes away with the other because the lower premiums are made up for by higher deductibles and copays, so the average person pays more, not less, even when their premium goes down.

Who in America believes that folks should have higher out-of-pocket costs than before? Who in America believes that folks making over \$1 million a year—God bless them; they are doing well—deserve another \$57,000 tax break? Who in America believes that we should be making it harder to afford nursing home care or maternity care or opioid abuse treatment? Who in America believes a child born with a preexisting condition should hit their lifetime insurance limit before they even leave the hospital for the first time? Who believes in that in this America?

It turns out, almost no one. A poll yesterday showed that only 12 percent of Americans support the Republican bill. No amendment or compromise or tweak or adjustment in formula can solve that.

So I repeat the offer I made to President Trump and my Republican friends yesterday: Let's start over. Drop this fundamentally flawed approach—abandon cuts to Medicaid, abandon tax breaks for the wealthy—and we can discuss the problems that Americans are actually concerned about: the cost, quality, and availability of healthcare.

I suggested that President Trump invite all Senators to Blair House to begin anew on a bipartisan approach to healthcare. Unfortunately, the President said I wasn't serious. Mr. President: Try me. The minute you make the invitation, we will take it in a very serious way. It is not that audacious of an idea. President Obama did the same thing early in his Presidency to discuss healthcare with Members of both parties in front of the American people. Our only condition: Drop the wrong-headed idea of slashing Medicaid to give tax breaks to the wealthy. It is perfectly reasonable, and a vast majority of Americans agree with us.

Nonpartisan institutions like the American Medical Association, the National Association of Medicaid Directors, AARP, and America's largest nursing home groups are all against the Republican approach. The Congressional Budget Office and other expert analyses say that it will not actually fix the problems in our healthcare system—high deductibles, high premiums, counties with too few insurance options—and the American people are as roundly against it as any piece of major legislation I have ever seen.

So I don't believe it is unserious to ask my Republican friends to drop this particular bill and talk to us about actually fixing the problems in our healthcare system.

I don't believe it is unserious to say to President Trump: You campaigned on bringing costs down and providing care for everyone. You campaigned on not cutting Medicaid and controlling the outrageous costs of prescription drugs. These are all your words in the campaign. Well, we Democrats agree with all of that. So let's talk about it.

Fundamentally, I don't believe that seeking a bipartisan solution on the great issues of our time should ever be considered unserious.

President Trump, you have complained about a lack of bipartisanship—unfairly, in our opinion. We are offering a way to implement bipartisanship, and right now it is you, not we, who are stopping it.

I hope my Republican friends, President Trump, and the majority leader think long and hard before dismissing our offer out of hand. I challenge them again: Invite all of us to Blair House the first day we get back from recess. If you think we are not serious, try us. Democrats are ready to turn the page on healthcare. When will my Republican friends realize it is time for them to do the same?

RUSSIA SANCTIONS

Finally, Mr. President, as to Russia sanctions, on June 15, nearly 2 weeks

ago, the Senate, in an act of bipartisanship, passed a tough Russia sanctions bill on a 98-to-2 vote. There are very few things of such significance that this body does with such a large bipartisan vote—Democrats and Republicans, all but two coming together.

The majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, and I worked hard to pass it before a possible meeting between President Trump and President Putin at the G20 summit. We wanted to send a message to Mr. Putin: If you interfere with our democratic institutions, you will be punished. These new sanctions should also help to deter future Russian interference.

At the Speaker's request, I hope this morning the Senate will pass a technical correction to address the blue-slip issue. It is important for Speaker RYAN to get the House to act on this legislation before the July 4th recess. It is critical that Congress speak in a loud, clear, and unified voice to President Putin: Interfering with our elections—the wellspring and pride of our democracy for over two centuries—will not be tolerated, and the United States will always respond forcefully, including with the power of economic sanctions.

I want to put the House on notice. If they water down the bill, weaken the sanctions, add loopholes to the legislation, they will find stiff resistance here in the Senate.

Later today, we will break for the July 4th recess. The Fourth of July is a day to remember the audacity of a ragtag group of colonies who declared themselves free and independent from the tyranny of one of the great, mighty foreign powers. What better way to mark the occasion than for the Congress of that once fledgling Nation—now the mightiest Nation in the world, ourselves—to pass a bill that says, 241 years since that fateful day, that we intend to defend our democracy as fiercely as the patriots who put down their plows and took up muskets on Bunker Hill did?

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

VENEZUELA

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak about the rise of a failed state, Venezuela, and the man-made tragedy President Maduro has imposed on his citizens.

For 3 months, Venezuelans have taken to the streets in daily protests. They are speaking out against their country's economic collapse, against widespread food shortages, the disintegration of their medical system, against endemic corruption, and

against a government that denies them their human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Appallingly, President Maduro has responded to the protests by unleashing his National Guard. As a recent Washington Post article stated, "Mr. Maduro and the corrupt clique around him are hanging on by the brute force of tear gas, water cannons, mass arrests, and shootings by snipers."

Since April, Venezuela's increasingly unstable crisis has left over 75 dead, thousands jailed, and thousands more injured. Yet, instead of listening to his people's legitimate demands and mitigating this tragedy, President Maduro is attempting to rewrite the Constitution, despite widespread opposition. Additionally, he declared this week that "what couldn't be done with votes would be done with weapons."

This is our hemisphere. This is a hemisphere that prides itself in democratic states, and here is the President of Venezuela saying he doesn't care what the voters say. With Maduro threatening to use arms against his people, one can only imagine the bloodshed and abuses will continue unabated.

Despite these threats, protests endure because Venezuelans see no alternatives. They have no other recourse against standing in lines for endless hours to scour the empty shelves at their markets. They have no other way to channel their sorrow over the spike in maternal and infant mortality rates in hospitals that lack supplies to treat the most basic diseases. They have no other way to express their outrage at the military profiting from corruption in food procurement contracts, even while children increasingly suffer the ravages of malnutrition.

Parallel to the protests, chaos is becoming commonplace. In the past 72 hours, the National Guard troops have stormed the National Assembly and assaulted opposition legislators. They came into the Parliament and assaulted the opposition. The supreme court has stripped the attorney general, Luisa Ortega, of her authorities for her criticism of President Maduro.

We have seen lootings and the burning of government buildings. Alarmingly, a rogue police officer commandeered a helicopter and launched grenades and small arms fire while flying over the supreme court. These incidents from just the last 3 days should make it clear to all we are now dealing with a failed state in our own hemisphere.

As this crisis cripples Venezuela, I call on all sides to refrain from violence. I also want to recognize that the current situation is the product of 18 years of systematic efforts to dismantle Venezuela's democratic institutions.

Since coming to power, President Maduro—like Hugo Chavez before him—has filled the ranks of government with loyalists who have led the

economy to hyperinflation and the brink of default. State oil companies like PDVSA, the country's only source of revenue, has been purged of its expertise. In a truly devastating blow to democracy and the rule of law, the judiciary has been entirely sapped of its independence so it now functions as a political appendage of the executive branch.

In the 18 months since the opposition coalition won control of the National Assembly—and I must tell you there was hope when we saw the voters in Venezuela enacted a new government in their Parliament—the supreme court has overturned every piece of legislation passed, gave itself authority to approve the national budget, and in April temporarily usurped the rest of the legislature's authorities, completely reversing the will of the people.

Additionally, as Venezuela's civilian and military justice systems have become accomplices to persecution and torture, the number of political prisoners has soared. Leopoldo Lopez, Judge Afiuni, Daniel Ceballos—these are just some of the more well-known names among the more than 350 political prisoners recognized by Venezuelan human rights NGO Foro Penal. These are people who are in prison as a result of their political beliefs.

It is no surprise the decay of judicial independence has led to an alarming rise in corruption and impunity. It is now a stated fact that senior officials have syphoned billions out of Venezuela and are engaged in the illegal drug trade.

In response, the United States has designated a dozen people under the Kingpin sanctions, including Vice President Tareck El Aissami. Interior Minister Reverol was indicted in the United States last year for drug trafficking. Even Maduro's nephews were convicted in the United States on drug charges.

The sum of these trend lines is truly disturbing. Today, Venezuela is a failed state, where authoritarian leaders profit from links to corruption and drug trafficking, while the Venezuelan people are subject to precarious humanitarian conditions and human rights abuses. Against this backdrop, we require little explanation why more than 18,000 Venezuelans sought asylum in the United States last year.

We are all concerned about the flight of people at risk. What is happening in Venezuela directly impacts people trying to seek safety coming into the United States. If all this wasn't enough, in late 2016, Venezuelan State oil company PDVSA used its U.S. subsidiary Citgo as collateral to secure a loan from Rosneft, a company that is controlled by the Russian Government and is currently under U.S. sanctions. The result is, the Russian Government holds at least 49.9 percent of Citgo's mortgage and could come into control of critical U.S. energy infrastructure, including refineries, terminals, and a large network of pipelines. This should

concern every Member of the U.S. Senate.

So the question for the United States and the international community is, How do we respond? What do we do? We cannot let this circumstance continue.

Thankfully, supported by a growing diplomatic coalition that includes Mexico, Brazil, Costa Rica, Peru, Canada, and the United States, the Secretary General of the Organization of American States, Luis Almagro, is marshalling international pressure. Mr. Almagro has called on President Maduro to heed the demands of his citizens, free political prisoners, permit the delivery of humanitarian assistance, commit to a timetable for overdue elections, and restore the authority of the National Assembly.

However, despite Mr. Almagro's leadership, the results of last week's meeting of Foreign Ministers was a stunning failure to reach consensus on a hemisphere response. Appallingly, eight countries refused to vote their conscience, among them Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Trinidad, and Suriname. They did not use the power under the OAS to recognize that Venezuela today is not living up to its charter commitment to be a democratic state. There is a process at the OAS to take action. They were unable to do that—a major setback.

As efforts at the OAS continue, all must remain clear that there are no alternative facts when it comes to Venezuela, there is just a manmade tragedy that demands collective action.

While providing full support for multilateral diplomacy, the United States must also lead. In May, I introduced bipartisan legislation to address the multifaceted crisis in Venezuela. My bill will authorize humanitarian assistance and require the State Department to coordinate an international approach to humanitarian challenges. The legislation will also provide strong congressional backing for OAS efforts, as well as funding for international election observers and civil society groups working to defend human rights and democratic values.

Given the rising instability in Venezuela, the bill would codify two lines of targeted sanctions against Venezuelan officials involved in corruption and undermining democratic governance—the very authorities the administration used to rightly sanction members of the Venezuelan supreme court last month.

Congress should act, as we have done in so many other places where we show congressional leadership to make it clear that this type of activity will not be allowed to continue and that Congress will take a strong position to give appropriate authority to sanction those individuals who are responsible.

Finally, the bill would require the State Department and U.S. intelligence community to prepare a report on the role of Venezuelan officials in corruption and drug trafficking.

As the instability in Venezuela grows, every day we decide not to act only makes the crisis worse. I urge my colleagues to work with legislation I have filed. Let's work with the Congress and the President to make it clear to the Venezuelan people they are not alone, and we will not tolerate a country in our hemisphere to become a failed state.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORRECTING THE ENGROSSMENT OF S. 722

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 210, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 210) to correct the engrossment of S. 722.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 210) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DIRECTING RETURN OF PAPERS REQUEST

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be directed to request the return of the papers for S. 722 from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued REQUESTS FOR AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I have six requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They do not have the approval of the

Democratic leader for the eighth consecutive legislative day; therefore, they will not be permitted to meet after 1 p.m. I ask unanimous consent that the list of committees requesting authority to meet be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Committee on Environment and Public Works; Committee on the Judiciary; Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, Congress and our country desperately need to have an honest, meaningful, transparent, and bipartisan conversation about improving our healthcare system. It shouldn't be a tall order, but around here things that seem common sense to the rest of the country are never simple. Instead, partisanship too often wins. We have seen that with the Senate Republican healthcare bill, as it was crafted behind closed doors without allowing any Democrats or the public to see it until it was a proposal.

It is good news that a vote on the bill was delayed, but we must continue to have this conversation as the debate continues. That bill was bad for North Dakota. Only when we seek real bipartisan solutions do I believe we will be successful in improving our healthcare system.

We need to reform our healthcare system. I have been saying it for years. In fact, I have proposed a number of fixes over the past 3½ years, but none of those fixes are embodied in the Republican healthcare bill. It is just not the right direction.

Just yesterday, I joined many of my colleagues to bring up some common-sense bills we can and should take up right now to make sure American families aren't hurt in the near term. We called on Republicans to work with us, but, unfortunately, they objected. I want to work in a bipartisan way. I want real healthcare reform. But, unfortunately, I do not believe everyone in Congress feels that way.

First, we need to talk about the facts of the Senate Republican bill—facts that are from very reputable non-partisan sources.

Earlier this week, the Congressional Budget Office issued a report reinforcing that the Senate Republican bill is just as terrible as the bill that came out of the House of Representatives a

few months ago. The Senate bill would rip away health insurance from 22 million Americans by 2026, including 31,000 North Dakotans who would lose private health coverage. You can't put a few band-aids on a bad bill and expect that North Dakota would not feel that pain.

Just as in the House bill, the biggest savings would come from severe cuts to Medicaid—a program that would see a 26-percent cut in 2026. The bill would slash a lifesaving program that 90,000 North Dakota children, individuals with disabilities, seniors, and low-income families rely on for affordable, quality care. That includes 36,000 children in my State.

The Senate Republican healthcare bill would get rid of the Medicaid expansion and cap the amount of Federal funding States can get to cover those traditional Medicaid patients. That would drastically reduce the amount of Medicaid funds going to the States. This would push those remaining costs onto States and counties that can't afford it. Importantly, it also would push the cost onto other patients. The American Hospital Association estimates that North Dakota Medicaid would lose \$1.2 billion through 2026. At the same time, North Dakota forecasts a \$46 million shortfall for 2015 through 2017—that is our biennial period—and another \$103 million shortfall for 2017 through 2018. You tell me how our State would pick up these extra costs for our families and our children. Unfortunately, we just will not be able to do it. We would be forced to discontinue care. That is just wrong.

Those Medicaid cuts would also imperil rural hospitals, which have seen their amount of bad debt fall by 45 percent because of Medicaid expansion. Helping those rural hospitals keep their doors open and deliver care close to home for farmers, ranchers, and communities is absolutely vital to rural development and vital to those people who are still working in rural America to put food on our table.

Additionally, the North Dakota Hospital Association released a study showing that healthcare and social assistance accounts for one of every seven workers in this State. I am going to repeat that: Healthcare and social assistance accounts for one of every seven workers in our State. Spending reductions under this Senate bill would curtail those jobs, hurt economic development—especially in rural communities—and make delivery of healthcare even more expensive for our rural families.

The cuts to Medicaid would take away coverage from many North Dakotans who are also seeking treatment for opioid abuse and addiction, which has reached an epidemic level in our State, as well as across the Nation. In fact, I had one North Dakota healthcare provider who was looking at providing additional behavior and mental health services. In the traditional hospital setting, about 14 to 15 percent of the patients are on Medicaid. He be-

lieves that once this hospital opens, anywhere from 60 to 70 percent of the patients will be dependent on Medicaid funding for their healthcare. If that money is not there, if there is no reliability about that money, how do we build the treatment services we need to attack this epidemic?

I want to dispel a myth about Medicaid, and that is that these are just people who can go to work every day, that they are not even working, that they are just on the public dole, and that they are just getting this money. The truth is that in North Dakota 83 percent of adult Medicaid enrollees are in families with a worker. That is a statistic according to the nonpartisan Kaiser Family Foundation.

For North Dakotans who get coverage on the individual marketplace, this bill would raise premiums 76 percent higher than what would be required to be paid under the current law. That statistic, again, is according to Kaiser Family Foundation. Seniors would be especially hard hit, with premiums more than doubling for those older than 55. The bill would disproportionately push the costs on to older Americans, who tend to live in rural communities, like all of those across North Dakota.

Under the Senate bill, in 2026 a 64-year-old with an income of \$56,800 would pay annually \$20,500 for a silver-level healthcare insurance plan. That is more than one-third of his or her entire income, and that is more than eight times what the same person would pay under the current law, which is \$6,800.

The bill would also enable insurance companies to impose lifetime maximums on coverage, once again, making it unaffordable for many people with life-threatening or long-term illnesses or disorders to get the treatment they need to live by.

This bill is a not so thinly veiled attempt to provide tax cuts for the wealthiest individuals at the expense of rural communities, like those across our State. Nearly 45 percent of the tax cuts in the Senate bill would go to the top 1 percent of incomes, those people making over \$875,000 a year. I will say that again. Nearly 45 percent of the tax cuts in the Senate bill would go to the top 1 percent of incomes, those making over \$875,000 a year, according to the Tax Policy Center.

But what is more telling about these striking statistics is the stories. I have heard from so many North Dakotans about how scared they are that this bill could pass and how it would hurt them if it ever happened. I have heard from North Dakotans with preexisting conditions, like cancer or asthma, parents of children with disabilities on Medicaid, adults with elderly patients in nursing homes, farmers and those in rural communities who rely on rural hospitals, and those receiving treatment for opioid abuse.

The consequences of this bill for North Dakotans are real. I want to tell

some of those very real stories across my State, because way too often we forget this is an issue that could not be more personal.

I want to introduce you to Allison and Jennifer Restemayer. This is her wonderful family. This is Allison here. Allison, from West Fargo, was almost 2 years old when she was diagnosed with a rare genetic disease. Allison's parents were told she would become severely mentally delayed by age 3, and she would likely pass away by the time she was 10 years old. I am so proud to tell you and so glad to tell you that this prediction did not come true.

Over the past several years, Allison has been able to get new, very expensive therapy that helps slow the progression of her disorder. Because there are currently no lifetime limits on coverage, Allison's family has been able to afford this treatment. Today, Allison is 16 years old. Allison needs physical therapy multiple times per week to truly make a difference in her life day to day and to help her live longer. Her private insurance covers just 12 physical therapy appointments per year. Allison is one of many children with disabilities or special needs on Medicaid, which covers the rest of her physical therapy.

For her and her family—you can see them here—who are so proud of the courage of Allison, it has been a lifeline, and it has been a lifegiver. But the Republican bill would enable insurance companies to impose lifetime maximums on coverage, which many North Dakotans, like Allison, would reach in no time. It would slash Medicaid—both expansion and traditional Medicaid—making it harder for families like Allison's to afford coverage and critical treatment for their children with special needs. The Restemayers should never ever have to worry.

I have spent a lot of time with Allison, and I think anyone who meets her knows that this world is a much better place with Allison healthy and alive. We are so proud to call her one of our friends. She has been an inspiration to me and my staff. She has participated in a lot of dialogues, and her advocacy has been absolutely instrumental in telling the story of families like hers in North Dakota.

I want to talk about Emerie and Amy Thom. At just 2 months old, Emerie, from Bismarck, had her first set of seizures and was diagnosed with a rare neurological condition. Her parents, Amy and Johnny, have crisscrossed North Dakota and visited many hospitals out of State to get Emerie the care she needs and to control her life-threatening seizures.

Emerie is now almost 4 years old and has spent a total of 8 weeks in the hospital since she was born. She receives therapy multiple times per week and needs various medical equipment. Just 1 month of therapy out-of-pocket would cost her family—good, hard-working people—\$3,000. Emerie is on

Medicaid, which has enabled her family to afford her hospital stays, her home healthcare, and her therapy. It has also enabled them to keep their daughter home with them in a loving family relationship, in a lovely family situation.

It is because of the access to Medicaid that this family has been able to stay in their home and keep their jobs, but the Senate Republican healthcare bill would rip Medicaid away from families like Emerie's. This family does not deserve that, and neither does any family who is working hard to take care of their children. These are all of our children, the children we see today who suffer from disabilities, who live and inspire us with their disabilities and their hope. This small help these families ask for from the Medicaid system should not be threatened, and these families should not be calling congressional offices begging us to please, please do everything we can.

Finally, I want to talk about Frances. Frances is one of the nicest people you are ever going to meet. For 25 years, she was a third grade teacher in Fessenden. When she was 21 years old, while she was teaching, she was diagnosed with a syndrome that affects the nerve endings in her body. She became paralyzed but taught herself to walk again. For the rest of her life, she will have to face the challenges that come with this disorder. Today, Fran can't walk anymore, and she has been in a wheelchair for the past 24 years.

For most of her life, Fran lived independently with her husband, who passed away in 2000. In the past few years, she has reached a point where she needs full-time care. She is now 84 years old. She lives in a nursing home in Harvey, and she has been there for 4 years. Fran had been in and out of nursing homes a few times beforehand, all which required private pay. Because of the extreme costs, Fran doesn't have any money or savings left. She spent it all on her healthcare.

Now she is one of many seniors on Medicaid, which enables her to afford the quality, long-term care she needs to live with dignity and support. At the nursing home, she gets extensive assistance with bathing, dressing, and doing any activities. Fran doesn't know what she would do without Medicaid. She doesn't have any children to help her. Her siblings are all older than she is, and they wouldn't be able to provide her with the level of care she needs. If it weren't for Medicaid, Fran would be out of options.

The Senate Republican bill threatens the coverage that Fran has and that so many others rely on. You know what, we cannot let that happen.

This issue has many faces. These are just three North Dakota faces I want to talk to you about. These families aren't interested in politics. They couldn't care less about politics. They want the ability to take care of themselves. There is no guilt to any of these conditions. There is no "you did it to yourself" to any of these conditions. This is the human condition.

We have to decide as a country, are we together in taking care of each other, or are we all on our own? That is the issue. How do we take care of the sickest among us? Are we together, or are we on our own? I believe we are stronger when we stand together to provide care to each other and to those who are not as fortunate.

I was talking to some of the families. It is hard when you are a mom, I think, to think about, well, what was your life with your child growing up? I had two children, born extraordinarily healthy. They barely missed a day of school, they were so healthy. They had an opportunity to engage in every level of activity, giving me and my husband the freedom to pursue other things in our lives. That is a gift. It is also a gift that we as a society can help those who don't have that level of good fortune but have children who need some special attention, children whose care you cannot afford on your own.

From the discussions I have had with so many of the families, very few of us could ever afford the medications and the therapies that guarantee quality of life not only for the child but for the family in terms of respite care.

Allison, Emerie, and Fran, we are going to keep talking about this, and we are going to keep evaluating all of the proposals that come our way. When they don't do right by you, Emerie, Allison, and Fran, when it is not the right solution for your family, it is not the right solution for North Dakota, and it is not the right solution for this country. We have work to do.

I know the Presiding Officer has been one of the leaders in analyzing and reviewing these bills. We have had a chance to have some discussions. I hope we will have further discussions about how we can continue to care for these wonderful North Dakotans.

The Presiding Officer knows story after story, having been a physician. Being a physician, my husband can tell you story after story about people who are challenged. In this system of healthcare, we all have to decide whether we stand alone or together. I believe America is stronger when we stand together and help each other.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ABOLISH HUMAN TRAFFICKING ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I want to come to the floor to talk about healthcare, a subject I know the Presiding Officer feels passionate about as a medical doctor. But before I delve into the healthcare debate, I want to discuss briefly two important bipartisan pieces of legislation that I have been working on with my colleagues

across the aisle and that are moving forward today.

I know the strange thing about this place—by "this place" I mean Washington, DC—is that the bipartisan work we are able to do rarely gets much attention. What gets attention in the news is when we fight over controversial topics, but bipartisan legislation that actually helps people and that gets done here is rarely heralded or even noticed. So I think it is worth highlighting a couple of examples today.

Today, in the Senate Judiciary Committee, we passed the Abolish Human Trafficking Act, which I introduced with Senator KLOBUCHAR. As the father of two daughters, I am always reminded of the profile of a victim of human trafficking in this country, a girl between the ages of 12 and 14 years old, who perhaps has run away from home. Who knows what the circumstances are at home? But they are looking for a better life, only to find themselves in too many instances exploited and the victims of human trafficking.

This bill reauthorizes several critical trafficking victims protection act programs that help fight the scourge of trafficking so that survivors can get the help they need and our law enforcement officers can go after the perpetrators of this terrible crime.

A vital provision of this bill is an extension of the Domestic Trafficking Victims Fund, which provides critical resources that victims need to recover from this crime. Part of the fund is financed through fines collected on convicted traffickers, and last year it provided almost \$5 million in services for victims. Let me dwell on that for just a minute.

When I was privileged to be attorney general of the State of Texas, part of the job was to administer the Crime Victims' Compensation Fund. This was a fund into which fines and penalties of people convicted of criminal acts went into the Crime Victims' Compensation Fund, so we could then use grants for the victims of crime to help them recover. That is exactly the kind of model we created with the Domestic Trafficking Victims Fund. My hope is that over time it will produce more money that will be available to help the victims of human trafficking to a greater extent. That is the idea, and these are not tax dollars, so that is an additional benefit. It is actually the fines and penalties of the perpetrators that go into this fund that then help the victims to heal.

This bill also makes the Human Trafficking Advisory Council permanent so that the group of survivors who advise people like us on what additional tools are needed to combat trafficking can continue to do so.

On the preventive end, this legislation lends a hand to our Nation's law enforcement so they can track down perpetrators of the crime and bring them to justice. It implements screening protocols for the Department of

Homeland Security so that law enforcement officials at every level know how to spot trafficking victims and how to respond. This is actually a really important element of fighting human trafficking.

A few years ago, when we had the Super Bowl in Dallas, TX, I was shocked to learn that the Super Bowl is one of the largest human trafficking events during the year. That is pretty sobering and, frankly, disgusting. Training people, including law enforcement, to be able to identify victims of human trafficking, some of whom may not consider themselves a victim until it is too late, only to find themselves a victim of modern day human slavery—but being able to identify victims of trafficking so that we can get law enforcement involved and get them rescued is a big, important part of fighting this crime.

In the long run, this legislation requires the Department of Justice to implement a national strategy to reduce the demand of human trafficking by essentially putting the johns—the people who buy sex from trafficking victims—out of service. This is a cause that clearly crosses partisan lines, and it is literally a nonpartisan issue.

I am glad we are making progress on this. I am thankful for the bipartisan support of my colleague from Minnesota, Senator KLOBUCHAR, as well as the Judiciary Committee members like the chairman, Senator GRASSLEY, and the ranking member, Senator FEINSTEIN, and many other Members on both sides who are cosponsors.

JOBS FOR OUR HEROES ACT

Mr. President, the second piece of legislation I want to mention is the Jobs for Our Heroes Act of 2017. This, too, is a bipartisan bill that makes it easier for our veterans to get jobs in our Nation's trucking industry. The men and women in our military learn valuable skills that can easily be transferred to the private sector when they leave the military and become a veteran, and this bill is designed to help veterans transition from their military service to getting jobs in our Nation's trucking industry. This is an area that is constantly in need of trained people with commercial drivers' licenses who can work in this industry.

As I suggested, many of our military servicemembers have experience driving similar vehicles while serving in the Armed Forces. Yet for them to get a job in trucking, they are required to go through a very expensive and time-consuming training program as if they have absolutely no knowledge or job experience whatsoever, largely duplicating what they already know just because of the regulations. That doesn't make any sense to me.

The legislation that I have introduced with Senators ELIZABETH WARREN, TAMMY DUCKWORTH, and THOM TILLIS takes into consideration the previous training and experience of veterans and allows them to apply for an exemption so they can quite lit-

erally get on the road and start working without delay.

This bill is twofold. Not only does it encourage our transportation industry to hire veterans, it helps our veterans transition into civilian life, connecting them to a well-paying job and a meaningful career. I expect the Commerce Committee to consider and pass this bill, as well, today.

These are two bipartisan examples that show we actually can work together in the U.S. Senate in ways that will help all of our States and the people we serve.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, there are subjects that are controversial. If there is one that sort of stands out above the rest, it is healthcare. Unfortunately, this has become all too much of a polarizing issue politically.

I happened to be in the Senate Chamber on Christmas Eve in 2009, at 7:30 in the morning, right before Christmas, of course, when our Democratic friends jammed through on a party-line vote the Affordable Care Act, now known as ObamaCare. I remember the promises the President made at the time. President Obama said: If you like your policy, you can keep your policy. That proved not to be true. He said: If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Well, that wasn't true, either. Then he said: Well, you will be able to save \$2,500 per family of four on your premiums. What experience has shown us is that instead of a \$2,500 savings, a family of four has experienced a \$3,000 increase in their premiums. That is 105 percent in the 39 States or so that have ObamaCare exchanges.

ObamaCare has been a failure if you consider the promises that were made and the promises that were broken. In experience, what we have seen is insurance companies, because of flaws in the design, literally leaving the States, leaving insured people with no option when it comes to their insurance. Perhaps they do have an insurance policy available, but their premiums have gone through the roof, as I indicated earlier—105 percent on balance since 2013. Their deductible is frequently so high that they are denied the benefit of what insurance they have because they are basically self-insured at \$5,000, \$6,000, \$7,000, or more.

Yesterday, we announced that our work on a market-driven, patient-centered healthcare reform plan to replace ObamaCare would continue over the next few weeks. As I said yesterday, I expect that we will revisit the Better Care Act when we come back for the July work period, which is the week after the Fourth of July. As the Republican conference has continued our discussion on our plan to replace the failed Affordable Care Act, three things have become clear to me.

Let me start with the first one. The first one is that our Democratic colleagues are not willing to lift a finger to help. Surely, they have constituents, as I do in Texas, who are con-

tacting them, telling them about their horror stories with regard to no access to policies, premiums that are sky high, and deductibles that are unaffordable. Apparently, they are unmoved by those stories.

As we continue to move toward a Republican healthcare solution, which is what we are left with when our Democratic colleagues refuse to participate, I want to remind my colleagues as to why we have this choice before us and why the hard work is worth it.

All of us have our stories from our States about premium hikes and lost coverage and frustration at the hands of a convoluted law, but I want to talk about the story of a young lady from Fort Worth, TX.

She is a nurse who graduated from Texas Christian University in 2010. By her own account, she is young, in good health, and has a fulfilling career in the healthcare industry. Her first job took her to the Rio Grande Valley in South Texas. While she had to pay out-of-pocket for care, she only had a monthly healthcare premium of \$71, but after the ObamaCare bill passed in 2013, she said: "My plan disappeared." In other words, she was one of those who suffered from the broken promise that if you liked your plan, you could keep it, because it disappeared.

There was a new plan, but her deductible rose to \$8,500. Now, I do not know many people who could pay out-of-pocket \$8,500 for their healthcare before their health insurance kicked in. To add insult to injury, her monthly premium skyrocketed from \$71 to \$300. She is paying \$300 a month for a policy with a deductible of \$8,500. It is not worth very much. One year later, this plan under Blue Cross Blue Shield also disappeared, leaving her to consider the cheapest marketplace plan for \$400 a month. She started at \$71, went to \$300, and then went to \$400 a month for, what she called, a "dismal" policy.

Ultimately, she did find a more affordable plan for \$247 a month. Yet, every year, she has seen her premium grow. She started out at \$71, finally to end with \$247. That is three times-plus what she originally paid, and her premium continues to grow every year.

Yet, as a nurse, her perspective is not just about herself. She cares passionately about her patients as well.

She wrote this to me:

I'm irritated, but at least I can afford it. But who can't? A lot of folks and a lot of my patients! I certainly couldn't if I had a family.

Doing nothing is not an option, which is why I am mystified that our Democratic colleagues have simply refused to participate in the process. For 7 years, we have promised the American people we would replace ObamaCare with something better that would include market-based solutions in order to provide care that more people could afford. This is based on a principle that, I believe, is a core principle: If people have the choice between products, they will choose the one that

is best for them at a price they can afford. Competition actually benefits consumers by providing a better product at a cheaper cost. That is what market-driven competition is all about.

To me, the choice is pretty simple. We either get rid of this failed law and replace it with real reform or ObamaCare will continue to collapse, and millions more people will continue to be harmed.

Now, this is something former President Clinton said, you will remember, during the campaign, which proved to be a little bit of an embarrassing comment when he said that ObamaCare was the “craziest thing in the world.” This was the former President of the United States, a Democrat, who was the husband of the Democratic nominee for President in the 2016 election. He called ObamaCare the “craziest thing in the world” because he knew well that no matter who won the election, whether it was Hillary Clinton or President Trump, that we would be talking about how to protect the American people from this failing system known as ObamaCare.

Yet our Democratic friends are apparently resigned to continue to let the American people suffer rather than try to do what is right and help make things better.

The work we are left to do is hard, but it is no excuse for not trying. ObamaCare is hurting our country, and we have a chance to make it better and to right the path. I remain hopeful and optimistic because doing nothing is not an option.

Let me just conclude with this observation: What we are trying to accomplish with the Better Care Act encompasses four things.

First, we are trying to stabilize the current insurance market to make sure there are actually insurance policies available for people to buy rather than to see them flee the marketplace.

Second, we are trying to make sure we do everything we can to bring insurance premiums down—in other words, to make it more affordable—by eliminating some of the mandates that make it unaffordable right now.

The third thing we are trying to do is to protect people with preexisting conditions. The Better Care Act or the BCRA as it is known—the Better Care Reconciliation Act—maintains the status quo when it comes to protecting people against preexisting conditions. We do not want anybody who has lost his coverage to be denied coverage because of a preexisting condition when he tries to buy insurance from another insurance company. That is what happens when you change your job. That is what happens when insurance companies decide to leave the marketplace. They simply cannot afford to continue to write policies so you have to change policies, like this young lady—the nurse whom I mentioned—had to do on a couple of occasions.

The fourth thing we are trying to do is to stabilize one of the most impor-

tant safety net programs in our country, which is Medicaid. There are three basic entitlement programs—Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. We are doing everything we can to stabilize Medicaid because we believe it is important for low-income citizens to have access to healthcare through Medicaid if they cannot afford it through private insurance.

I want to just address some of the misinformation and, I think, outright falsehoods we have heard from some people about what the Better Care Reconciliation Act does to Medicaid.

I keep hearing people say this cuts Medicaid. It reduces the rate of growth of Medicaid, which is true. We basically put Medicaid on a budget, and we grow it year, after year, after year, as I will mention in a moment, but nowhere other than in Washington, DC, would anybody consider this a cut.

For example, in 2017, we will spend \$393 billion on Medicaid. Now, because this is a State-Federal cost share, in my State, it is either the No. 1 or No. 2 most expensive item in our spending under our State budget each year. It crowds out a lot of other things because it is so expensive. Yet it is uncontrolled, so, in 2017, we will see \$393 billion spent.

At the end of the budget window—10 years, reflected by 2026—the Federal Government will have spent, under the Budget Control Act, \$464 billion. That is a \$71 billion difference between 2017 and 2026. In no other alternate universe that I am aware of would this be considered a cut. This is an increase in Medicaid.

Now, we can have discussions—and we should and we are having discussions—as to: Is this an adequate rate of growth of Medicaid to meet the growing population and to make sure people are taken care of?

Nothing we do in this bill drops anybody from Medicaid, and the suggestion that it does is simply, I would suggest, not accurate, nor is it a cut. We can have discussions about what the proper rate of growth is, and we are having those discussions, but it is a fact, reflected by the Congressional Budget Office—which is the official scorekeeper in Congress—that, in 2017, we will spend \$393 billion, and under the Better Care Reconciliation Act, we will spend \$464 billion, which is a difference of \$71 billion over that 10 years.

I know we will have a lot more to talk about as we continue to debate this bill. My hope is that we will have a bill that we will be able to send to the Congressional Budget Office, which will take a couple of weeks to score—that is a requirement—before we can actually bring it to the floor. I hope that at some point in the not-too-distant future, we will be able to bring a bill to the floor and have a real debate and have an amendment process that will allow everybody and anybody in the Senate to offer amendments in order to change or modify the bill.

In the end, I believe we have to decide because doing nothing is not an

option. Doing nothing means consigning the people who are being hurt by ObamaCare today to continue to be hurt and to be priced out of healthcare entirely. To my mind, that is not a responsible thing for us to do.

That is why I support the Better Care Reconciliation Act. It is not a perfect bill, but it is the next step in helping us turn our current healthcare disaster around. At some point, I hope our Democratic friends will join with us, as they have done under the two bills I mentioned earlier, for this is one of the most important things we will do in the Congress. If you think about what touches people's lives in such a personal way, it is hard to think of anything that does that more than healthcare.

Right now, we are hearing a lot of scare stories and inaccuracies about what this bill does. There is plenty of room for debate and differences of opinion based on the facts, but as the saying goes, you are entitled to your own opinion, but you are not entitled to your own facts. Facts are facts, and based on the facts, we ought to argue our policy differences and then vote.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUNT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, it be in order to move to proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 104, William Hagerty to be Ambassador to Japan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 104, William Hagerty to be Ambassador to Japan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of William Francis Hagerty IV, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of William Francis Hagerty IV, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Deb Fischer, Steve Daines, Luther Strange, Bob Corker, Thom Tillis, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott, Johnny Isakson, Richard C. Shelby, Michael B. Enzi, Richard Burr, John Hoeven, David Perdue, Roy Blunt, Todd Young.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 3, 2017, THROUGH MONDAY, JULY 10, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn, to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted, on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Monday, July 3, at 6 p.m., Thursday, July 6, at 9 a.m. I further ask that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, July 6, it next convene at 3 p.m., Monday, July 10; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Rao nomination; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the postcloture time on the Rao nomination expire at 5:30 p.m., Monday, July 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for the cloture vote on the nomination of Neomi Rao to be the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs within the White House Office of Management and Budget.

On vote No. 155, had I been present, I would have voted nay on the motion to invoke cloture on the Rao nomination.

This administration has dedicated itself to undermining many of the commonsense regulations that protect public health, workers, consumers, students, and the environment.

Ms. Rao's previous writings show that, as OIRA Administrator, she would likely continue this trend and actively work to prevent any new regulations from being implemented.

She has previously called for increased political oversight of independent agencies, like the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and dramatically limiting the regulatory authority of other Federal agencies.

This is concerning as OIRA plays a critical role in the Federal regulatory process and often determines how new regulations are implemented.

Therefore, I would have voted against cloture on Ms. Rao's nomination as I do not believe she will adequately defend agencies' duties to set safety standards that protect the public.

TRIBUTE TO DR. LONNIE G. BUNCH III

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, DC has as its newest treasure, the National Museum of African American History and Culture. It is the work of many and would not be there without its founding director, Dr. Lonnie G. Bunch III.

I know as a member of the Smithsonian board of regents that Dr. Bunch is the single most important person bringing about this magnificent museum and one which will speak to the history of African Americans in this country more than anything else.

We all know that history has seen an enormous amount of pain caused by vi-

olence and deaths resulting from racism in America. When you come into that moving museum, as I have many times, the last thing you would expect is someone who would leave the ultimate symbol of racism, a noose, hanging in it. I know the dismay felt by people of all races when it was found, but probably what has helped the healing the most is the op-ed of June 23, 2017, in the New York Times, written by my friend, Lonnie Bunch.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the op-ed, so that all can see it and so that it will be part of the history of the U.S. Senate.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 23, 2017]

A NOOSE AT THE SMITHSONIAN BRINGS HISTORY BACK TO LIFE

(By Lonnie G. Bunch III)

The person who recently left a noose at the National Museum of African American History and Culture clearly intended to intimidate, by deploying one of the most feared symbols in American racial history. Instead, the vandal unintentionally offered a contemporary reminder of one theme of the black experience in America: We continue to believe in the potential of a country that has not always believed in us, and we do this against incredible odds.

The noose—the second of three left on the National Mall in recent weeks—was found late in May in an exhibition that chronicles America's evolution from the era of Jim Crow through the civil rights movement. Visitors discovered it on the floor in front of a display of artifacts from the Ku Klux Klan, as well as objects belonging to African-American soldiers who fought during World War I. Though these soldiers fought for democracy abroad, they found little when they returned home.

That display, like the museum as a whole, powerfully juxtaposes two visions of America: one shaped by racism, violence and terror, and one shaped by a belief in an America where freedom and fairness reign. I see the nooses as evidence that those visions continue to battle in 2017 and that the struggle for the soul of America continues to this very day.

The people responsible knew that their acts would not be taken lightly. A noose is a symbol of the racial violence and terror that African-Americans have confronted throughout American history and of the intensity of resistance we've faced to any measure of racial equality. During slavery, one of the main purposes of lynching was to deter the enslaved from escaping to freedom. But lynching did not end with slavery; it was also a response to the end of slavery. It continued from the 1880s until after the end of World War I, with more than 100 people lynched each year. So prevalent was this atrocity that between 1920 and 1938, the N.A.A.C.P. displayed a banner at its national headquarters that read simply, "A man was lynched yesterday."

Lynching was not just a phenomenon of the American South or the Ku Klux Klan. And in many places, as black people fought for inclusion in American life, lynchings became brutal spectacles, drawing thousands of onlookers who posed for photographs with the lifeless bodies. This collective memory explains why the noose has become a symbol of white supremacy and racial intimidation.

So, what does it mean to have found three nooses on Smithsonian grounds in 2017? A

noose inside a Missouri high school? A noose on the campus of Duke University? Another at American University?

As a historian, who also happens to be old enough to remember “Whites Only” signs on motels and restaurants that trumpeted the power of laws enforcing segregation, I posit that it means we must lay to rest any notion that racism is not still the great divide.

As someone who has experienced the humiliating sting of racial epithets and the pain of a policeman’s blow—simply because I was black and in a neighborhood not my own—I would argue that it answers a naive and dangerous question that I hear too often: Why can’t African-Americans get over past discrimination?

The answer is that discrimination is not confined to the past. Nor is the African-American commitment to American ideals in the face of discrimination and hate.

The exhibitions inside the museum combine to form a narrative of a people who refused to be broken by hatred and who have always found ways to prod America to be truer to the ideals of its founders.

In the process of curating these experiences, I have acquired, examined and interpreted objects that stir feelings of intense pain. Anger and sadness are always parts of this work, but I never let them dominate it. Instead, I use them to help me connect with the people who have suffered and continue to suffer immeasurable pain and injustice, while clinging to their humanity and their vision of a better country.

I see the nooses in the same way. They are living history. Viewed through this lens, they are no less a part of the story the museum tells than the Klan robes, the slave shackles small enough to fit a child, the stretch of rope used to lynch a Maryland man in 1931 or the coffin used to bury the brutally murdered Emmett Till.

If you want to know how African-Americans continue to persevere and fight for a better America in the face of this type of hatred, you need only visit the museum, where the noose has been removed but the rest of the remarkable story of our commitment to overcome remains. Anyone who experiences the National Museum of African American History and Culture should leave with that realization, as well as the understanding that this story is continuing. The cowardly act of leaving a symbol of hate in the midst of a tribute to our survival conveyed that message as well as any exhibit ever could.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last night in the Kennedy Caucus Room, the U.S. Capitol Historical Society honored the Senate Appropriations Committee with a celebration of its 150th anniversary. Past and present committee members and staff gathered to reflect on the history of the committee, and Senate Historian Betty Koed gave a wonderful keynote address.

Established on March 6, 1867, the committee’s powers are rooted in article 1, section 9, of our Constitution which states, “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.” The Founders recognized the power of the purse as one of the most important tools Congress has to ensure our system of checks and balances and to conduct oversight of the executive and judicial branch—but it is much

more than that. The Appropriations Committee is where we translate the priorities of a nation into the realities of the people.

Our country is not a business, where we allocate resources only according to the bottom line. We do not invest in order to make a profit or a one-for-one dollar in return. We invest in those areas where it is uniquely right for government to take the lead. We invest in the areas that make a difference in the everyday lives of Americans and that help build the foundations of our country and our economy—infrastructure, national security, our environment, education, science and research, healthcare.

I want to thank the U.S. Capitol Historical Society for organizing this anniversary celebration, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the remarks given by Senate Historian Betty Koed be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 150TH ANNIVERSARY

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 2017

BETTY K. KOED, SENATE HISTORIAN

On March 6, 2017, the Senate reached an important milestone in the history of its committees. The Committee on Appropriations turned 150 years old.

For its first quarter-century, the Senate operated without permanent legislative committees. Instead, it relied on temporary “select” committees to manage proposals and write bills. In 1816, having created nearly a hundred of these ad hoc committees, the Senate decided on something more permanent.

In December of 1816, it created eleven standing committees, including Judiciary, Foreign Relations, Commerce, and Finance. However, it did not create a Committee on Appropriations.

Over the next five decades, the Finance Committee handled most appropriations, but that overworked committee struggled with the haphazard funding requests of executive agencies.

Wishing to appear frugal, agency directors often understated their funding needs to the House of Representatives and then, in the hectic final days of a session, quietly turned to the Senate for emergency funds.

The threat of suspended operations usually convinced Congress to replenish the coffers. If agencies ran a surplus, directors simply spent those funds as they pleased.

By the 1860s senators realized that they needed to gain better control over appropriations. The Civil War had vastly expanded federal spending. In fact, in 1865, expenditures passed the billion-dollar mark for the first time in our national history.

The lack of centralized control over appropriations also played to the president’s advantage, and the executive often spent millions without first securing formal congressional appropriations.

In other words, by the end of the Civil War, no less than the power of the purse was at stake.

On March 6, 1867, two years after similar action taken by the House, Senator Henry Anthony of Rhode Island proposed a new committee to consider spending bills.

The Senate agreed—by unanimous consent—and passed subsequent legislation to better regulate how such funds were used.

Before long, this new committee became a Senate powerhouse. Led by strong chairmen like Iowa’s William B. Allison, the Appropriations Committee reached new heights of influence during the Senate’s Gilded Age.

Not surprisingly, senators who did not serve on the committee began to complain. Did this upstart committee have too much power? Chairmen of the legislative committees, as well as the heads of executive agencies, said yes, and looked for ways to wrest back some of that power.

In the 1890s, senators curtailed the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee, giving control over spending in certain areas, such as agriculture, military affairs, and pensions, back to legislative committees.

Committee chairs were delighted, but with no centralized control over the budgetary process, the committees ran amok. Spending increased with little or no accountability.

And so, in 1921, again prompted by war-related costs that had pushed annual spending to more than \$25 billion a year, Congress passed the Budget and Accounting Act.

Signed by President Warren G. Harding, the 1921 law required an annual budget from the president, created the General Accounting Office (now GAO), the Bureau of the Budget (now the OMB), and led to the establishment of permanent subcommittees for Appropriations.

But passage of that bill was just the beginning. In implementing the new law, Chairman Francis E. Warren of Wyoming shaped the future of the committee.

In 1922 Warren introduced a successful resolution to again centralize the appropriations process. He also included in his resolution a revision to Rule 16, requiring that all general appropriation bills, and amendments to such bills, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

This, in essence, established the broad jurisdiction that the committee enjoys today.

Since that time, the Appropriations Committee has continued to evolve as its duties and workload were amended by subsequent legislation.

Of course, the biggest change came in 1974 with the Budget Act, which created the House and Senate Budget Committees along with the Congressional Budget Office. But, again, the Appropriations Committee remained intact.

In the 1980s and 90s, other elements were added—Gramm-Rudman, budget summits, PAYGO, CRs—but you know that history better than I do. You’ve been living it.

Today—150 years after its creation—the Senate Committee on Appropriations, ably led by Chairman Cochran and Vice Chairman Leahy, continues to be a powerful and influential voice in national policymaking.

Of course, that doesn’t mean that the appropriations process has always been easy. In fact, at times, it has been downright testy.

For example, on a hot day in August of 1950, as the Senate continued working past its targeted adjournment date, tempers inside the committee room got to be nearly as hot as the scorching summer sun.

“The Senate is beginning to show signs of overwork,” observed newspaper columnist Jack Anderson. “Sessions are growing longer,” he wrote, “and tempers shorter.”

Among the confrontations that caught Anderson’s eye was a battle between two of the Hill’s best known curmudgeons, Tennessee senator Kenneth McKellar and Missouri Representative Clarence Cannon.

They were the chairmen of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees and for years they had argued bitterly over federal spending. That battle reached a climax in 1950.

“A gavel-bashing, name-calling clash between 81-year-old . . . McKellar, and 71-year-

old . . . Cannon, was broken up . . . just short of physical violence," noted the Washington Post on August 19, 1950.

While meeting in conference, Senator McKellar had sharply commented on Cannon's personality, using language peppered with words such as blind, stupid, and pig-headed.

Infuriated, Cannon sprang from his chair, rushed towards McKellar, and shouted, "I've taken all I'm going to [take]." Startled but defiant, McKellar snatched the gavel and tried to rap it on Cannon's head.

"In the nick of time," the Post reported, a staff member "grabbed Cannon" and "two senators seized the gavel from McKellar."

Peace was restored . . . for the moment.

A decade later, another chairman of the Appropriations Committee—Senator Carl Hayden of Arizona—fought so bitterly with old Clarence Cannon that the two houses of Congress had to establish neutral ground.

Like McKellar, Hayden was an old hand at appropriations. With 50 years of congressional service behind him, his skillful management of spending bills had earned him the label, "the third senator from every state."

But Hayden's notable length of service had not prepared him for Clarence Cannon. In the House since 1923, Cannon knew his way around bicameral disputes.

This was a battle of the titans on Capitol Hill.

"Government agencies are frantically going broke," wrote a reporter in June of 1962, just because two members of Congress "keep yelling at each other."

For months, Cannon and Hayden had delayed action on legislation while they argued over seemingly petty issues.

The press dubbed it the "Battle of the Octogenarians," but underlying this crisis was a dispute as old as Congress itself.

Was the Senate truly the "upper house"?

Fueling the argument was a long-simmering House resentment of the Senate's general air of superiority, an attitude which had resulted in some rather high-handed practices.

For example, for nearly two centuries, all conference committees had been chaired by senators, and such meetings had always been held on the Senate side of the Capitol.

In 1962, the House decided to challenge this old custom of senatorial privilege. Leading the charge was Appropriations Chairman Clarence Cannon.

Defending the Senate's prerogatives—Carl Hayden.

Cannon informed Hayden that he refused to make the trek to the Senate side of the Hill for conference meetings. From now on, he insisted, senators had to walk to the House side—at least half of the time! Furthermore, he demanded that he be allowed to chair half of the conferences.

Hayden countered. In that case, he insisted, the Senate would initiate half of all appropriations bills.

The resulting stalemate lasted for months. Meeting after meeting produced no agreement. The appropriations process remained stalled well past the end of the fiscal year, while government agencies scrambled for funds.

Finally, Carl Hayden called for a truce. He suggested a special meeting to be held on neutral ground and turned to Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield for a solution.

Needless to say, Mansfield was anxious to end the battle. He searched for a proper meeting space. Finally, he opened EF-100, a small room located off the crypt, in the exact center of the Capitol.

"I even agreed to have it surveyed," Mansfield explained, "so that the conference table would not be so much as an eighth of an inch more on one side than the other."

Presented with this option, Chairman Cannon agreed to meet in conference, but stood firm in his demands to co-chair meetings.

To end the crisis, and probably urged on by Mansfield, Carl Hayden relented. The Senate sacrificed a few of its cherished privileges, and government operations returned to normal.

Pundits dismissed the battle as a tempest in a teapot, but more astute observers recognized that this high-profile battle was another chapter in an on-going struggle over the shared constitutional powers of the Senate and the House.

Finally, this evening I would like to highlight an important but mostly forgotten milestone in this committee's history.

Since 1867, about 300 senators have served on the committee. Of those 300, a mere dozen have been women. The first woman to serve was, of course, Margaret Chase Smith of Maine, who joined the committee in 1953.

As you all know, in 2012, Senator Barbara Mikulski—the second woman to serve on the committee—became the first woman to chair it.

Those are both major milestones in Senate history.

Here's one more.

Way back in 1911, a woman served as chief clerk to the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Her name was Leona Wells. She joined the Senate's clerical staff in 1901 and remained on the payroll for 25 years. I believe her to be the first woman to hold a top committee position in the Senate.

Born in Illinois in 1877, Wells moved to Wyoming when she turned 21, because this young suffragist could cast a vote in Wyoming. There she met Senator Francis E. Warren, whose patronage brought her to Washington.

As chair of the Military Affairs Committee, Senator Warren appointed Wells to the committee's clerical staff. When he became chairman of Appropriations in 1911, he brought Wells with him, giving her the position of chief clerk—although it appears that the Senate never officially gave her that title.

At the time, Leona Wells was unusual—a well-paid professional woman on Capitol Hill. In fact, she was so unusual that she attracted media attention.

Leona Wells "is probably the most envied woman in government service," reported the Boston Globe in an article titled "Uncle Sam's Highest Salaried Woman."

Not only did she earn a good salary, the Globe noted, but she is "the first woman employee of the Senate to be placed in charge of the affairs of a big committee."

Wells scouted new territory for female staff, but one area remained off limits—the Senate Chamber. When Chairman Warren was on the floor doing committee business, Wells had to wait outside.

Male committee clerks freely entered the chamber, but the Senate was not yet ready to admit a female staffer. Instead, as the Globe reported, Wells waited "just outside the swing doors of the chamber . . . and kept the door an inch or two ajar that she might hear everything that went on inside."

Leona Wells is largely forgotten now, but her service on the Appropriations Committee opened a door so other women could follow. Her story is also part of this committee's history.

This has been an all-too-brief summary of the history of this important committee, but I hope it will serve as a reminder.

Just like Francis Warren or Carl Hayden or even Leona Wells, all of you—chairs, vice chairs, members, and staff—are part of the history of the Committee on Appropriations.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 16-68, concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Acceptance to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$175 million. After this letter is delivered to our office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXEY,
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-68

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment * \$100 million.

Other \$75 million.

Total \$175 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

One hundred sixty-eight (168) MK-54 Lightweight Torpedo (LWT) Conversion Kits.

Non-MDE includes: Shipping containers, operator manuals and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services.

(iv) Military Department: Navy.

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: FMS Cases TW-P-AJX and TW-P-AKB.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 29, 2017.

* As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States—MK-54 Lightweight Torpedo (LWT) Conversion Kits

TECRO has requested a possible sale of MK-54 Lightweight Torpedo (LWT) Conversion Kits. This request provides the recipient with MK-54 LWTs in support of their LWT program. This sale will include LWT containers, torpedo support, torpedo spare parts, publications, training, weapon system support, engineering and technical assistance for the upgrade and conversion of one hundred sixty eight (168) MK-46 Mod 5 Torpedoes to the MK-54 Lightweight Torpedo (LWT) configuration. The total estimated program cost is \$175 million.

This proposed sale is consistent with United States law and policy, as expressed in Public Law 96-8.

This proposed sale serves U.S. national, economic and security interests by supporting the recipient's continuing efforts to modernize its armed forces and enhance its defensive capabilities. The proposed sale will help improve the security of the recipient and assist in maintaining political stability, military balance and economic progress in the region.

The proposed sale will improve the recipient's capability in current and future defensive efforts. The recipient will use the enhanced capability as a deterrent to regional threats and to strengthen homeland defense. The recipient will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

There will be various contactors involved in this case.

There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

It is estimated that during implementation of this proposed sale, a number of U.S. Government and contractor representatives will be assigned to the recipient or travel there intermittently during the program.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-68

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

Annex Item No vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The MK 54 Lightweight Torpedo (LWT) has been in service in the U.S. Navy (USN) since 2004. The version offered in this sale is the MK54 Mod 0 of the system. The purchaser currently does not have this weapon system in its inventory. The proposed sale consists 168 MK-54 Mod 0 LWT conversion kits, containers, spare and repair parts, weapon system support and integration, personnel training, training equipment, test equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistical support services and other related elements of logistical support.

a. Although the MK 54 Mod 0 LWT is considered state-of-the-art-technology, there is no Critical Program Information associated with the MK 54 Mod 0 LWT hardware, technical documentation or software. The highest classification of the hardware to be exported is SECRET. The highest classification of the technical manual that will be exported is CONFIDENTIAL. The technical manual is required for operation of the MK 54 Mod 0 LWT. The highest classification of the software to be exported is SECRET.

2. Loss of hardware, software, publications or other items associated with the proposed

sale to a technologically advanced or competent adversary, poses the risk of the destruction of the countermeasures or replication and/or improvements to the adversary's Undersea Weapon Systems, weakening U.S. defense capabilities.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. A determination has been made that the recipient country can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives in the Policy justification.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the government of Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (IECRO) in the United States.

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 16-69, concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Acceptance to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$250 million. After this letter is delivered to our office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J. W. RIXEY
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-69

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$150 million.

Other \$100 million.

Total \$250 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Forty-six (46) MK 48 Mod 6AT Heavyweight Torpedoes (HWT).

Non-MDE includes: Shipping containers, operator manuals and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services.

(iv) Military Department: Navy.

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc. Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Notification Delivered to Congress: June 29, 2017.

As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States—MK 48 Mod 6AT Heavyweight Torpedo (HWT)

Taiwan has requested a possible sale of forty-six (46) MK 48 Mod 6AT Heavyweight Torpedoes (HWT). This sale will include HWT containers, torpedo support, torpedo spare parts, publications, training, weapon system support, engineering and technical assistance. The total estimated program cost is \$250 million.

This proposed sale is consistent with United States law and policy, as expressed in Public Law 96-8.

This proposed sale serves U.S. national, economic and security interests by supporting the recipient's continuing efforts to modernize its armed forces and enhance its defensive capabilities. The proposed sale will help improve the security of the recipient and assist in maintaining political stability, military balance and economic progress in the region.

The proposed sale will improve the recipient's capability in current and future defensive efforts. The recipient will use the enhanced capability as a deterrent to regional threats and to strengthen homeland defense. The recipient will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

There are no prime contractors associated with this case as all materials will be procured from U.S. Navy stocks. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

It is estimated that during implementation of this this proposed sale a number of U.S. Government and contractor representatives will be assigned to the recipient or travel there intermittently during the program.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-69

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

Annex Item No vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The MK 48 Heavy Weight Torpedo (HWT) has been in service in the U.S. Navy (USN) since 1972. This sale furnishes the MK 48 Mod 6 Advanced Technology (AT) version of the system. The purchaser currently does not have this weapon system in its inventory. The proposed sale consists of 46 HWTs, containers, spare and repair parts, weapons system support and integration, personnel training, training equipment, test equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services and other related elements of logistical support

a. There is no Critical Program Information associated with the MK 48 Mod 6AT HWT hardware, technical documentation or software. The highest classification of the hardware to be exported is SECRET. The highest classification of the technical manual that will be exported is CONFIDENTIAL. The technical manual is required for operation of the MK 48 Mod 6AT HWT. The highest classification of the software to be exported is SECRET. The MK 48 Mod 6AT HWT meets Anti-Tampering requirements.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

3. A determination has been made that the recipient country can provide substantially

the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives in the Policy justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 16-67, concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Acceptance to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$125 million. After this letter is delivered to our office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXEY,
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-67

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment \$100 million.
Other \$25 million.

TOTAL \$125 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Sixteen (16) Standard Missile-2 (SM-2) Block IIIA All-Up Rounds (AUR) Forty-seven (47) MK 93 MOD 1 SM-2 Block IIIA Guidance Sections (GSSs).

Five (5) MK 45 MOD 14 SM-2 Block IIIA Target Detecting Device (TDDs) Shrouds.

Non-MDE includes: Seventeen (17) MK 11 MOD6 SM-2 Block IIIA Autopilot Battery Units (APBUs) maneuverability upgrades on the GSSs, sixty-nine (69) section containers and sixteen (16) AUR containers, operator manuals and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (LHT).

(v) Prior Related Cases if any: FMS Cases TW-P-LGQ.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See attached annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 29, 2017.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States—SM-2 Block IIIA Standard Missiles and Components

TECRO has requested a possible sale of sixteen (16) Standard Missile-2 (SM-2) Block IIIA All-Up Rounds (AUR), forty-seven (47) MK 93 MOD 1 SM-2 Block IIIA Guidance Sections (GSSs), and five (5) MK 45 MOD 14 SM-2 Block IIIA Target Detecting Devices

(TDDs) Shrouds. This request also includes Seventeen (17) MK 11 MOD6 SM-2 Block IIIA Autopilot Battery Units (APBUs) maneuverability upgrades on the GSSs, sixty-nine (69) section containers and sixteen (16) AUR containers, operator manuals and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services. The total estimated program cost is \$125 million.

This proposed sale is consistent with United States law and policy, as expressed in Public Law 96-8.

This proposed sale serves U.S. national, economic and security interests by supporting the recipient's continuing efforts to modernize its armed forces and enhance its defensive capabilities. The proposed sale will help improve the security of the recipient and assist in maintaining political stability, military balance and economic progress in the region.

The proposed sale will improve the recipient's capability in current and future defensive efforts. The recipient will use the enhanced capability as a deterrent to regional threats and to strengthen homeland defense. The SM-2 Block IIIA missiles and components proposed in this purchase will be used to supplement existing inventories of SM-2 Block IIAs to be used for self-defense against air and cruise missile threats onboard their destroyer-class surface ships. The recipient will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be Raytheon Missiles Systems Company of Tucson, Arizona. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

It is estimated that during implementation of this proposed sale, a number of U.S. Government and contractor representatives will be assigned to the recipient or travel there intermittently during the program.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-67

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. A completely assembled STANDARD Missile-2 (SM-2) Block IIIA with or without a conventional warhead, whether a tactical or inert (training) configuration, is classified CONFIDENTIAL. Missile component hardware includes: Guidance Section (classified CONFIDENTIAL), Target Detection Device (classified CONFIDENTIAL), Warhead (UNCLASSIFIED), Rocket Motor (UNCLASSIFIED), Steering Control Section (UNCLASSIFIED), Safe and Arming Device (UNCLASSIFIED), and Autopilot Battery Unit (classified CONFIDENTIAL).

2. SM-2 operator and maintenance documentation is considered CONFIDENTIAL. Shipboard operation/firing guidance is considered CONFIDENTIAL. Pre-firing missile assembly/pedigree information is UNCLASSIFIED.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. A determination has been made that recipient can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive tech-

nology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 16-73, concerning the Department of the Air Force proposed Letter(s) of Acceptance to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$185.5 million. After this letter is delivered to our office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXEY,
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-73

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$83.5 million.
Other \$102.0 million.

Total \$185.5 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Fifty-six (56) AGM-154C Joint Standoff Weapons (JSOWs).

Non-MDE includes: JSOW integration, captive flight vehicles, dummy training missiles, missile containers, spare and repair parts, support and test equipment, Joint Mission Planning System updates, publications and technical documentation, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (QBZ).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 29, 2017.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States—AGM-154C Joint Standoff Weapon (JSOW) Missiles

TECRO requested a possible sale of fifty-six (56) AGM-154C JSOW Air-to-Ground Missiles. This request also includes: JSOW integration, captive flight vehicles, dummy training missiles, missile containers, spare and repair parts, support and test equipment, Joint Mission Planning System updates, publications and technical documentation, personnel training and training

equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$185.5 million.

This proposed sale is consistent with U.S. law and policy as expressed in Public Law 96-8.

This proposed sale serves U.S. national, economic, and security interests by supporting the recipient's continuing efforts to modernize its armed forces and to maintain a credible defensive capability. The proposed sale will help improve the security of the recipient and assist in maintaining political stability, military balance, and economic progress in the region.

The proposed sale will improve the recipient's capability in current and future defensive efforts. The recipient will use the enhanced capability as a deterrent to regional threats and to strengthen homeland defense. The recipient will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

Currently, market research is being conducted to determine the viability of a qualified contractor in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulations. The purchaser typically requests offsets, but any offsets will be determined between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives outside the United States.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-73

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AGM-154C Joint Standoff Weapon (JSOW) is a low observable, 1,000 lb. class, inertial navigation and global positioning satellite guided family of air-to-ground glide weapons. JSOW consists of a common airframe and avionics that provides for a modular payload assembly to attack stationary and moving massed flight-armored and armored vehicle columns, surface-to-air, soft to hard, relocatable, and fixed targets. JSOW provides combat forces with an all-weather, day/night/multiple kills per pass, launch and leave, and standoff capability.

2. The highest classification of the hardware to be exported is SECRET. The highest classification of the technical documentation to be exported is SECRET, but no radar cross-section and infrared signature data nor U.S.-only tactics or tactical doctrine will be disclosed. The highest classification of the software to be exported is SECRET; however, no software source code will be disclosed. All reprogramming of missile microprocessor memories must be accomplished by U.S. Government personnel or U.S. Government approved contractors.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification. Moreover, the benefits to be derived from this sale, as outlined in the Policy Justification, outweigh the potential damage

that could result if the sensitive technology were revealed to unauthorized persons.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

HON. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 16-75, concerning the Department of the Air Force proposed Letter(s) of Acceptance to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$400 million. After this letter is delivered to our office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXEY,
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

Enclosure.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-75

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment (MDE)* \$0 million.

Other \$400 million.

Total \$400 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Non-MDE includes: Follow-on sustainment package for the Surveillance Radar Program (SRP) that includes contractor logistics support (sustainment); engineering services and technical updates to address equipment obsolescence; transportation and material costs associated with contractor repair and return services; spare and repair parts; support and test equipment; publications and technical documentation personnel training and training equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering; technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (QAP).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: TW-D-DAH—\$831 million—27 Oct 2004; TW-D-QAI—\$370 million—25 May 2012.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 29, 2017.

* As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States—Surveillance Radar Program (SRP) Operations and Maintenance Support

TECRO requested a possible sale of SRP Operations and Maintenance follow-on sustainment package that includes, contractor logistics support (sustainment); engineering services and technical updates to address equipment obsolescence; transportation and material costs associated with contractor repair and return services; spare

and repair parts; support and test equipment; publications and technical documentation personnel training and training equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering; technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$400 million.

This proposed sale is consistent with United States law and policy as expressed in Public Law 96-8.

This proposed sale contributes to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security and defensive capability of the recipient, which has been and continues to be an important force for political stability, military balance, and economic progress in the region.

The proposed sale improves the recipient's capability to provide early warning against current and future airborne threats. The SRP is a key component to the recipient's Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence Surveillance and Reconnaissance architecture. It will use the requested updates and sustainment as a defensive deterrent to regional threats and to strengthen its homeland defense. This potential sale will not introduce new capabilities, but will continue a similar sustainment package to one currently in place.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

Currently, market research is being conducted to determine the viability of a qualified contractor in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulations. The purchaser typically requests offsets, but any offsets will be determined between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives outside the United States.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-75

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The purchaser currently owns an Early Warning Radar (EWR) that serves as a critical element to its Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) infrastructure. The radars provide a robust capability to detect, acquire, and track theater ballistic missiles, air breathing targets, and cruise missile threats. The system is able to operate in severe clutter and jamming environments amid high levels of background radio frequency interference. The follow on sustainment package requested will not introduce new capabilities.

2. The highest classification of the hardware to be exported is UNCLASSIFIED. The highest classification of the technical documentation to be exported is SECRET. There are technical manuals as well as Engineering Change Proposals, drawings, and specifications required as part of the sustainment updates. Components requiring depot level maintenance will be shipped to the U.S. for servicing. The highest level of software to be exported is UNCLASSIFIED.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification. Moreover, the benefits to be derived from this sale, as outlined in the Policy Justification, outweigh the potential damage that could result if the sensitive technology were revealed to unauthorized persons.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 16-74, concerning the Department of the Air Force proposed Letter(s) of Acceptance to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$147.5 million. After this letter is delivered to our office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXLEY,
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-74

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* \$47.5 million.
Other \$100.0 million.
Total \$147.5 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):
Fifty (50) AGM-88B High-Speed Anti-Radiation Missiles (HARMs).

Ten (10) AGM-88B Training HARMs.
Non-MDE includes: HARM integration, LAU-118A Launchers, missile containers, spare and repair parts, support and test equipment, Joint Mission Planning System update, publications and technical documentation, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (QBZ).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 29, 2017.

* As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States—AGM-88B High-Speed Anti-Radiation Missiles (HARM)

TECRO requested a possible sale of fifty (50) AGM-88B HARMs and ten (10) AGM-88B Training HARMs. This request also includes: HARM integration, LAU-118A Launchers, missile containers, spare and repair parts, support and test equipment, Joint Mission

Planning System update, publications and technical documentation, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$147.5 million.

This proposed sale is consistent with U.S. law and policy as expressed in Public Law 96-8.

This proposed sale serves U.S. national, economic, and security interests by supporting the recipient's continuing efforts to modernize its armed forces and to maintain a credible defensive capability. The proposed sale will help improve the security of the recipient and assist in maintaining political stability, military balance, and economic progress in the region.

The proposed sale will improve the recipient's capability in current and future defensive efforts. The recipient will use the enhanced capability as a deterrent to regional threats and to strengthen homeland defense. The recipient will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

Currently, market research is being conducted to determine the viability of a qualified contractor in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulations. The purchaser typically requests offsets, but any offsets will be determined between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives outside the United States.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-74

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. AGM-88B High-Speed Anti-Radiation Missile (HARM) is a supersonic air-to-surface missile designed to seek and destroy enemy radar-equipped air defense systems. HARM has a proportional guidance system that hones in on enemy radar emissions through a fixed antenna and seeker head in the missile nose. The missile consists of four sections: guidance section, warhead, control section, and rocket motor.

2. The highest classification of the hardware to be exported is SECRET. The highest classification of the technical documentation to be exported is SECRET, but no radar cross-section and infrared signature data nor U.S.-only tactics or tactical doctrine will be disclosed. The highest classification of the software to be exported is SECRET; however, no software source code will be disclosed. All reprogramming of missile microprocessor memories must be accomplished by U.S. Government personnel or U.S. Government approved contractors.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification. Moreover, the benefits to be derived from this sale, as outlined in the Policy Justification, outweigh the potential damage

that could result if the sensitive technology were revealed to unauthorized persons. A determination has been made that the recipient country can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification and in accordance with the Taiwan Relations Act.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 16-70, concerning the Department of the Navy proposed Letter(s) of Acceptance to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$80 million. After this letter is delivered to our office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXLEY,
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-70

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* \$ 0 million.
Other \$ 80 million.
Total \$ 80 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Non-MDE Includes: AN/SLQ-32(V)3 Electronic Warfare System upgrade hardware, software, support equipment and parts, publications, training, engineering and technical assistance.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (LHW).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: FMS Cases TW-P-SDV, TW-P-GNT, and TW-P-GOU.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 29, 2017.

* As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States—AN/SLO-32(V)3 Upgrade

TECRO has requested a possible sale to upgrade the AN/SLQ-32(V)3 Electronic Warfare Systems in support of four

(4) ex-KIDD Class (now KEELUNG Class) destroyers. This sale will include AN/SLQ-32(V)3 upgrade hardware, software, support equipment and parts, publications, training, engineering and technical assistance. The total estimated program cost is \$80 million.

This proposed sale is consistent with United States law and policy, as expressed in Public Law 96-8.

This proposed sale serves U.S. national, economic and security interests by supporting the recipient's continuing efforts to

modernize its armed forces and enhance its defensive capabilities. The proposed sale will help improve the security of the recipient and assist in maintaining political stability, military balance and economic progress in the region.

The proposed sale will improve the recipient's capability in current and future defensive efforts. The recipient will use the enhanced capability as a deterrent to regional threats and to strengthen homeland defense. The proposed sale will improve operational readiness and enhance the electronic warfare capability onboard the ex-KIDD Class destroyers. The recipient will have no difficulty in absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be Raytheon Missiles Systems Company of Tucson, Arizona. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

It is estimated that during implementation of this proposed sale, a number of U.S. Government and contractor representatives will be assigned to the recipient or travel there intermittently during the program.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-70

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b) (1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

Annex Item No vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AN/SLQ-32(V)3 is an electronic warfare system providing shipboard identification and cataloging of the electronic signature of missiles and aircraft. The system consists of sensors and computers which process electronic signals within parameters established in a threat library. The customer currently has an earlier version of this equipment in inventory.

a. The AN/SLQ-32(V)3 upgrade consists of hardware, technical documentation, and software. The highest classification of the hardware to be exported is SECRET. The highest classification of software to be exported is SECRET.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

3. A determination has been made that the recipient country can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives in the Policy justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Government of Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

MARKETPLACE CERTAINTY ACT

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am expressing sentiments for myself and on behalf of Senators WYDEN and MURRAY, as a fair reading of the Affordable Care Act, ACA, makes clear, S. 1462, the Marketplace Certainty Act, is not necessary to provide a permanent appropriation for the payment of cost-

sharing reductions under the ACA. The ACA already prescribes that such payments are to be made from such a permanent appropriation pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1324. This is because an essential component of the ACA's system for ensuring the availability of affordable health insurance coverage is its two-part package of subsidies: tax credits and cost-sharing reductions. Whereas the premium tax credits make it more affordable for an individual to purchase health insurance, the cost-sharing reductions make healthcare more affordable by reducing the often daunting costs, such as copayments and deductibles, that even those with health insurance must pay to obtain healthcare, ACA, sections 1401, 1402, 26 U.S.C. 36B, 42 U.S.C. 18071. The ACA directs the Secretary of the Treasury to "establish" a single, integrated "program" to "make advance payment" of both subsidies to insurance companies, who are accordingly mandated to reduce individuals' premium payments to insurers, and their cost-sharing obligations to healthcare providers. To assure insurers and covered individuals that these equally essential funds will both be available, the act provides that requisite payments are to be jointly made from a permanent appropriation, 31 U.S.C. 1324, rather than be subject to the year-to-year whims of the annual appropriations process.

Despite the fact that the current permanent appropriation in section 1324 plainly covers these cost-sharing reduction payments, pending litigation brought by the House Republican leadership—which is currently being held in abeyance in the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals—and the current administration's mixed signals as to whether it will continue to make these payments required by law, could generate instability in individual insurance markets. S. 1462 removes all basis for any further questions about what is already clear from a fair reading of the ACA as a whole: both subsidies are to be funded from the same permanent appropriation. In addition, the amendment includes provisions that will strengthen the existing subsidy provisions, and, in light of developments since the ACA was enacted in 2010, make insurance more affordable for beneficiaries and help stabilize State-level individual insurance markets.

NOMINATION OBJECTION

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Steven Gill Bradbury, of Virginia, to be General Counsel for the Department of Transportation.

LGBTQ PRIDE MONTH

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize LGBTQ Pride Month, a time to openly acknowledge and celebrate the contributions lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer or questioning individuals have made to

our Country and the progress they have made over the years toward equality and civil rights.

Pride, equality, freedom—these values are at the core of Pride Month for LGBTQ individuals and families in Maryland and across the United States. Every American deserves the same freedoms, the same opportunities and the same protections under the law to love whom they love.

Respect, dignity, hope—LGBTQ Americans have helped drive the innovation and bold ideas that make America exceptional. They have stood sentry in our military, made scientific advances, created jobs from Main Street to Wall Street, made all of America laugh and cry, and so much more. LGBTQ individuals have enriched our communities and made us a stronger nation.

Fear, apprehension, caution—those of us who defend civil rights every day understand that these are discouraging and uncertain times. It pains me to say the full admission of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer or questioning individuals into society has yet to be granted. The open expression of one's sexual orientation and gender identity has been—and oftentimes still is—wrought with discrimination and hardship.

Despite the highs of Windsor and Obergefell, the LGBTQ community feels the pain of the senseless shooting at Pulse nightclub 1 year ago, blatant discrimination in States like North Carolina, and the incomprehensible abandonment of transgender students in schools, and the decades of injustice that reach back far beyond Stonewall. The results of last year's Presidential election brought an unwanted chill to the winds of momentum that had swept through the LGBTQ community. Insensitive language from the current administration adds an ominous cloud over the potential for future progress.

To all of my lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer or questioning sisters and brothers, I say this: You are not alone. I support you. I will fight alongside you. We will not allow extremism to take away the inherent rights afforded to each and every one of us. Equality and liberty will prevail over any who would use hate and bigotry to frighten or intimidate others.

I have joined with nearly half of the U.S. Senate as a sponsor of the Equality Act, S. 1006, historic, comprehensive Federal legislation that would ensure full Federal nondiscrimination equality for LGBTQ individuals by adding sexual orientation and gender identity to other protected classes, such as race or religion, in existing Federal laws. Despite major advances in equality for LGBTQ Americans, including nationwide marriage equality, the majority of States still do not have explicit LGBTQ nondiscrimination protection laws. The Equality Act would fill in the gap by explicitly banning discrimination in a host of areas, including employment, housing, public

accommodations, jury service, access to credit, and Federal funding.

When the White House broke more than a decade of tradition by failing to recognize June as LGBTQ Pride Month, I joined my colleagues in picking up the mantle by introducing the first-ever Senate resolution recognizing June as LGBTQ Pride Month. The resolution notes major milestones in the fight for equal treatment of LGBTQ Americans and resolves to continue efforts to achieve full equality for LGBTQ individuals.

As we build a new future of equality for all, despite the current headwinds, it is important that we learn from our Nation's past and use it as a source of strength and a teachable moment for those unaware of the history the LGBTQ community and what our Nation has been through. It is my firm hope that we are not seeing a redux of a McCarthy-like rise in political-driven discrimination.

For this reason, I was taken back a bit at the confirmation hearings of Rex Tillerson and Nikki Haley, who are now serving as America's top diplomats, that neither of them would say the phrase "LGBTQ." Following that peculiarity, it has been widely reported that the Trump administration has scrubbed LGBTQ content from various Federal Government websites—in some cases changing the agency's official nondiscrimination policy.

Juxtaposed with the Obama administration that lit up the White House in rainbow lights during Pride month and backed up those concrete actions of support, this attempt to erase LGBTQ individuals from government was disturbing. I was alarmed because I knew that it had been tried before during the McCarthy era. It had a damaging effect on U.S. foreign policy back then, and it cannot be repeated.

In what came to be known as the Lavender Scare, according to the State Department's Bureau of Diplomatic Security, employees were forced out on the ostensible grounds that their real or perceived sexual orientation rendered them vulnerable to blackmail, prone to getting caught in "honey traps," and a general security risk. Many more individuals were prevented from joining the State Department due to a screening process that was put in place to prevent those who "seemed like they might be gay or lesbian" from being hired.

David Johnson's "The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government," University of Chicago Press, 2006, the definitive academic study of the issue, found that at least 1,000 people were dismissed from the U.S. Department of State alone for alleged homosexuality during the 1950s and well into the 1960s before the "scare" ran its course.

The Senate bears a special measure of responsibility for the Lavender Scare, as the State Department's actions were in part in response to con-

gressional investigations into "sex perversion of federal employees," reports on the employments of "moral perverts by Government Agencies," and hearings or pressure placed on the Department through the appropriations process.

Last year, in my role as ranking member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I urged then-Secretary of State John Kerry to shine a spotlight on this dark period in American diplomatic history by issuing the first-ever public apology for the Department of State's targeting due to perceived sexual orientation.

This month, I introduced new legislation called the Lavender Offense Victim Exoneration Act of 2017, or the LOVE Act. Similar to what was enacted for the men and women of our military, who also were forced to hide their real self to the world, the LOVE Act would make amends and help right the wrongs that were leveled against our U.S. diplomats during this un-American and unacceptable episode in our history. The Lavender Scare is a painful but little-known chapter in American history, and even though times have thankfully changed in so many ways for the LGBT community, we must have the courage of our conviction to recognize wrong, apologize, and move forward with common sense and compassion whenever it is required.

A few have asked me, Why now? Why do we need to relive past transgressions when there are "more important things to do"? The answer is clear: The current administration may work to avoid using the words lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender, but Congress should take firm action to show LGBTQ Americans that their valuable contributions to our country—today or 60-plus years ago—are very real and they are recognized. We cannot and should not turn our backs on the individuals who sacrificed so much for the benefit of the American people. We cannot and will not turn back the clock on the hard-fought civil rights of the LGBTQ community.

The theme of the 2017 Baltimore Pride celebration is "Pride Unleashed," a commitment to "work boldly and to live freely." I can think of no better mantra for LGBTQ Marylanders and allies as we fight side by side to protect civil rights and celebrate the strength of our diversity.

I implore you and all of our colleagues to join the fight for LGBTQ equality. The administration also should take firm action to show LGBTQ Americans that their valuable contributions to our country are recognized and appreciated. It is the responsibility of each and every citizen to root out systemic intolerance. Inclusion and diversity are some of our Nation's greatest strengths; yet these values are now in peril. We cannot and will not turn back the clock on hard-fought civil rights for the LGBTQ community.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BALLARD LOCKS IN WASHINGTON STATE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today, with my colleague Senator CANTWELL, I wish to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the construction and operation of the Hiram M. Chittenden Locks, more commonly known in Washington State as the Ballard Locks. The Ballard Locks are not just symbolic of our region's rich maritime history, but a century later, they remain vital to the economy, public safety, environment, and more in Puget Sound.

As early as the 1850s, settlers in Puget Sound recognized the benefits of connecting the region's freshwater lakes to the saltwater of Puget Sound. Shortly thereafter, the U.S. Navy expressed interest. Ultimately, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Army Corps, initiated planning for the locks in the late 1890s and work began in earnest under Hiram M. Chittenden, the Seattle district engineer for the Army Corps from April 1906 to September 1908. Construction began in 1911 after the locks received approval from Congress, and the Ballard Locks were formally opened for vessel traffic on July 4, 1917.

The Ballard Locks enable commercial and recreational vessels to travel to the docks, shipyards, warehouses, maintenance and repair facilities, and marinas in the region's freshwater lakes while also reducing maintenance costs and prolonging vessel life in the freshwater environment. The importance of the locks is underscored by their annual usage. Each year, the Ballard Locks support 45,000 vessel transits and 14,000 lockage counts, which makes them the busiest lock in the United States in overall vessel traffic. If you only count commercial vessels from fishing fleets to oceangoing freight shippers and more, the Ballard Locks are the 12th busiest in the Nation.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I join my colleague Senator MURRAY in commemorating the Ballard Locks' 100th anniversary. As our constituents in Washington State know, these locks are an integral part of our regional economy. The safe and efficient operation of the Ballard Locks supports \$1.2 billion in total lock-related economic activity, more than 3,000 full-time jobs, and more than 1 million tons of freight. With over 1.3 million visitors a year to see the locks and the fish ladder and visit the Carl S. English Jr. Botanical Gardens, the Ballard Locks are one of the region's top tourist attractions generating another \$40 million in economic activity per year.

The Ballard Locks provide critical public safety and environmental functions, maintaining the water level of Lake Washington and Lake Union and preventing salt water intrusion from Puget Sound into these freshwater lakes. The locks support two floating highway bridges—Interstate-90 and

State Route-520—the water and sewer systems that serve Mercer Island residents, and approximately 75 miles of developed commercial, municipal, and residential shoreline. It also allows for emergency response by the Seattle Fire Department, Seattle Harbor Patrol, King County Sheriff, and U.S. Coast Guard. The facilities spillway and fish ladder serve as a link for salmon and steelhead migrating from the ocean upstream to freshwater spawning grounds, which is important to fulfilling Federal Tribal treaty responsibilities.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, like other infrastructure across Washington State and the Nation, the Ballard Locks are showing their age. Senator CANTWELL and I commend the Army Corps for its work to restore and modernize the locks, and we are doing our part in Congress to support these efforts. Year after year, we work to help Presidential administrations understand the critical importance of the Army Corps' work, and we make sure budgets actually reflect that need. We stand ready to continue to work with our partners in Puget Sound to complete the necessary repairs and upgrades of the Ballard Locks, as our regional economy and the more than 200 businesses that rely upon the locks cannot afford an extended, unplanned closure.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, together Senator MURRAY and I will continue to advocate for this critical infrastructure, working to ensure our colleagues and the administration understand the importance of the waterways and navigation systems in the Pacific Northwest. Investing in our water infrastructure supports jobs, economic security, and healthy communities. Senator MURRAY and I are proud to fight for the investments the Army Corps needs to operate, maintain, and restore the Ballard Locks.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MARVIN QUALLEY

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the distinct honor of recognizing Marvin Qualley, a dedicated basketball official from Roosevelt County. This past week, Marvin was selected by the Montana High School Association for induction into the 2017 Montana Officials' Association Hall of Fame.

Marvin's recognition as a hall of fame official is clearly well earned. He has been a bedrock official in the northeast Montana basketball circuit for many years. From Plentywood to Poplar, the communities of northeast Montana have benefited from Marvin's officiating. The 36-year duration of Marvin's contributions to youth sports is simply amazing. The quality of his hall of fame career is evident in his frequent selection to officiate postseason competitions. He was behind the whis-

tle for 15 State basketball tournaments and 60 total tournaments. In addition to his accomplishments as a referee, Marvin has spent many years behind the wheel of a school bus helping students in the Froid and Medicine Lake communities safely reach their destination.

Both behind the wheel and behind the whistle, Marvin's commitment to safety and fair play has helped a generation of Montana students. Officiating youth sports is often a thankless task. Looking back on Marvin's distinguished career, it is appropriate to sum it up with a sincere "Good job, ref!" •

TRIBUTE TO MARY JO CODEY

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the legacy of a great New Jerseyan upon her retirement from a 40-year teaching career. As Mary Jo Codey wraps up her final school year at Gregory Elementary, a public school in West Orange, NJ, we congratulate her on a long and fruitful career inspiring and educating our children while putting them on the path to success. Even as the first lady of New Jersey under the administration of her husband, Richard Codey, Mary Jo refused to leave the children she loved so much, saying, "When asked if I would resign my teaching responsibilities during my tenure as the First Lady, my response was consistently 'no.' Teaching was and is my passion!" Her dedication and service to her students and to her State will not soon be forgotten.

While teaching may have been Mary Jo's first passion, her drive to make life better for children and families extends well beyond the classroom. I have been honored over the years to work closely with Mary Jo on an issue near and dear to her heart. Ten to 20 percent of women across America are suffering from postpartum depression, and after the birth of her first son in 1984, Mary Jo was one of them. Then, after the birth of her second son, her depression returned, but this time she was able to recognize it and seek treatment for it. Instead of hiding her illness or being ashamed of it, Mary Jo's personal struggle became the motivation for her to raise awareness for postpartum depression and work tirelessly to improve diagnostic and treatment options on the State and Federal level.

Thanks to her leadership, New Jersey became the first State to provide resources to ensure that uninsured mothers can receive postpartum depression screening and treatment. I am proud to say that Mary Jo and I worked together to pass the Melanie Blocker Stokes Mom's Opportunity To Access Health, Education, Research, and Support for Postpartum Depression Act, or MOTHERS Act, as part of the Affordable Care Act in 2010. This legislation encourages better education, support services, and research for postpartum depression, and we owe its passage

largely to advocates like Mary Jo Codey. Now, we still have a long way to go to ensure that postpartum depression and other aspects of maternal mental health are given the awareness and resources that they deserve. However, even as she closes the book on her teaching career, I know that Mary Jo's work is far from over, and she will not rest until we reach our goal. Whether it is her advocacy on behalf of postpartum depression or breast cancer, of which she is a survivor, her commitment to improving the lives of children, mothers, and families is unwavering.

With that, I look forward to continuing to work with Mary Jo in the coming years, thank her for her incredible service to New Jersey and all of us, and congratulate her on her retirement. •

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:42 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1215. An act to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system.

H.R. 1500. An act to redesignate the small triangular property located in Washington, DC, and designated by the National Park Service as reservation 302 as "Robert Emmet Park", and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1215. An act to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1500. An act to redesignate the small triangular property located in Washington, DC, and designated by the National Park Service as reservation 302 as "Robert Emmet Park", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1460. A bill to provide for the modernization of the energy and natural resources policies of the United States, and for other purposes.

PRIVILEGED NOMINATION REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

On request by Senator TESTER, under the authority of S. Res. 116, 112th Congress, the following nomination was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Brooks D. Tucker, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of Veterans' Affairs (Congressional and Legislative Affairs), vice Joan M. Evans.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTS, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with amendments:

H.R. 1029. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to improve pesticide registration and other activities under the Act, to extend and modify fee authorities, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTS for the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

*J. Christopher Giancarlo, of New Jersey, to be Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

By Mr. THUNE for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*David P. Pecoske, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security.

*Robert L. Sumwalt III, of South Carolina, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2021.

*Derek Kan, of California, to be Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Stephen Elliott Boyd, of Alabama, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. CORKER):

S. 1472. A bill to reauthorize the Tennessee Civil War Heritage Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1473. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a five-year extension to the homeless veterans reintegration programs and to provide clarification regarding eligibility for services under such programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 1474. A bill to prohibit the use of fiscal year 2018 funds for the closure, consolidation, or elimination of certain offices of the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1475. A bill to provide for the identification and documentation of best practices for cyber hygiene by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 1476. A bill to safeguard the United States and our allies from Russian ballistic and cruise missile threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 1477. A bill to prohibit the use of official time for labor organizing activities by employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs unless all veterans seeking hospital care or medical services from the Department are able to schedule their appointments within the wait-time goals of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 1478. A bill to improve the Defense Siting Clearinghouse; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 1479. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to improve the supplemental agricultural disaster assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 1480. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include biomass heating appliances for tax credits available for energy-efficient building property and energy property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1481. A bill to make technical corrections to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1482. A bill to provide a permanent easement to the Shishmaref Native Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1483. A bill to establish an account for amounts due to Shee Atika Incorporated under the Cube Cove Land Agreement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1484. A bill to provide for a land exchange relating to the Admiralty Island National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1485. A bill to satisfy certain claims under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1486. A bill to amend the Barrow Gas Field Transfer Act of 1984 with respect to the Ukpeagvik Inupiat Corporation sand and gravel resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1487. A bill to provide for certain conveyances of surface estate under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1488. A bill to require full spending of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, to provide for expanded uses of the Fund, and to prevent cargo diversion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TESTER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. REED, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1489. A bill to amend section 3312 of title 38, United States Code, to restore Post-9/11 Educational Assistance and other relief for veterans affected by school closures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1490. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act regarding the Nagamut selection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1491. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act with respect to the Native Villages of Haines, Ketchikan, Petersburg, Tenakee, and Wrangell, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1492. A bill to establish a Regional Corporation for Natives who are non-residents of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1493. A bill to require a study and report identifying the impacts on Chugach Alaska Corporation land that resulted from changes in Federal law or Federal or State land acquisitions in the Chugach region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1494. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act in order to increase the dividend exclusion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1495. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act regarding the treatment of fractional shares of stock by Regional Corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1496. A bill to amend the definition of Village Corporation in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1497. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to provide a lactation room in public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1498. A bill to establish in the Smithsonian Institution a comprehensive American women's history museum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. 1499. A bill to increase from \$10,000,000,000 to \$50,000,000,000 the threshold figure at which regulated depository institutions are subject to direct examination and reporting requirements of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 1500. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to ensure that the reciprocal deposits of an insured depository institution are not considered to be funds obtained by or through a deposit broker, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1501. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 to support maker education and makerspaces; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1502. A bill to improve passenger vessel security and safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 1503. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the 60th anniversary of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1504. A bill to direct the Attorney General to study issues relating to human trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1505. A bill to provide that silencers be treated the same as firearms accessories; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 1506. A bill to improve the handling of instances of sexual harassment, dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1507. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to allow the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide capitalization grants to States to establish revolving funds to provide funding assistance to reduce flood risks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HATCH, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 1508. A bill to amend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 to modify the authorized uses of certain county funds and to extend the deadline for participating counties to initiate projects and obligate funds; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1509. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to authorize an extension of exclusivity periods for certain drugs that are approved for a new indication for a rare disease or condition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1510. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to provide for online voter registration and other changes and to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to improve voting, to require the Election Assistance Commission to study and report on best practices for election cybersecurity and election audits, and to make grants to States to implement those best practices recommended by the Commission; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 1511. A bill to bring stability to the individual insurance market, make insurance coverage more affordable, lower prescription drug prices, and improve Medicaid; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANFORD (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1512. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Energy, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Transportation, and the Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality from considering, in taking any action, the social cost of carbon, the social cost of methane, the social cost of nitrous oxide, or the social cost of any other greenhouse gas, unless compliant with Office of Management and Budget guidance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CARPER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1513. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. CAPITO, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1514. A bill to amend certain Acts to reauthorize those Acts and to increase protections for wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1515. A bill to facilitate access to university technical expertise in support of Depart-

ment of Defense missions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 1516. A bill to expand health care choices by allowing Americans to buy health care coverage across State lines; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1517. A bill to enhance the Human Exploitation Rescue Operations Act of 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CORKER:

S. Res. 210. A resolution to correct the engrossment of S. 722; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. LANFORD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CASIDY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CASEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KAINE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. REED):

S. Res. 211. A resolution condemning the violence and persecution in Chechnya; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. REED, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. Res. 212. A resolution recognizing June 2017 as "LGBTQ Pride Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Res. 213. A resolution honoring the memory of Dallas Police Department Senior Corporal Lorne Ahrens, Sergeant Michael Smith, Officer Michael Krol, Officer Patrick Zamarripa, and Dallas Area Rapid Transit Police Officer Brent Thompson, who were killed during the attack in Dallas, Texas, that occurred 1 year ago, on July 7, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANFORD, Mr. LEE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY,

Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 214. A resolution designating June 19, 2017, as "Juneteenth Independence Day" in recognition of June 19, 1865, the date on which slavery legally came to an end in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. Res. 215. A resolution designating July 14, 2017, as Collector Car Appreciation Day and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Con. Res. 20. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the overtime rule published in the Federal Register by the Secretary of Labor on May 23, 2016, would provide millions of workers with greater economic security and was a legally valid exercise of the authority of the Secretary under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Con. Res. 21. A concurrent resolution urging the Government of the People's Republic of China to unconditionally release Liu Xiaobo, together with his wife Liu Xia, to allow them to freely meet with friends, family, and counsel and seek medical treatment wherever they desire; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 27

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 27, a bill to establish an independent commission to examine and report on the facts regarding the extent of Russian official and unofficial cyber operations and other attempts to interfere in the 2016 United States national election, and for other purposes.

S. 41

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 41, a bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate covered part D drug prices on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries.

S. 45

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 45, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase penalties for individuals who illegally reenter the United States after being removed and for other purposes.

S. 65

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 65,

a bill to address financial conflicts of interest of the President and Vice President.

S. 407

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 407, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 474

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 474, a bill to condition assistance to the West Bank and Gaza on steps by the Palestinian Authority to end violence and terrorism against Israeli citizens.

S. 497

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 736

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 736, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants.

S. 839

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 839, a bill to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with such rule.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1002, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1024

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1024, a bill to

amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1024, supra.

S. 1028

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1028, a bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a National Family Caregiving Strategy, and for other purposes.

S. 1034

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1034, a bill to improve agricultural job opportunities, benefits, and security for aliens in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1136

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1136, a bill to improve the structure of the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 1162

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1162, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes.

S. 1182

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1182, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

S. 1196

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1196, a bill to expand the capacity and capability of the ballistic missile defense system of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1277

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1277, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a high technology education pilot program, and for other purposes.

S. 1279

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1279, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to furnish health care from the Department of Veterans Affairs through the use of non-Department health care providers, and for other purposes.

S. 1312

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1312, a bill to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States.

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1312, *supra*.

S. 1349

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to provide that the rate of military basic pay for the Senior Enlisted Advisors to the commanders of the combatant commands shall be equivalent to the rate of military basic pay for the Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and for other purposes.

S. 1366

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1366, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to review the discharge characterization of former members of the Armed Forces who were discharged by reason of the sexual orientation of the member, and for other purposes.

S. 1368

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1368, a bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1393

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1393, a bill to streamline the process by which active duty military, reservists, and veterans receive commercial driver's licenses.

S. 1412

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1412, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for a percentage of student loan forgiveness for public service employment, and for other purposes.

S. 1418

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1418, a bill to establish protections for passengers in air transportation, and for other purposes.

S. 1426

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1426, a bill to amend the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act to expand the purposes of the corporation, to designate the United States Center for Safe Sport, and for other purposes.

S. 1435

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1435, a bill to provide an amnesty period during which veterans and their family members can register certain firearms in the National Firearm Registration and Transfer Record, and for other purposes.

S. 1465

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1465, a bill to terminate the prohibitions on the exportation and importation of natural gas, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 61

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 61, a resolution calling on the Department of Defense, other elements of the Federal Government, and foreign governments to intensify efforts to investigate, recover, and identify all missing and unaccounted-for personnel of the United States.

S. RES. 168

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 168, a resolution supporting respect for human rights and encouraging inclusive governance in Ethiopia.

At the request of Mr. CASEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 168, *supra*.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 1478. A bill to improve the Defense Siting Clearinghouse; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1478

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 "Defense Siting Clearinghouse Improvement Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. DEFENSE SITING CLEARINGHOUSE.

(a) CODIFICATION.—Chapter 7 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 183 the following new section:

"§ 183a. Defense Siting Clearinghouse for review of mission obstructions

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish a Defense Siting Clearinghouse (in this section referred to as the 'Clearinghouse').

"(2) The Clearinghouse shall be—

"(A) organized under the authority, direction, and control of an Assistant Secretary of Defense designated by the Secretary; and

"(B) assigned such personnel and resources as the Secretary considers appropriate to carry out this section.

"(b) FUNCTIONS.—(1) The Clearinghouse shall serve as a clearinghouse to coordinate Department of Defense review of applications for energy projects filed with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49 and received by the Department of Defense from the Secretary of Transportation.

"(2) The Clearinghouse shall accelerate the development of planning tools necessary to determine the acceptability to the Department of Defense of proposals included in an application for an energy project submitted pursuant to such section.

"(3) The Clearinghouse shall perform such other functions as the Secretary of Defense assigns.

"(c) REVIEW OF PROPOSED ACTIONS.—(1) Not later than 30 days after receiving from the Secretary of Transportation a proper application for an energy project under section 44718 of title 49 that may have an adverse impact on military operations and readiness, the Clearinghouse shall conduct a preliminary review of such application. The review shall—

"(A) assess the likely scope, duration, and level of risk of any adverse impact of such energy project on military operations and readiness; and

"(B) identify any feasible and affordable actions that could be taken by the Department, the developer of such energy project, or others to mitigate the adverse impact and to minimize risks to national security while allowing the energy project to proceed with development.

"(2) If the Clearinghouse determines under paragraph (1) that an energy project will have an adverse impact on military operations and readiness, the Secretary of Defense shall issue to the applicant a notice of presumed risk that describes the concerns identified by the Department in the preliminary review and requests a discussion of possible mitigation actions.

"(3) The Clearinghouse shall develop, in coordination with other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, an integrated review process to ensure timely notification and consideration of energy projects filed with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49 that may have an adverse impact on military operations and readiness.

"(4) The Clearinghouse shall establish procedures for the Department of Defense for the coordinated consideration of and response to a request for a review received from another Federal agency, a State government, an Indian tribal government, a local government, a landowner, or the developer of an energy project, including guidance to personnel at each military installation in the United States on how to initiate such procedures and ensure a coordinated Department response.

"(5) The Clearinghouse shall develop procedures for conducting early outreach to parties carrying out energy projects that could have an adverse impact on military operations and readiness and to clearly communicate to such parties actions being taken by the Department of Defense under this section.

"(d) COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall develop a comprehensive strategy for addressing the military impacts of projects filed with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49.

"(2) In developing the strategy required by paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

"(A) assess of the magnitude of interference posed by projects filed with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49;

"(B) for the purpose of informing preliminary reviews under subsection (c)(1) and

early outreach efforts under subsection (c)(5), identify geographic areas selected as proposed locations for projects filed, or which may be filed in the future, with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49 where such projects could have an adverse impact on military operations and readiness and categorize the risk of adverse impact in such areas; and

“(C) specifically identify feasible and affordable long-term actions that may be taken to mitigate adverse impacts of projects filed, or which may be filed in the future, with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49, on military operations and readiness, including—

“(i) investment priorities of the Department of Defense with respect to research and development;

“(ii) modifications to military operations to accommodate applications for such projects;

“(iii) recommended upgrades or modifications to existing systems or procedures by the Department of Defense;

“(iv) acquisition of new systems by the Department and other departments and agencies of the Federal Government and timelines for fielding such new systems; and

“(v) modifications to the projects for which such applications are filed, including changes in size, location, or technology.

“(e) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DETERMINATION OF UNACCEPTABLE RISK.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may not object to an energy project filed with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49, except in a case in which the Secretary of Defense determines, after giving full consideration to mitigation actions identified pursuant to this section, that such project would result in an unacceptable risk to the national security of the United States. Such a determination shall constitute a finding pursuant to section 44718(f) of title 49.

“(2) Not later than 30 days after making a determination of unacceptable risk under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on such determination and the basis for such determination. Such report shall include an explanation of the operational impact that led to the determination, a discussion of the mitigation options considered, and an explanation of why the mitigation options were not feasible or did not resolve the conflict. The Secretary of Defense may provide public notice through the Federal Register of the determination.

“(3) The Secretary of Defense may only delegate the responsibility for making a determination of unacceptable risk under paragraph (1) to the Deputy Secretary of Defense, an under secretary of defense, or a principal deputy under secretary of defense.

“(f) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT CONTRIBUTIONS OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to request and accept a voluntary contribution of funds from an applicant for a project filed with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49. Amounts so accepted shall remain available until expended for the purpose of offsetting the cost of measures undertaken by the Secretary of Defense to mitigate adverse impacts of such a project on military operations and readiness or to conduct studies of potential measures to mitigate such impacts.

“(g) EFFECT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE HAZARD ASSESSMENT.—An action taken pursuant to this section shall not be considered to be a substitute for any assessment or determination required of the Secretary of Transportation under section 44718 of title 49.

“(h) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect or limit the

application of, or any obligation to comply with, any environmental law, including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘adverse impact on military operations and readiness’ means any adverse impact upon military operations and readiness, including flight operations, research, development, testing, and evaluation, and training, that is demonstrable and is likely to impair or degrade the ability of the armed forces to perform their warfighting missions.

“(2) The term ‘energy project’ means a project that provides for the generation or transmission of electrical energy.

“(3) The term ‘landowner’ means a person that owns a fee interest in real property on which a proposed energy project is planned to be located.

“(4) The term ‘military installation’ has the meaning given that term in section 2801(c)(4) of this title.

“(5) The term ‘military readiness’ includes any training or operation that could be related to combat readiness, including testing and evaluation activities.

“(6) The term ‘military training route’ means a training route developed as part of the Military Training Route Program, carried out jointly by the Federal Aviation Administration and the Secretary of Defense, for use by the armed forces for the purpose of conducting low-altitude, high-speed military training.

“(7) The term ‘unacceptable risk to the national security of the United States’ means the construction, alteration, establishment, or expansion, or the proposed construction, alteration, establishment, or expansion, of a structure or sanitary landfill that would—

“(A) endanger safety in air commerce, related to the activities of the Department of Defense;

“(B) interfere with the efficient use and preservation of the navigable airspace and of airport traffic capacity at public-use airports, related to the activities of the Department of Defense; or

“(C) significantly impair or degrade the capability of the Department of Defense to conduct training, research, development, testing, and evaluation, and operations or to maintain military readiness.”.

(b) CONFORMING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) REPEAL OF EXISTING PROVISION.—Section 358 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (49 U.S.C. 44718 note) is repealed.

(2) REFERENCE TO REGULATIONS.—Section 44718(g) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “211.3 of title 32, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on January 6, 2014” both places it appears and inserting “183a(i) of title 10”.

(3) TABLE OF SECTIONS AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of title 10 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 183 the following new item:

“183a. Defense Siting Clearinghouse for review of mission obstructions.”.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF EXISTING RULES AND REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding the amendments made by subsection (a), any rule or regulation promulgated to carry out section 358 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (49 U.S.C. 44718 note) that is in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act shall continue in effect and apply to the extent such rule or regulation is consistent with the authority under section 183a of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), until such rule or regulation is otherwise amended or repealed.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1497. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to provide a lactation room in public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, as a father of four and a traveling family, I know how important and challenging it is for nursing mothers to find a space to care for and feed their children. As our society and economy becomes ever more transient, we need to provide spaces for mothers on the go and ease their return to the workforce. Last Congress, I helped ensure the Bottles and Breastfeeding Equipment Screening Act became law, which eased the burden traveling mothers experienced. We need to continue easing this burden and expand facilities in public buildings.

Federal agencies, under current law, are required to provide space for nursing mothers to pump breastmilk for their newborns. Additionally, General Services Administration requires installation of these spaces for all newly constructed federal buildings, as well as those undergoing modernizations. These rooms are a simple hygienic place, other than a bathroom, that are shielded from view, free from intrusion, contain a chair, a table surface, and an electrical outlet. This is good policy and should be extended to the public when visiting Federal facilities for business or other purposes.

That is why I am introducing the Fairness For Breastfeeding Mothers Act. This legislation would simply extend the use of these facilities in public buildings to visitors, ensuring all mothers can continue to care for their children.

I want to thank Senator MERKLEY for being the Democrat lead as well as Congresswoman NORTON’s lead in the House of Representatives. I ask my Senate colleagues to join us in support of this important legislation.

S. 1497

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 “Fairness For Breastfeeding Mothers Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. LACTATION ROOMS IN PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 33 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 3315, 3316, and 3317 as sections 3316, 3317, and 3318, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 3314 the following:

“§ 3315. Lactation rooms in public buildings

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY.—The term ‘appropriate authority’ means—

“(A) the head of a Federal agency;

“(B) the Architect of the Capitol; and
 “(C) another official authority responsible for the operation of a public building.

“(2) COVERED PUBLIC BUILDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘covered public building’ means a public building that—

“(i) is open to the public; and

“(ii) contains a public restroom.

“(B) INCLUSION.—The term ‘covered public building’ includes a building listed in section 5101 or 6301.

“(3) LACTATION ROOM.—The term ‘lactation room’ means a hygienic place, other than a bathroom, that—

“(A) is shielded from view;

“(B) is free from intrusion; and

“(C) contains—

“(i) a chair;

“(ii) a working surface; and

“(iii) if the public building is supplied with electricity, an electrical outlet.

“(b) LACTATION ROOMS REQUIRED.—Except as provided in subsection (c), the appropriate authority of a covered public building shall ensure that the building contains a lactation room that is made available for use by members of the public to express breast milk.

“(c) EXCEPTIONS.—A covered public building may be excluded from the requirement in subsection (b) at the discretion of the appropriate authority if—

“(1) the public building—

“(A) does not contain a lactation room for employees who work in the building; and

“(B) does not have a room that could be repurposed as a lactation room or a space that could be made private using portable materials, at a reasonable cost; or

“(2) new construction would be required to create a lactation room in the public building and the cost of the construction is not feasible.

“(d) NO UNAUTHORIZED ENTRY.—Nothing in this section authorizes an individual to enter a public building or portion of a public building that the individual is not otherwise authorized to enter.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 33 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking the items relating to sections 3315 through 3317 and inserting the following:

“3315. Lactation rooms in public buildings.

“3316. Delegation.

“3317. Report to Congress.

“3318. Certain authority not affected.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1498. A bill to establish in the Smithsonian Institution a comprehensive American women’s history museum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce, along with the senior Senator from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, the Smithsonian American Women’s History Museum Act. This bill would establish an American women’s history museum in our Nation’s capital.

American women have made invaluable contributions to our Country in diverse fields such as government, business, medicine, law, literature, sports,

entertainment, the arts, and the military. Telling the history of American women matters, and a museum recognizing these achievements and experiences is long overdue.

In 1999, a Presidential commission on commemorating women in American history concluded that an “appropriate celebration of women’s history in the next millennium should include the designation of a focal point for women’s history in our Nation’s capital.” In 2014, Congress took an important step toward realizing this goal when it passed legislation creating an independent, bipartisan Commission to study the potential for establishing such a museum in Washington, DC. Following 18 months of study, the bipartisan Commission unanimously concluded, “America needs and deserves a physical national museum dedicated to showcasing the historical experiences and impact of women in the country.” Mr. President, I could not agree more.

The bill we are introducing today is the next step toward creating this national museum. Incorporating the recommendations of the bipartisan Commission, the bill would establish a national museum to collect, study, and create programs incorporating and exhibiting a wide spectrum of American women’s experiences, contributions, and history. Although the Smithsonian Institution would be the governing body, the bill requires that the construction of the museum be financed entirely with private funds.

Mr. President, nearly 100 years ago, American women won the right to vote after a decades-long fight for suffrage. The story, leaders, and lessons of women’s suffrage are among the most powerful in our Nation’s history. As the centennial celebration of that historic moment nears, I can think of few better ways to honor those women and that momentous achievement than by passing this legislation. A museum dedicated to women’s history would help ensure that future generations understand what we owe to those American women who have helped build, sustain, and advance our society. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1507. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to allow the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide capitalization grants to States to establish revolving funds to provide funding assistance to reduce flood risks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am introducing the State Flood Mitigation Revolving Fund Act of 2017 along with Senators KENNEDY and MENENDEZ.

The purpose of this bill is to reduce flood risk and the costs associated with flooding by establishing a State revolving loan program to fund mitigation

projects for homeowners, businesses, and communities. This includes activities such as home elevations, flood proofing, acquisitions, and environmental restoration. By funding projects that reduce risk, the bill also provides an avenue to help middle-income and low-income property owners reduce their flood insurance premiums.

Mr. President, flooding is the most common and costly hazard facing American property owners. Every year, we are reminded of this when we see catastrophic flooding in communities across the country. Since 2010, my home State of Rhode Island has experienced two Presidentially-declared flooding disasters, which have cost the Federal government over \$86 million in payments from the National Flood Insurance Program. Nationally, disasters like these have caused FEMA to pay out an average of nearly \$3 billion a year in flood insurance claims over the last five years—not to mention the billions in disaster payments for uninsured damage.

Almost universally, experts remind us that the best way to reduce the cost of flooding is to engage in proactive, not reactive, flood mitigation. This is what the State Flood Mitigation Revolving Fund Act seeks to do.

Modeled on the successful Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds, this bill creates a straightforward and easily accessible program through which States can offer low-interest loans to homeowners, businesses, and communities who want to mitigate their flood risk. By creating a revolving fund, the bill will allow States to design and more efficiently implement their own flood mitigation strategies provided that they help achieve Federal objectives such as reducing disaster payments.

Within this construct, the bill gives States the flexibility to undertake flood mitigation projects without the red tape associated with other Federal disaster mitigation programs. The bill requires state to provide a match of 20 percent, but they would have an incentive to further leverage Federal dollars, as many already do under the drinking water and clean water SRFs.

Additionally, the bill ensures mitigation assistance is focused on where the flood risk is greatest and where people are most vulnerable. The bill requires States to prioritize mitigation assistance for low-income homeowners and geographic areas, pre-FIRM buildings, and severe repetitive loss and repetitive loss buildings. Finally, it gives States the option of providing additional subsidization for low-income property-owners and communities that simply do not have the wherewithal to assume additional debt.

Mr. President, as we talk about appropriate investments in infrastructure, mitigation is one place where we should be putting our money. FEMA reports that every \$1 we spend on mitigation generates \$4 in future savings. Not only will this legislation lead to a healthy return on investment, it will

also create jobs through the work it funds

I invite my colleagues to join me, Senator KENNEDY, and Senator MENENDEZ in supporting this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 210—TO CORRECT THE ENGROSSMENT OF S. 722

Mr. CORKER submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 210

Resolved, That in the engrossment of S. 722, an Act to provide congressional review and to counter Iranian and Russian governments' aggression, the Secretary of the Senate shall—

(1) in section 216(c)—

(A) strike paragraph (4) and insert the following:

“(4) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—If a committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval has been referred has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution.”;

(B) in paragraph (5)(A)—

(i) in clause (i), strike “section 216 A3 that is described as” and insert “subsection (a)(3)(A) that relates to”; and

(ii) in clause (ii), strike “section 216 A3 that is described as” and insert “subsection (a)(3)(B) that relates to”; and

(C) in paragraph (7)(A), strike “but applicable” and all that follows through “disapproval.”; and

(2) in section 236, strike subsection (b) and insert the following:

“(b) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—No provision affecting sanctions or licensing actions under this title or an amendment made by this title shall apply to any portion of a sanction or licensing action that affects the importation of goods.”.

SENATE RESOLUTION 211—CONDEMNING THE VIOLENCE AND PERSECUTION IN CHECHNYA

Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CASEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KAINE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. REED) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 211

Whereas, on April 1, 2017, the Russian newspaper Novaya Gazeta reported that authorities in Chechnya, a republic of the Russian Federation, had abducted, detained, and tortured over 100 men due to their actual or suspected sexual orientation;

Whereas multiple independent and first-hand accounts have subsequently corroborated the Novaya Gazeta report, and describe a campaign of persecution by Chechen officials against men due to their actual or suspected sexual orientation;

Whereas, as a result of this persecution, at least three deaths have been reported and many individuals have been forced to flee Chechnya;

Whereas Chechen officials have denied the existence of such persecution, including through a statement by the spokesman for Chechen leader Ramzan Kadyrov that “You cannot arrest or repress people who don't exist in the republic.”;

Whereas the same spokesman for Ramzan Kadyrov has also stated that “If such people existed in Chechnya, law enforcement would not have to worry about them, as their own relatives would have sent them to where they could never return,” and credible reports indicate that Chechen authorities have encouraged families to carry out so-called “honor killings” of relatives due to their actual or suspected sexual orientation;

Whereas Chechnya is a constituent republic of the Russian Federation and subject to its laws, and Ramzan Kadyrov was installed as the leader of Chechnya by Russian President Vladimir Putin;

Whereas Chechen authorities have a long history of violating the fundamental human rights of their citizens, including through extrajudicial executions, forced disappearances, and torture of government critics;

Whereas Kremlin spokesman Dmitry Peskov dismissed reports of persecution in Chechnya and termed them “phantom complaints”;

Whereas Russia's Human Rights Ombudsman, Tatyana Moskalkova, has also claimed that such reports should not be believed because formal complaints have not been registered with the appropriate authorities;

Whereas the Russian Federation is a participating State of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and a signatory to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and thus has agreed to guarantee the fundamental human rights of all of its citizens;

Whereas, on April 7, 2017, the United States Department of State issued a statement saying “We categorically condemn the persecution of individuals based on their sexual orientation” and urging the Government of the Russian Federation to take steps to ensure the release of all those wrongfully detained in Chechnya, and to conduct a credible investigation of the reports; and

Whereas, on April 17, 2017, United States Ambassador to the United Nations Nikki Haley issued a statement saying “Chechen authorities must immediately investigate these allegations, hold anyone involved accountable, and take steps to prevent future abuses. We are against all forms of discrimination, including against people based on sexual orientation. When left unchecked, discrimination and human rights abuses can lead to destabilization and conflict.”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the violence and persecution in Chechnya and calls on Chechen officials to immediately cease the abduction, detention, and torture of individuals on the basis of their actual or suspected sexual orientation, and hold accountable all those involved in perpetrating such abuses;

(2) calls on the Government of the Russian Federation to protect the human rights of all its citizens, condemn the violence and persecution, investigate these crimes in Chechnya, and hold accountable all those involved in perpetrating such abuses;

(3) calls on the United States Government to continue to condemn the violence and persecution in Chechnya, demand the release of individuals wrongfully detained, and identify those individuals whose involvement in this violence qualifies for the imposition of sanctions under the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-208; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note) or the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (Public Law 114-328); and

(4) affirms that the rights to freedom of assembly, association, and expression and freedom from extrajudicial detention and violence are universal human rights that apply to all persons, and that countries that fail to respect these rights jeopardize the security and prosperity of all their citizens.

SENATE RESOLUTION 212—RECOGNIZING JUNE 2017 AS “LGBTQ PRIDE MONTH”

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. REED, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 212

Whereas individuals who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (referred to in this preamble as “LGBTQ”) include individuals from all States and the District of Columbia and all faiths, races, national origins, socioeconomic statuses, education levels, and political beliefs;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States have made, and continue to make, vital contributions to the United States and to the world in every aspect, including in the fields of education, law, health, business, science, research, economic development, architecture, fashion, sports, government, music, film, technology, literature, civil rights, and politics;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States serve as law enforcement officers, firefighters, and first responders in all States and the District of Columbia;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States serve, and have served, the United States Army, Coast Guard, Navy, Air Force, and Marines, honorably and with distinction and bravery;

Whereas an estimated number of more than 100,000 brave men and women were discharged from the Armed Forces of the United States between the beginning of World War II and 2011 because of their sexual orientation, including the discharge of more than 13,000 men and women under the “Don't Ask, Don't Tell” policy in place between 1994 and 2011;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States serve, and have served, in positions in the Federal Government and State and local governments, including as members of Congress, Governors, mayors, and city council members;

Whereas, throughout much of the history of the United States, same-sex relationships were criminalized in many States and many LGBTQ people in the United States were

forced to hide their LGBTQ identities while living in secrecy and fear;

Whereas, on June 26, 2015, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 135 S. Ct. 2584, that same-sex couples have a constitutional right to marry and acknowledged that “many same-sex couples provide loving and nurturing homes to their children,” and that laws prohibiting same-sex marriage “harm and humiliate the children of same-sex couples”;

Whereas Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (referred to in this preamble as “AIDS”) has disproportionately impacted LGBTQ people in the United States partly caused by a lack of funding and research devoted to finding effective treatment for AIDS and the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (referred to in this preamble as “HIV”) during the early stages of the HIV and AIDS epidemic;

Whereas gay and bisexual men and transgender women of color have a higher risk of contracting HIV;

Whereas the LGBTQ community has maintained its unwavering commitment to ending the HIV and AIDS epidemic;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States face disparities in employment, healthcare, education, and many other areas central to the pursuit of happiness in the United States;

Whereas 31 States have no explicit ban on discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in the workplace, housing, or public accommodations, and 36 States have no explicit ban on discrimination against LGBTQ individuals in education;

Whereas LGBTQ youth are at increased risk of suicide, homelessness, and becoming victims of bullying and violence;

Whereas the LGBTQ community has faced discrimination, inequality, and violence throughout the history of the United States;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States, in particular transgender individuals, face a disproportionately high risk of becoming victims of violent hate crimes;

Whereas members of the LGBTQ community have been targeted in acts of mass violence, including—

(1) the Pulse nightclub shooting in Orlando, Florida on June 12, 2016, where 49 people were killed; and

(2) the arson attack at the UpStairs Lounge in New Orleans, Louisiana on June 24, 1973, where 32 people died;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States face persecution and violence in many parts of the world, including State-sponsored violence;

Whereas, in 2017 alone, hundreds of LGBTQ people around the world have been arrested in countries and territories such as Chechnya, Indonesia, and Bangladesh;

Whereas the LGBTQ community has gathered in some of the most dangerous places in the world to hold Pride festivals and marches, despite threats of violence or arrest;

Whereas, in 2009, President Barack Obama signed “Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act” (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2835) into law to protect all people in the United States from crimes motivated by the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of an individual;

Whereas the demonstrators that protested on June 28, 1969 following a law enforcement raid of the Stonewall Inn, an LGBTQ club in New York City, are pioneers of the LGBTQ movement for equality;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States have fought for equal treatment, dignity, and respect;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States have achieved significant milestones, ensuring that future generations of LGBTQ people in the United States will enjoy a more equal and just society;

Whereas, despite being marginalized throughout the history of the United States, LGBTQ people in the United States continue to celebrate their identities, love, and contributions to the United States in various expressions of Pride; and

Whereas the inclusion of LGBTQ people in the United States continues to expand every day and LGBTQ people in the United States remain determined to pursue equality, respect, and inclusion for all individuals regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the rights, freedoms, and equal treatment of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (referred to in this resolving clause as “LGBTQ”) people in the United States and around the world;

(2) acknowledges that LGBTQ rights are human rights that are to be protected by the United States Constitution and numerous international treaties and conventions;

(3) commits to ensuring the equal treatment of all people in the United States, regardless of sexual orientation and gender identity;

(4) commits to ensuring that the United States remains a beacon of hope for the equal treatment of people around the world, including LGBTQ individuals; and

(5) encourages the celebration of June as “LGBTQ Pride Month” in order to provide a lasting opportunity for all people in the United States to learn about the discrimination and inequality that the LGBTQ community endured, and continues to endure, and to celebrate the contributions of the LGBTQ community throughout the history of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 213—HONORING THE MEMORY OF DALLAS POLICE DEPARTMENT SENIOR CORPORAL LORNE AHRENS, SERGEANT MICHAEL SMITH, OFFICER MICHAEL KROL, OFFICER PATRICK ZAMARRIPA, AND DALLAS AREA RAPID TRANSIT POLICE OFFICER BRENT THOMPSON, WHO WERE KILLED DURING THE ATTACK IN DALLAS, TEXAS, THAT OCCURRED 1 YEAR AGO, ON JULY 7, 2016

Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 213

Whereas the horrific act of violence and hatred that occurred in Dallas, Texas, on July 7, 2016, was the deadliest attack on United States law enforcement officers since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas the attack occurred during a lawful, peaceful, nonviolent demonstration and took place with the intention of targeting police officers;

Whereas law enforcement personnel and first responders performed their duties and responsibilities admirably during the attack and risked being killed for the safety of the people of Dallas;

Whereas President Barack Obama, President George W. Bush, and other officials joined together for a memorial service following the attack;

Whereas the Dallas Police Chief helped a wounded community heal in the aftermath

of the attack and called on members of the community to join law enforcement and become part of the solution;

Whereas the Dallas Area Rapid Transit (referred to in this preamble as “DART”) Police Chief demonstrated strong leadership and compassion in responding to the first fallen officer from DART in the line of duty;

Whereas Friday, July 7, 2017, marks 1 year since the attack;

Whereas the community of Dallas and communities across Texas and the United States continue to support the victims of this attack and the families, friends, and loved ones of those victims; and

Whereas the community of Dallas and communities across Texas and the United States continue to support the brave men and women of local law enforcement for the dedicated service that local law enforcement provides to the community; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the victims killed in the heinous attack in Dallas, Texas, on July 7, 2016, and offers heartfelt condolences and deepest sympathies to the families, loved ones, and friends of the victims;

(2) honors the survivors of the attack and pledges continued support for the recovery of the survivors;

(3) expresses the belief of the Senate that an attack on a law enforcement officer is an affront to the rule of law, the promise of justice, domestic tranquility, common defense, general welfare, and the blessings of liberty secured by the Constitution of the United States;

(4) applauds the bravery and dedication exhibited by the hundreds of Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials, emergency medical responders, and others who offered support and assistance during and after the attack; and

(5) stands together united against violence and hatred, and in support of the brave and honorable police officers across the United States who work every day to keep the United States safe.

SENATE RESOLUTION 214—DESIGNATING JUNE 19, 2017, AS “JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY” IN RECOGNITION OF JUNE 19, 1865, THE DATE ON WHICH SLAVERY LEGALLY CAME TO AN END IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 214

Whereas news of the end of slavery did not reach the frontier areas of the United States, in particular the State of Texas and the other Southwestern States, until months after the conclusion of the Civil War, more

than 2½ years after President Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863;

Whereas, on June 19, 1865, Union soldiers, led by Major General Gordon Granger, arrived in Galveston, Texas, with news that the Civil War had ended and that the enslaved were free;

Whereas African-Americans who had been slaves in the Southwest celebrated June 19, commonly known as “Juneteenth Independence Day”, as inspiration and encouragement for future generations;

Whereas African-Americans from the Southwest have continued the tradition of observing Juneteenth Independence Day for over 150 years;

Whereas 45 States and the District of Columbia have designated Juneteenth Independence Day as a special day of observance in recognition of the emancipation of all slaves in the United States;

Whereas Juneteenth Independence Day celebrations have been held to honor African-American freedom while encouraging self-development and respect for all cultures;

Whereas the faith and strength of character demonstrated by former slaves and the descendants of former slaves remain an example for all people of the United States, regardless of background, religion, or race;

Whereas slavery was not officially abolished until the ratification of the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States in December 1865; and

Whereas, over the course of its history, the United States has grown into a symbol of democracy and freedom around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 19, 2017, as “Juneteenth Independence Day”;

(2) recognizes the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day to the United States;

(3) supports the continued nationwide celebration of Juneteenth Independence Day to provide an opportunity for the people of the United States to learn more about the past and to better understand the experiences that have shaped the United States; and

(4) recognizes that the observance of the end of slavery is part of the history and heritage of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 215—DESIGNATING JULY 14, 2017, AS COLLECTOR CAR APPRECIATION DAY AND RECOGNIZING THAT THE COLLECTION AND RESTORATION OF HISTORIC AND CLASSIC CARS IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF PRESERVING THE TECHNOLOGICAL ACHIEVEMENTS AND CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 215

Whereas many people in the United States maintain classic automobiles as a pastime and do so with great passion and as a means of individual expression;

Whereas the Senate recognizes the effect that the more than 100-year history of the automobile has had on the economic progress of the United States and supports wholeheartedly all activities involved in the restoration and exhibition of classic automobiles;

Whereas the collection, restoration, and preservation of automobiles is an activity

shared across generations and across all segments of society;

Whereas thousands of local car clubs and related businesses have been instrumental in preserving a historic part of the heritage of the United States by encouraging the restoration and exhibition of such vintage works of art;

Whereas automotive restoration provides well-paying, high-skilled jobs for people in all 50 States; and

Whereas automobiles have provided the inspiration for music, photography, cinema, fashion, and other artistic pursuits that have become part of the popular culture of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 14, 2017, as “Collector Car Appreciation Day”;

(2) recognizes that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to engage in events and commemorations of Collector Car Appreciation Day that create opportunities for collector car owners to educate young people about the importance of preserving the cultural heritage of the United States, including through the collection and restoration of collector cars.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 20—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE OVERTIME RULE PUBLISHED IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER BY THE SECRETARY OF LABOR ON MAY 23, 2016, WOULD PROVIDE MILLIONS OF WORKERS WITH GREATER ECONOMIC SECURITY AND WAS A LEGALLY VALID EXERCISE OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. CON. RES. 20

Whereas the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) established overtime compensation requirements for certain employees when they work more than 40 hours in a given workweek;

Whereas under section 13(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 213(a)(1)), Congress delegated to the Secretary of Labor the authority to define and delimit the terms relating to the exemption for bona fide executive, administrative, and professional employees (commonly known as the “white collar exemption”);

Whereas for more than 75 years, the Secretary of Labor has exercised its delegated authority to issue regulations that define and delimit the terms relating to the white collar exemption by applying a duties test and applying a minimum compensation level or salary threshold;

Whereas the Secretary of Labor began utilizing a salary threshold in the initial regulations defining and delimiting the terms re-

lating to the white collar exemption, which were first issued in 1938;

Whereas Congress has long approved the use of a salary threshold by the Secretary of Labor, as demonstrated by the fact that Congress has amended the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 at least 10 times since 1938 and has not precluded the Secretary from using a salary threshold;

Whereas the salary threshold became woefully out of date and ineffective as a result of not being sufficiently updated to keep pace with a changing economy, as evidenced by the fact that more than half of all full-time salaried workers were covered by the salary threshold in 1975 and only 8 percent of these workers were covered by the salary threshold in 2015;

Whereas the salary threshold of \$455 per week, or \$23,660 per year, that was in effect on May 22, 2016, was below the poverty line for a family of 4;

Whereas the Secretary of Labor updated the salary threshold on May 23, 2016, through a final rule entitled “Defining and Delimiting the Exemptions for Executive, Administrative, Professional, Outside Sales and Computer Employees” (81 Fed. Reg. 32391) by increasing the salary threshold to the 40th percentile of earnings of full-time salaried employees in the lowest-wage Census Region, resulting in a salary threshold of \$913 per week or \$47,476 per year;

Whereas the final rule would benefit more than 13,000,000 employees by providing overtime compensation protections to 4,200,000 new employees and strengthening overtime compensation protections for 8,900,000 additional employees;

Whereas the Secretary of Labor went through a thorough process in crafting the final rule, seeking public input and conducting extensive economic analysis, including—

(1) spending more than a year meeting with more than 200 interested parties to obtain input before issuing the proposed rule in 2015;

(2) considering more than 270,000 comments received during the 60-day public comment period on the proposed rule; and

(3) making significant changes in response to public input before issuing the final rule;

Whereas the public comments submitted to the Secretary of Labor regarding the proposed rule were overwhelmingly positive and supportive of the rule;

Whereas the increase in the salary threshold, included in the final rule, to the 40th percentile of earnings of full-time salaried employees in the lowest-wage Census Region, resulting in a threshold of \$913 per week or \$47,476 per year, was a strong yet measured increase by almost any measure, including as compared to—

(1) the higher salary threshold of \$970 per week or \$50,440 per year, initially put forward by the Secretary of Labor in the proposed rule;

(2) the salary threshold of \$984 per week or \$51,168 per year, which would be necessary to fully account for the erosion to the value of the salary threshold since 1975 due to inflation;

(3) the salary threshold of \$1,122 per week or \$58,344 per year, which would be necessary to cover the same share of all salaried workers as were covered in 1975 after accounting for changes in the economy; and

(4) the salary threshold of \$1,327 per week or \$69,004 per year, which would be necessary to cover the same percentage of all salaried workers as were covered in 1975;

Whereas the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas erroneously called the authority of the Secretary of Labor under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 into question when it issued a preliminary injunction enjoining the Department of

June 29, 2017

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S3867

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

BRENDAN CARR, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2018, VICE THOMAS EDGAR WHEELER.

BRENDAN CARR, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS FROM JULY 1, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE ON THE COUNCIL OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING HIS HOLINESS
GURUDEV RAKESHBHAI
JHAVERI, SPIRITUAL LEADER OF
THE SHRIMAD RAJCHANDRA
MISSION IN DHARAMPUR

HON. RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, today I honor His Holiness Gurudev Rakeshbhai Jhaveri, spiritual leader of the Shrimad Rajchandra Mission in Dharampur and living embodiment of Jainism — a dynamic religion which exemplifies the highest and noblest values, moral upliftment and spiritual elevation — as he makes a historically important visit to Jain devotees across North America.

The Jain Society of Metropolitan Chicago was founded in 1970 to provide a temple for religious services and a community center for the social, cultural and educational needs of the Jain community in northern Illinois. The Jain Society engages in various activities and endeavors centered around spirituality, character-building, and human welfare.

Born in 1966, His Holiness Gurudev Rakeshbhai Jhaveri realized his calling early in life and since a very early age has dedicated himself to service and to the spiritual practice of Jainism. Over time, his outstanding virtues of austerity, self-control, devotion, humility and service have earned him the affectionate title Pujya. Following in the footsteps of his guru Shrimad Rajchandra, Pujya has pledged to propagate peace and perform acts of service, especially in this time of such unrest in the world.

Every time I visit the Jain Society and witness the beautiful work of its volunteers, I learn more and reaffirm my admiration of Jainism and its values. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support my many friends who follow the path of Jainism throughout the country, especially under the guidance of such an influential leader.

I honor His Holiness Gurudev Rakeshbhai Jhaveri, spiritual leader of the Shrimad Rajchandra Mission in Dharampur, on the occasion of his visit to the Jain Society of Metropolitan Chicago in July of 2017.

LEE RASCH

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues the work of Lee Rasch, who is retiring at the end of this month as president of Western Technical College in Wisconsin. There is an old saying, "Think Globally, Act Locally." No saying better reflects the work of Lee.

For twenty-eight years, Lee has led Western, working in a collective manner with governmental and business leaders in the eleven (11) county, three campus region to expand workforce development opportunities and enhance job skills training to students who were comprised of recent high school graduates to those who were recently unemployed. With a mannerism of respect and understanding, Lee led the college with a style that emphasized listening, learning and collaboration. Under his leadership, Western continued to grow and evolve, working with employers to identify programs and courses that grow the economies of our region and state, while also ensuring that the students have the skills they need to meet the ever-changing demands of the workplace.

Lee's leadership at Western emphasized community engagement. As such, he contributed a significant amount of his time and effort to improve the economic vitality of downtown La Crosse and the greater Coulee Region. La Crosse and western Wisconsin were not the only communities where Lee made an impact. As the La Crosse Tribune wrote in an article in December 2016 when they named him the 2016 Tribune Person of the Year: "He has been instrumental in building the sister city relationship between La Crosse and Kumbo, Cameroon, after a chance encounter with a member of the Tertiary Sisters of St. Francis at Western." His efforts have led to greater educational training and the improvement of nearly a dozen rural schools near Kumbo. Lee's love of education has improved the lives of people at the local and global level.

I congratulate Lee Rasch for his work. I wish him and his wife, Susan Fox, much joy and happiness in a well-deserved retirement. The people, businesses and communities in western Wisconsin, Kumbo, Cameroon, and countless others are better off as a result of your work.

IN MEMORY OF NICKY HAYDEN

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of my constituent, Nicky Hayden, an international motorcycle racer who tragically passed away following a bicycle accident in Italy last month at the age of thirty-five. Nicky, known around the world as the "Kentucky Kid," was a beloved member of the Owensboro community.

Nicky was riding by age three, and he followed in his older brother's footsteps to begin a career in racing when he was just sixteen years old and attending Owensboro Catholic High School. He won his first AMA Grand National Championship in 1999. In 2002, he shared a podium with both of his brothers, Tommy and Roger Lee at the Springfield IT race. Eventually he joined the Honda Repsol

MotoGP team in 2003 and won the MotoGP world title in 2006. He continued to race in international competitions in the years that followed, and was competing in the Motul Italian Round in May before he passed away.

In his personal life, Nicky was a son, a brother, and a fiancé. And he always considered Owensboro home, traveling back and forth from there to his international races.

Nicky's favorite bible verse was Proverbs 14:23: "All hard work brings a profit, but mere talk only leads to poverty." While the community continues mourning our loss, we can all be grateful that we were lucky enough to have shared this earth with Nicky. I am grateful for his passion for life and his dedication to his family and hometown community of Owensboro. We will miss him.

HONORING MINEOLA WISENER
FIELD AIRPORT

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to recognize 100 years of aviation at Mineola Wisener Field Airport located in Wood County, Texas. On July 4, 1917, a United States Army Signal Corps Curtis JN-4 "Jenny" aircraft, piloted by Lt. Ralph W. Stone, landed just outside Mineola, Texas. The site was established as "Massingale Meadow" and was used as an emergency landing site for Love Field Airport. The site was published in books in 1920 and 1921 and many early aviators and pioneers frequented the site.

Robert "Henry" Wisener, Jr. was 12 years old when he observed the first landing from his family farm in 1917. When he was 17, Henry was taught to fly by Roy Wilson, a Hollywood stunt pilot who spent time at the field. Henry's love and passion for aircraft grew from there. On June 1, 1926, Henry leased "Massingale Meadow" and named the airport the Royal Field. Here he built the first airplane hangar and offered flight training, aircraft repairs and fuel. He later based the Royal Flying Circus here and together with his brother Bryce, performed aerial acrobatics throughout Texas and the Southwest and Midwest regions of the U.S.

In 1941, Henry purchased "Massingale Meadow" along with a 50 acre tract to lengthen the runway. In 1946, an aircraft maintenance shop, classroom, and flight office were built to provide training under the GI Bill. During that year a decommissioned Department of Commerce Airways Beacon Tower and Beacon were disassembled and moved to "Massingale Meadow".

From 1963 to 1983, the city of Mineola leased the airport and it operated as the Mineola Municipal Airport. The airport was renamed Mineola Wisener Field Airport at the expiration of the lease.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Wisener Field and its early founders and operators have been recognized throughout the years on many occasions, including by the Texas Historical Commission. The Texas Aeronautics Commission and the Federal Aviation Administration recognized Mineola Wisener Field Airport as the "second oldest, continuously-used, uncontrolled airport in the state." As Wood County's first airport, Wisener Field has made a long-lasting impact on the economy, as well as aviation enthusiasts.

As the Representative of the 5th Congressional District of Texas, it is an honor to recognize Wisener Field on the 100th Anniversary of its first landing.

HOW TRUMPCARE WILL EXACERBATE THE TRANSPORTATION BARRIER

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, America is a global leader in health care innovation and discovery. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, we've made great progress in making sure more Americans have access to health insurance in recent years. We must recognize that much work remains to ensure all Americans have practical access to health services. Financial and structural barriers continue to exist for countless Americans, particularly those in rural and under resourced communities where distance to a hospital is long and the concentration of health professionals is sparse.

Health care access presents a problem for people in rural areas where distance is a taxing obstacle. People in suburban and urban settings, while they may live closer to a doctor or hospital, can still have trouble with transportation. Often, households share one vehicle between many family members if they own one at all. Low-income neighborhoods are often subject to unreliable public transportation. Birmingham is the only city in my district with a public transportation system but it faces many challenges that the city is trying to rectify. For the disabled, obese, or chronically ill, the lack of reliable transportation options lead to missed appointments and overall lower health outcomes.

Patients miss doctor's appointments simply because they do not have transportation to get there. Without transportation access, patients may wait for a medical emergency just to be able to see a doctor. In rural parts of Alabama, the problem is worse among minorities. Throughout the nation, 55 percent of African American and 60 percent of Hispanic survey respondents reported that transportation was a major barrier to medical treatment, compared to 38 percent of white respondents.

Eligibility requirements vary, but each state has a "non-emergency medical transport" benefit for people with Medicaid. It covers a certain number of rides for medical care per month. Some states contract with local companies to provide rides for citizens who otherwise would have no way to receive regular medical attention. These are just some of the benefits millions of beneficiaries will have no access to if Trumpcare becomes law.

The Affordable Care Act's expansion of Medicaid and reforms to the individual insur-

ance market has helped to lower the uninsured rate for African Americans. Between 2013 and 2016, the uninsured rate for African Americans declined from 18.9 percent to 11.7 percent. However, African Americans still have higher uninsured rates than whites (7.5 percent) and Asian Americans (6.3 percent). Repealing the ACA and cutting Medicaid programs reverses the progress America has made to make healthcare more accessible and affordable in recent years.

One's access to quality health care should not depend on where they live, what their race is, or how much money they have. This country should uphold the values it claims to have and ensure that healthcare is not a preferential benefit, but a human right for every citizen.

IN HONOR OF MR. BILL DEBERRY, SR.

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Mr. Bill DeBerry, Sr., one of the finest businessmen in Denton, Texas. As the founder and owner of a funeral home in Denton, Bill devoted much of his life to assisting others during some of the most difficult times of their own lives.

Bill left school at an early age to help support his family when he began driving an ambulance for a funeral home. The owner of the funeral home at the time noticed Bill's work ethic and encouraged him to finish his education. With both high school and University of North Texas degrees in hand, Bill worked his way through the Dallas Institute of Mortuary Services.

After graduating with his specialized degree, Bill began his mortuary career at Schmitz-Floyd-Hamlett Funeral Home in Denton. After gaining valuable experience in the industry, he opened Bill DeBerry Funeral Directors in 1990. This local business continues to serve the Denton community today under the leadership and dedication of his sons.

I would like to offer my sincere condolences to Mr. DeBerry's family, friends, and colleagues. He will be remembered for his compassion and commitment to excellence throughout his 60 year career, as well as his service to our Denton community.

IN RECOGNITION OF EDUARDO AND MARIA VALADAO

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my parents, Eduardo and Maria Valadao, on being nominated the 2017 Kings County Dairy Couple of the Year.

This year, Mr. and Mrs. Valadao are being honored as the 2017 Kings County Dairy Couple of the Year at the Kings County June Dairy Month Committee Dinner in Hanford, California. This award is given to members who are actively involved in industry activities.

As parents, grandparents, and lifetime dairy farmers, Eduardo and Maria Valadao exemplify the values, leadership, and commitment this award stands for by improving the image of the dairy industry.

Eduardo F. Valadao was born on October 14, 1943, in Fontinhas, a civil parish on the Terceira Island in the Portuguese Azores. Almost thirteen miles southwest, Maria F. Goncalves was born in Ribeirinha, on February 17, 1953. The couple's relationship bloomed after first meeting at a bull fight in front of Maria's childhood home. Mr. Valadao migrated to Los Angeles County in January of 1969. He immediately took a job milking cows, in hopes of creating a successful life for his future wife and children. After establishing a life in the States, Eduardo traveled back to the Azores and proposed to Maria. Following her fiancé, Maria immigrated to the United States in 1972. The couple married on April 28, 1973, in Artesia, California.

The youngest of eight, Eduardo Valadao was raised on a dairy, and worked close with his father and brothers. He wanted to continue the lifestyle he was raised in, to guarantee his days would be spent with his family, teaching his sons about hard work. After their first son, Eduardo "Eddie" Goncalves Valadao, was born on March 18, 1974, the family partnered with another Portuguese family and purchased their first cows on a dairy in Riverdale. Mr. Valadao worked to grow this dairy until it was large enough to support both families involved. After Mrs. Valadao gave birth to their second son, Miguel "Mike" Goncalves Valadao on August 13, 1975, Mr. Valadao moved his family from Los Angeles County to Riverdale in September of 1975.

As a result of the Valadao household increasing, Mr. Valadao moved on from the partnership and rented a larger dairy facility in Tulare, California, in 1977. The family then welcomed their third son, David Goncalves Valadao, on April 14, 1977. Eduardo continued to farm in Tulare until he was ready to invest in his own dairy. Following the birth of their only daughter, Melinda Goncalves Valadao, on June 16, 1985, Mr. Valadao purchased the family's first dairy facility located in Hanford, California. Eduardo and Maria continued to farm and raise their children on this dairy for twelve years. In 1997, they decided to expand their operation and purchased the land of the current dairy. It wasn't until February of 2000 when the current dairy was in full production.

Today, Eduardo and Maria Valadao remain actively involved in their dairy. Eduardo, continuing the tradition of hard work, can be found at the dairy on a daily basis. This humble dairy couple has successfully raised their sons with the same work ethic, knowledge, and passion for the industry as they each manage their own dairies. The first dairy is still in the family, owned and operated by Eddie Valadao. Due to their lifetime commitment to dairying, and priority to instill those values in their family, Mr. and Mrs. Valadao have become staples in the dairy community.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing my parents for their strong presence in the dairy industry, and congratulating them on being Kings County Dairy Couple of the Year.

CONGRATULATING THE MARYLAND TERRAPINS ON THEIR WOMEN'S AND MEN'S NATIONAL LACROSSE CHAMPIONSHIPS

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to congratulate the University of Maryland on its double victory last month in the NCAA Division I lacrosse national championships. Both the women's Terrapin and men's Terrapin teams brought the highest prize home to College Park in Maryland's Fifth District, representing the first time that both Maryland lacrosse teams won championships in the same year.

Lacrosse has deep roots in Maryland, an older version having been played across eastern and central North America for centuries by Native American nations. That game inspired European settlers and their descendants in the United States and Canada to implement the modern game of lacrosse, which has become one of our country's most popular sports. Played in youth leagues, high schools, and colleges across America, lacrosse teaches teamwork, sportsmanship, athleticism, strategy, and leadership.

The University of Maryland's lacrosse program has been competitive nationally even long before the NCAA's national championships first began for men in 1971 and for women in 1982. Since the 1930's, the Terrapin men's team won the Wingate Memorial Trophy several times as the victors of the U.S. Intercollegiate Lacrosse Association national championship. For the modern tournament, the Terrapin men won championships in 1973 and 1975 before beginning a forty-two year drought that ended last month with their 9–6 victory over Ohio State in the 2017 championship game, led by Head Coach John Tillman. Coach Tillman took over the Maryland lacrosse program seven years ago and has brought the team to six NCAA Final Four tournaments and five national championships. This year's men's roster included eight All-Americans, who helped make 2017 a year to remember.

For the Terrapin women, winning championships became a tradition, with thirteen national titles since 1982, including a streak of seven consecutive victories from 1995 to 2001. This year, they beat Boston College 16–13 in a closely contested game held in Massachusetts to secure their fourteenth national championship. Head Coach Cathy Reese, herself an alumna of the University of Maryland, has been leading the Terrapin women since 2007. As a former Terrapin lacrosse star, Coach Reese was a two-time All-American and was named the NCAA tournament's 'Most Valuable Player' in 1998. This year, her Terrapins finished the season with an undefeated, 23–0 record, capped by this latest national title. This is their third championship victory in the last four years. Five of the team's athletes were named All-Americans for 2017.

Both teams were led by standout stars, and for the first time in NCAA lacrosse history both recipients of the prestigious Tewaaraton Award, which honors the top men's and women's players each year, were won by Maryland athletes. For the women's team, midfielder

and captain Zoe Stukenberg brought home the award, while for the men attackman Matt Rambo received the honor. Both of them have also been nominated for Espy awards, with the winners to be announced on July 12.

I'm proud that the University of Maryland is a national powerhouse for both athletics and academics, leading the country both on the playing field and in classrooms and laboratories. I join in congratulating our victorious Terrapins and wishing them much success as they prepare for next season and to defend their historic double-victory.

RECOGNIZING ALZHEIMER'S AWARENESS MONTH

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, June marks Alzheimer's Awareness Month, a time when we especially recognize the patients and caregivers who are fighting Alzheimer's—a terrible disease that impacts 11 percent of South Carolina's seniors.

As a member of the Congressional Task Force on Alzheimer's, I am dedicated to working with my colleagues in Congress to support patients and caregivers and to encourage the advancement of treatment.

I was grateful to support the Palliative Care and Hospice Education and Training Act, legislation that supports families facing Alzheimer's. I was also grateful that the House passed the 21st Century Cures Act—legislation that encourages and supports innovations in research and medical treatments.

I appreciate the service of advocates from the Alzheimer's Association-South Carolina Chapter, especially those who serve the Midlands and Aiken-Barnwell communities: Program Director Sheila Lewis, Program Director Elizabeth Brantley, Director of Development Alexis Watts, and Director of Communications and Advocacy Taylor Wilson.

In conclusion, God Bless our Troops, and may we never forget September 11th in the Global War on Terrorism.

IN HONOR OF DR. ROBERT B. TOULOUSE

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and public service of Robert B. Toulouse. Dr. Toulouse, provost emeritus and dean of the Toulouse Graduate School at the University of North Texas in Denton, Texas, devoted his life to the education of others.

Robert Toulouse served his country for 25 years. Beginning in World War II, Dr. Toulouse served five years of active duty in the United States Air Force and twenty years in the U.S. Air Force Reserve. In 1978, he retired at the rank of Lieutenant Colonel.

Dr. Toulouse earned three degrees in education from the University of Missouri, which led him to a robust career in academia. In

1948, Dr. Toulouse began his distinguished career in education as assistant professor in the University of North Texas' College of Education. He made a significant impact on campus through his service as dean of the graduate school from 1954 to 1982. During this time, the graduate school grew to host more than 100 graduate programs, increasing from just a few hundred graduate students to more than 5,000.

After 28 years at the helm of the graduate school, Dr. Toulouse joined the university's leadership team as provost and vice president for academic affairs in 1982. After he retired as provost emeritus, the University of North Texas named the Robert B. Toulouse School of Graduate Studies in 1990 in honor of his tremendous professional and personal contributions to the institution.

Dr. Toulouse passed away this year at the age of 98, leaving a rich legacy of service to our community. I would like to offer my sincere sympathy to the Toulouse family on their loss. I am grateful for the service Dr. Robert B. Toulouse rendered to this nation and to the university of which I am a proud alumnus.

TRIBUTE TO MR. RICHARD BICE

HON. ROD BLUM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Richard Bice of Cedar Rapids, for his services as a local ambassador for the Cedar Rapids Alzheimer's Association. Earlier this year, Mr. Bice was awarded the Alzheimer's Association Advocate of the Year for the Greater Iowa Chapter.

Mr. Bice has dedicated himself to service throughout his life: serving in the United States Army, running a successful insurance business in Cedar Rapids, serving as a state president for Multiple Sclerosis and Muscular Dystrophy associations in Iowa, and forming the Cedar Rapids Metro Optimists Club. Mr. Bice was also a dedicated husband to his late wife, Carolyn Bice, who was diagnosed with Alzheimer's in 2002. Mr. Bice cared for her at home for over 11 years until her death in 2013.

Although he misses his wife dearly, Mr. Bice has maintained a positive outlook on life and has continued to better the community around him. Mr. Bice is a tremendous advocate for the Alzheimer's Association, where he discusses the journey that he and his wife went through after her Alzheimer's diagnosis. Thanks to the hard work of Richard and countless others we have hope that new opportunities for a cure will be available for future generations. It is clear that Richard lives by the words of his father, "whatever you've been given, if you give back, it'll double."

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to recognize Mr. Bice during Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month, and thank him for his outstanding contributions to the Eastern Iowa community, to the State of Iowa, and to our country.

RECOGNIZING THE LIBERTY STORE FOR OVER 100 YEARS OF BUSINESS

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor The Liberty Store in Auburn, New York, as this family-owned business celebrates over 100 years serving our community.

For over a century, The Liberty Store has provided a large variety of menswear items to Cayuga County. When the Goldman family first opened the doors of its small business in 1915, it advertised shoes, pants, and socks. Over the years, the Goldman family has grown The Liberty Store into a one-stop shop for individuals and businesses alike, including the Auburn Correctional Facility. This small business has evolved over the past century to meet the needs of its clients and our community—now serving jails, police, and fire departments in 30 states. The Liberty Store has become an integral part of Auburn's landscape and still provides menswear for Central New Yorkers of all ages.

I am proud to recognize The Liberty Store and to congratulate the Goldman family on 102 years in business. This fourth-generation company has become a staple for the Auburn community and I wish The Liberty Store continued success in the years to come.

IN MEMORY OF PAUL BERLIN

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, I recognize the life of a local icon: longtime Texas and Houston radio legend, Paul Berlin.

Spanning nearly seven decades, Paul's career in radio began after he won a local "So You Want to be an Announcer" contest at the young age of 17. Although a native of Memphis, Tennessee, Paul moved to Houston when he was 19, where he officially began his radio career as a local disc jockey at KNUZ Radio.

Paul's warm personality, jovial manner, and unique radio persona attracted fans from all genres of music, but his love of music went far beyond his radio appearances. As the owner of a string of nightclubs, Paul promoted concerts and dances hosted by legends such as Chuck Berry, Jerry Lee Lewis, and Nat King Cole, across the Houston area.

His passion for music eventually carried him overseas, where Paul toured U.S. military bases across Europe and brought the sounds of home to thousands of our young service members.

Over the years, Paul worked with music legends such as Elvis Presley, Johnny Cash, Ray Charles, Mary Tyler Moore, and Sonny & Cher. However, he never stopped playing the music of local Houston singers, and he is credited with starting many songwriters' careers.

Before he retired in 2004, Paul went on to DJ at three other Houston stations. Six years after retiring, his love for music pulled him

back into the radio business, and he returned to host a Saturday evening special at KSEV.

In 1998, Paul was inducted into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame, and in 2002, he was inducted into the Texas Radio Hall of Fame. Paul's storied career earned him many honors, such as the American Women in Radio & TV Media's Radio Personality of the Year and Marconi Award Nominee for Major Market Personality of the Year.

Paul was preceded in death by his precious wife of over sixty years, Nezzie. He is survived by five sons, Brad and his wife Patti, Glenn and his wife Sue, Bruce and his wife Dana, Craig and his wife Jamie, and Donald; nine grandchildren, Evan, Elise, Ross and his wife Melissa, Valerie, Denise and her husband Josh, Austin and his wife Cam, Paul, Carson, and Courtney; three great grandchildren, Samantha, Paige, and Tate; and many nieces and nephews.

Paul's formula for happiness, "someone to love, something to do, and something to look forward to," rings true today, and his love of music and dedication to his community made Houston a far happier place. On June 23, 2017, Paul passed away at the age of 86, and he will be sorely missed.

IN RECOGNITION OF KELBY THORNTON'S BACK TO BACK WINS AT THE NATIONAL SKILLSUSA MASONRY CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kelby Thornton on his back to back championships at the 2016 and 2017 Annual National SkillsUSA Masonry Contest in Louisville, Kentucky.

A senior at Central Cabarrus High School, Kelby and Coach Todd Hartsell, the masonry teacher at Central Cabarrus, returned to Louisville this year to defend Kelby's title. SkillsUSA is a national organization represented by students, teachers and industry professionals who want to provide educational opportunities. The masonry competition pits high school students from all over the country against each other as they test their practiced trade. North Carolina currently holds more National Masonry Championships than all other states combined, thanks to strong competitors like Kelby representing our great state.

This year's event brought a host of talent and I am extremely proud of Kelby for his hard work. I am also thankful for the teachers, coaches and volunteers who made the event possible. I look forward to many more years of successful competition and wish Kelby the best of luck as he continues pursuing his dreams.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in recognizing Kelby Thornton for his second consecutive National Masonry Championship.

CELEBRATING INDIA'S FRIENDSHIP

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over more than 70 years we have developed a strong strategic partnership with India. We have a lot in common when it comes to national security and counterterrorism.

But our partnership doesn't end there. Our trade relations have grown increasingly stronger over the years. In 2016, our trade with India totaled nearly \$115 billion, making India our largest goods trading partner.

Over the past year, we've also been exporting more and more LNG to India. 65 percent of Indians are under 35 and the U.S. has more natural gas than we can use. Trade in energy with India just makes sense. It helps both of us and deepens our bilateral ties.

Earlier this month, Secretary Perry approved an LNG export application that will send 1.8 billion cubic feet per day to India: Mr. Speaker, the world's largest democracy and the oldest democracy are natural partners.

Our shared values and interests ensure that our strategic partnership of over 70 years will endure.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING MARILYN HOPKINS

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Marilyn Hopkins upon her retirement as Provost and Chief Operating Officer (COO) of Touro University, California. She is retiring after more than 35 years of administrative and teaching experience in higher education. Dr. Hopkins has been an active member of the academic and medical communities during her successful career.

Dr. Hopkins earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Nursing at California State University, Sacramento in 1970. She went on to earn her Master's and Doctoral degrees in Nursing at the University of California, San Francisco.

Prior to her appointment as Provost and Chief Operating Officer in 2009, Dr. Hopkins worked as a registered nurse for nearly 20 years at three different hospitals in California. She was employed as a full professor with tenure at California State University, Sacramento from 1974 to 1997, teaching graduate and undergraduate courses on diverse medical subjects. Dr. Hopkins then served as the Dean for the College of Health and Human Services at California State University, Sacramento.

Touro University, California offers accredited graduate programs in several medical fields, and is located in Vallejo, California. As Provost and COO, Dr. Hopkins provided leadership in institutional assessment and comprehensive strategic planning. She created a campus infrastructure to support research, grant-writing and publication opportunities for faculty and students and worked closely with the academic deans to recruit and retain a talented and diverse faculty. Since moving to Solano County, Dr. Hopkins has been actively

engaged in local and regional community initiatives. She serves on the Board for the Vallejo Education Business Alliance and was recognized by the Solano County Library Foundation during Women's History Month for her contributions to women and the community.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Marilyn Hopkins has led a long career in both nursing and academia. She is an active member of our community. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor her here today and extend our best wishes for an enjoyable retirement.

THE LEGACY OF RON HOWARD

HON. TED BUDD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, Ron Howard, of Canton, North Carolina, has passed away. After 31 years of military service, this city, Washington, D.C., was his last battlefield. The jungles of Vietnam were his first. I regret deeply that his final hours were spent preparing for battle against the bureaucracy of the country to which he had given so much.

Any man who has seen combat and death knows how precious life is. A normal man who serves his country for 31 years takes the rest and ease that he has more than earned. Ron was an extraordinary man, and he used the remainder of his time to build his company, his community, and his country. He gave his time, and he knew its price, but it was a price he paid gladly. We are all the better for it.

His legacy lies in his beautiful family, his company, and in the magnificent airplane that he brought into existence. When a Hellfire missile leaves one of the rails on the Archangel and its rocket motor comes to life, hammering down pain and misery on ISIS terrorists, that too is Ron's legacy. His was a truly great American life, and an inspiration to those who knew him. He will not be forgotten, not by me, not by anyone who knew him.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOHN MILLS CARTER, SR.

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. John Mills Carter, Sr., a beloved member of the Fort Worth community who passed away on June 23, 2017.

Mr. Carter was born in 1936 in Shreveport, Louisiana. A graduate of Booker T. Washington High School and Spauldings Business College, Mr. Carter distinguished himself in the food service industry throughout his celebrated career. As a child, he would help his father service the commissary at the plantation where he worked. This established his passion for food service. After college, Mr. Carter opened a small nightclub and cafe in Louisiana before moving to Texas in 1961 in search of better opportunities for him and his family.

After moving to Texas, Mr. Carter managed several restaurants in the Dallas-Fort Worth

area before opening his own restaurant in Fort Worth in 1992. His restaurant, "John Carter's Place Restaurant" served award winning home style soul food and was known for its quality service. Mr. Carter was especially proud of the restaurant's People's Choice Award and its being named "Best of Tarrant [County]" for several years. Before passing it down to his family as his health declined, Mr. Carter also established and grew catering operations for the restaurant.

Along with his successes in the restaurant business, Mr. Carter was also very involved in his community. Throughout his life, he was committed to supporting local charities, schools, and religious organizations as well as helping new restaurateurs get started. Mr. Carter was recognized as a KKDA Coca-Cola African-American Hero, Quest for Success Honoree, Dr. Marion J. Brooks "Living Legend", East Fort Worth Business Association Award Winner, Phi Beta Sigma Business Award recipient, and Tarrant County Youth Advocacy Award recipient, along with many other accolades and recognitions.

As a faithful member of the Greater Mt. Tabor Christian Center for more than 45 years, Mr. Carter served as a Deacon, a member of the Executive Leadership Council, a Sunday school teacher, a choir member, and a Food Service Ministry volunteer.

Mr. Carter was married to his wife, Louella, for 55 years until her passing on Christmas Day of last year. He is survived by his three children, Robert, Denise, and John Jr., along with several grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

I honor Mr. John Mills Carter, Sr.'s positive impact on the Fort Worth community.

HONORING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF PHIL WALTON

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Phil Walton, who is retiring from public service after a remarkable 42 year career with the Social Security Administration. Mr. Walton exemplifies the sterling qualities of a public servant who upholds the highest standards of federal service: one of a loyal and enlightened corps of highly trained, honorable civil servants. The administrative capabilities of individuals like Mr. Walton hold this Republic together.

Phil Walton began his career with the Social Security Administration in Rock Island, Illinois, where he started as a claims representative. He soon began rising through the ranks as a field representative, operations supervisor, operations officer, area administrative assistant, executive assistant and district manager. He was first named District Manager in Chillicothe, Ohio, moving to Toledo, Ohio in 1993 where he has ably guided the Toledo agency since.

In addition to his leadership of the Toledo Social Security Office, Phil has been an active community leader since his arrival to the Toledo area. He served as a Cubmaster, Den Leader and Area Commissioner for the Boy Scouts of America. He has been a member of the Friends of Wood County CASA, currently

serving as Board Chair. He has also served on the Advisory Board of the Toledo Legal Aid Society.

As a member of the National Council of Social Security Management Associations, Phil was awarded the Public Service Award in 2009 "in recognition of his years of volunteer work." Erin Thompson, public affairs specialist for the Toledo Social Security Office, stated, "We would like to take the time to thank Phil Walton for his 42 years of service with Social Security, where he started as a Claims Representative in 1975 in Rock Island, Illinois and completes his career as a District Manager of Toledo downtown, where he has been since 1993. In addition to leading the Toledo office, he has been on numerous boards, most notable as the Chairperson for the Area Office on Aging 2009 to the present. In addition to his service for seniors, he has also served as Board President for the Friends of Wood County CASA from 2007 to present."

Phil has given of his time and talents to the Area Office on Aging of Northwest Ohio Board of Directors, serving in various capacities since 1993 and as Board President since 2009. Billie Johnson, President and CEO of the agency, notes "Phil Walton has been a dedicated Board member of the Area Office on Aging of Northwestern Ohio, Inc. for more than twenty years. His leadership, compassion and wisdom helped the agency grow and develop many vital services for older adults, caregivers and disabled persons living in northwest Ohio. Phil helped the agency navigate through several monumental funding challenges. He has given his time, personal resources and energy to so many people and various communities in northwest Ohio. We are extremely grateful for his commitment, dedication and leadership. Phil is the current Board Chairman for the Area Office on Aging."

American labor leader Walter Reuther said, "There is no greater calling than to serve your fellow men. There is no greater contribution than to help the weak. There is no greater satisfaction than to have done it well." Phil Walton's life and career have been given over to serving his fellow citizens, to helping the weakest among us—those who are elderly, those who are disabled, children. He has done it very well. His legacy is in the lives which were made better for his efforts, in those with whom he worked to ensure a top-notch federal government agency and services, in the organizations which have benefitted from his investment and leadership, and a community richer for his contributions. On this day as Phil turns the page from career to retirement, we offer a most heartfelt "thank you" for his extraordinary commitment to our nation and its people. As he ends his public life and looks toward retirement, he has fulfilled Mohammad Ali's call that "Service to others is the payment you make for your space here on earth."

THE BENTON WAVE

HON. J. FRENCH HILL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the recent selfless actions of two extraordinary individuals in my district: Mr. Robin Creel and Mr. Danny Revis.

Both men work tirelessly for the Benton school district transportation program.

Last month, about 40 students from Shelby County in Memphis piled onto a bus and began their journey toward the popular Magic Springs amusement park in Hot Springs, Arkansas.

Unfortunately, as they traveled down I-30, their bus broke down.

Through the Arkansas State Police, word got to Mr. Revis that an entire busload of children was stranded.

After discussion with officials of the Tennessee school district from which the students hailed, Mr. Creel volunteered to use a Benton school bus to quickly transport the Memphis students to Magic Springs, where, after a full day of enjoyment, a Shelby County bus would pick them up.

Along with its well-known Benton Wave, a gesture of genuine friendliness noticeable throughout the city, Mr. Revis and Mr. Creel's commendable actions contribute to Benton's long-standing aura of friendship and compassion.

RECOGNIZING THE 40TH
ANNIVERSARY OF PONY BIRD

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, children and adults who are mentally and physically disabled have a great friend in an organization called Pony Bird, Incorporated located in Jefferson County, Missouri.

Named after a children's book about a young boy and his magical flying pony, Pony Bird is celebrating its 40th anniversary. It began in 1977 in one home devoted to caring for 10 severely disabled children. Today, Pony Bird provides 24-hour care in six residential homes for up to 60 individuals unable to walk or meet their daily living needs.

The facilities in Mapaville and De Soto allow residents to receive a maximum level of personalized care. They lead happy lives through socialization, participation, work and the opportunity to volunteer as members of their community.

Pony Bird has been recognized many times by the State of Missouri Department of Mental Health for its outstanding level of care. It is my great privilege to celebrate their 40 years of caring for our most vulnerable citizens today before the United States House of Representatives.

HONORING LET MON LEE ON HIS
DISTINGUISHED CAREER

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge Mr. Let Mon Lee, upon his retirement from his position as Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works and over three decades of public service.

Mr. Lee assumed his most recent position in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in 2009. In

his role as Deputy Assistant Secretary, Mr. Lee has been responsible for the executive direction of Army Civil Works projects involving flood risk management, storm damage prevention, navigation, and environmental restoration. Prior to this, Mr. Lee served at the Army Corps Headquarters for almost 20 years. His work with Army Corps were separated by a five-year stretch on the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee.

I have had the pleasure of working with Mr. Lee on our shared efforts to improve the level of flood protection for Sacramento, in my district. Sacramento is defined by its two great rivers, the American and the Sacramento, which makes it the most at-risk major American city for flooding. Mr. Lee has been a great champion for Sacramento's flood control projects, and together we have been able to better protect the lives and livelihoods of my constituents.

Mr. Lee has been wonderful to work with on both a professional and personal level. I wish him many years of happiness in retirement with his wife and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in thanking Mr. Lee for his service.

12 CARRIER ACT

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that my bill, the 12 Carrier Act, was included in last night's NDAA markup. This legislation will play a critical role in rebuilding our nation's military.

With ongoing perils around the world, including increasing violence by ISIS and persistent threats by North Korea, it is vital to our nation's security that our Navy is fully equipped with the resources and capabilities to respond to these threats. By including my bill in the Committee's mark, we will be increasing the statutory limit for carriers from eleven to twelve. In doing so, this measure will empower the Navy with the tools they desperately need to meet Combatant Commander requirements, deter conflict, prolong the lives of our fleet, and send a message to potential adversaries that we will not allow our decisive advantage in worldwide maritime force projection to erode.

Since the end of the Cold War, aircraft carrier requirements have increased while the aircraft carrier force structure has declined. The Navy has stated that the current forces cannot support global requirements. For years, this strain has caused our fleet to operate at maximum capacity, limiting aircraft carrier at-sea training, increasing deployment lengths and decreased time available for maintenance. To express the shortcomings of our carrier fleet, Navy Rear Admiral Thomas Moore has stated "We're an 11-carrier Navy in a 15-carrier world". President Trump also recently stressed the necessity of adding a twelfth carrier to our fleet.

Maintaining the required operational tempo with 12 carriers relieves significant stress both in terms of manpower, as well as keeping the proper maintenance cycles of the carriers themselves. When the carrier fleet is at full strength of 12, regional combatant com-

manders will be able to rely on the imposing presence of U.S. forces and will be able to respond to threats in a more expedited manner.

I am encouraged that my fellow members of the Armed Services Committee agree with my concerns about the shrinking size and capabilities of the United States Navy, and acted in a bipartisan fashion to include my "12 Carrier Act" into the markup. I thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Subcommittee Chairman WITTMAN for their support on this measure, and I look forward to seeing this measure passed by the House as part of the FY18 National Defense Authorization Act.

IN RECOGNITION OF DAWN
WRIGHT

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Dawn Wright on the occasion of her retirement from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) after 36 years of honorable service.

Born to Robert and Nancy Warren, Dawn is the oldest of four children. Robert, a Marine officer for much of his life, served in multiple locations across the U.S. This gave Dawn and her siblings the opportunity to grow up in California, Virginia, North Carolina, and Hawaii.

Growing up in a military family, Dawn joined the United States Navy in July 1974 with the goal of becoming an air traffic controller. She quickly became a ground-controlled approach (GCA) controller at Naval Air Station Kingsville before transferring to Rota, Spain where she gained experience working in a control tower alongside Spanish controllers.

After leaving the Navy in 1979, Dawn was hired to work for the FAA in August 1981. Her first assignment was Bridgeport Tower in Stratford, Connecticut where she became a full-fledged air traffic controller for the FAA. There, she received a number of 'on the spot' awards and recognition for her outstanding work.

In 1986, Dawn moved to Massachusetts and worked at both Cape Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON) and Hyannis Air Traffic Control (ATCT), quickly climbing the ranks to a supervisory role by 1991. In 1994 Dawn decided to become an automations specialist where she learned computer programming, software, networking and operating systems. It was during this time that she received recognition for building a computer for Cape TRACON out of scrapped, non-working computers. She has since become a staff specialist and her responsibilities have included air traffic controller testing on Nantucket, teaching the Automated Radar Terminal Systems (ARTS) course to new air traffic controllers, ensuring quality assurance at the facility, and evaluations for multiple facilities including Boston ATCT and Providence ATCT.

Outside of work, Dawn is an accomplished rower, having been part of a crew team from 2001 to 2012 as a Masters rower. In her spare time she is an avid amateur ballroom dancer, rides motorcycles and pursues recording her family's genealogy. While her childhood was not spent in Massachusetts, she has since learned that she has historic ties to the Commonwealth. She is a descendent of Thomas

Mayhew, the first governor of Martha's Vineyard, and John Swain, one of the original proprietors of Nantucket Island.

Dawn will be celebrating her retirement on June 30th and will be dearly missed by all at Cape TRACON. With her retirement she plans to spend more time with her family, including her boyfriend, her parents, and her son Brian and his family.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Dawn Wright for her many years of steadfast service to public safety, the aviation industry, and our country. I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing her a happy retirement and many more years of health and happiness.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHRIS COLLINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I missed one vote on June 28, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 332.

CELEBRATING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF TACO PALENQUE

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 30th Anniversary of Taco Palenque.

Taco Palenque opened on July 1st, 1987, with the purpose of serving delicious and authentic Mexican cuisine. Over its thirty years of existence, it has served some of the best food in all of South Texas. Founded by Mr. Juan Francisco "Pancho" Ochoa in Laredo, TX, Taco Palenque has seen much success. With over 1,500 employees and 21 locations across Texas, including in San Antonio, Laredo, McAllen, and Mission, Taco Palenque has shown to be a top-quality restaurant chain.

Offering everything from traditional tacos to homemade menu, Taco Palenque never fails to provide excellent cuisine to Texans. The hard work and effort that is shown through Taco Palenque's cuisine speaks to the dedication of Mr. Ochoa, who always made sure to never serve any food that he does not personally like. This mindset has brought him many honors including The Chamber of Commerce's Laredo Businessman of the Year award. He has also been honored by the Texas legislature for his work and contributions to the restaurant industry.

His restaurants have also been recognized for their outstanding customer service which came through Mr. Ochoa's dedication to customer satisfaction. For Mr. Ochoa, no task is too small to preserve the famous taste of his restaurants. Regardless of the cost, customer satisfaction takes priority. This is one of the many reasons for Taco Palenque's ongoing success.

Taco Palenque is not just a thriving business but a family owned operation. From the outset, this organization would not have been possible without the help and expertise of

Pancho's family members. Mr. Ochoa's wife, Florida, was instrumental in helping to create some of Taco Palenque's most famous recipes. She worked tirelessly with Mr. Ochoa to perfect everything that is served. As the business expanded, his children took on several important roles in the business, including General Director of the company and manager of several different restaurants.

I would also like to note that Taco Palenque has supporters here in our nation's Capital. Over the last several years, my office has hosted "Laredo Day", a widely attended and bi-partisan reception that features the culture and cuisine of Laredo, TX. At this event we serve Taco Palenque which is often noted by our guests to be some of the best food that they have ever had. These guests include members of Congress, ambassadors, and cabinet officials. The food is so popular my office oftentimes has to limit the number of guests to the reception.

Taco Palenque does not limit itself to merely serving good food. Throughout Taco Palenque's existence, the restaurant has partnered with advocates and organizations that promote the well-being of the local community. As a sponsor of multiple youth sports teams and organizations, such as Mercy Ministries of Laredo, the Boys and Girls Club of Laredo, and the American Cancer Society Relay for Life, community is clearly important to this establishment.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize the accomplishments of Taco Palenque, my dear friend Pancho Ochoa, and all his staff.

HONORING JUDGE EDWARD PHILMAN

HON. NEAL P. DUNN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of Hearing Officer and Former Gilchrist County Court Judge Edward Philman, who passed away on May 17th.

Judge Philman was a pillar of the community and served the citizens of Gilchrist County as their County Court Judge for 24 years before his retirement in 2012. He then went on to work as a Senior Judge and as a Civil Traffic Hearing Officer for the Eighth Judicial Circuit of Florida.

His achievements were many during his lifetime. He served his country in the U.S. Army infantry and was a combat veteran in Vietnam. He was named the Gilchrist County Citizen of the Year in 1989. Judge Philman was an involved member of the Trenton Rotary Club and served as district governor from 2012 to 2013.

Judge Philman also instituted the Fifth-Grade Mock Trials in Gilchrist County. Since it began, the Mock Trials have taught hundreds of local students how the judicial system actually works.

Judge Philman earned his Juris Doctor from Mercer University in 1981 with honors and his Bachelor of Arts from the University of Florida in 1978. He also attended Lake City Community College and Lake City Forest Ranger School, after graduating Bell High School.

He has been quoted saying, "Let my life and the work I have done speak for me."

Mr. Speaker, Judge Philman's life and work have truly spoken to the character of the extraordinary man we lost last month. Please join me in honoring a man who dedicated his life to the letter of the law, the late Judge Edward Philman.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with House Report 115-193, I include in the RECORD the following Congressional Budget Cost Estimate for H.R. 1684.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 27, 2017.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 1684, the Disaster Assistance Support for Communities and Homeowners Act of 2017.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Robert Reese.

Sincerely,

MARK P. HADLEY
(For Keith Hall, Director).

Enclosure.

H.R. 1684—DISASTER ASSISTANCE SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITIES AND HOMEOWNERS ACT OF 2017

As passed by the House of Representatives
on June 26, 2017

H.R. 1684 would require the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to provide technical assistance to community, homeowner, and similar associations. FEMA would be required to help such associations take actions after a disaster that would make them eligible to receive reimbursement from entities that receive FEMA grants. This legislation also would require FEMA to submit a report to the Congress on expanding the areas of condominiums and housing cooperatives that are eligible for federal disaster relief.

Based on information provided by FEMA, about the cost to collect information necessary to complete the report, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 1684 would cost \$1 million in 2018; such spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

Enacting H.R. 1684 would not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply. CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 1684 would not increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2028.

H.R. 1684 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contacts for this estimate are Meghan Shewsbury and Robert Reese. The estimate was approved by Theresa Gullo, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FOOD
DESERTS ACT

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in June of 2017, Marsh Supermarkets grocery stores announced the closure of many stores throughout the Midwest. Many of these stores were located in my district where already many families lack a car or reliable public transportation to get to the nearest alternative, often located over a mile away. Today, thousands of my constituents are struggling to find the food they need, with many forced to rely on fast food restaurants and convenience stores. These options are neither healthy nor affordable.

Sadly, this situation is not unique. Over 29 million people, almost 10 percent of the U.S. population, live without ready access to affordable, nutritious food and over 2 million people have no transportation to get to their nearest store. Many have seen their local stores close their doors during the recent economic downturn. Others lost access years ago and are now facing the serious long-term impacts of obesity, diabetes, malnutrition and other diet related ailments. Unfortunately, residents in these low-income areas tend to spend less on groceries, leaving little financial incentive for traditional grocery chains to make costly investments for new locations.

In the wealthiest country on Earth, nutritious food should be an expectation, not a luxury. That is why I am introducing the Food Deserts Act, which creates new avenues to fund stores in underserved communities. This bill will create USDA funded, state operated revolving funds that will issue low interest loans for the operation of grocery stores in food deserts. The bill ensures that recipients of these loans, including for-profit, non-profit and municipal entities, will provide affordable, healthy food, including fresh produce and staples like milk, bread and meat. It will also ensure that USDA professionals are available to provide technical assistance to recipients who need it.

Access to healthy food is something that most of us take for granted. But despite our own experiences, we need to remember that millions of our constituents are struggling every day to feed their families. With this market driven approach, I hope to complement existing federal programs and efforts around the country by ensuring a stable lending stream for struggling grocery stores and sustainable access to food for communities in need.

RECOGNIZING CANADA'S SESQUICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF CONFEDERATION

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of United States' closest allies and neighbor, the nation of Canada, on its sesquicentennial anniversary of confederation.

Minnesota shares a special bond with our neighbor to the north through many deep cul-

tural, economic, and environmental ties. As Minnesota's largest trading partner, Canada helps generate \$20 billion of economic activity, a clear indicator of its importance to our state. However, perhaps even more meaningful are connections we share to our precious cultural and natural heritage. The Great Lakes and the pristine natural beauty of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness not only form Minnesota's northern border with Canada, but they also help define our collective identities, drawing visitors from both near and abroad who come to explore and marvel over the world's largest reserve of fresh water, and accessible and beautiful wilderness. It is because of the natural wonders that we both share, that Minnesota and Canada also share a commitment to action in addressing climate change and protecting our natural resources for future generations.

Minnesotans and Canadians are also deeply connected on a cultural level. Long before Europeans arrived, Indigenous Americans and First Nations created thriving communities and lived off of the abundance of the vast forests, plains, lakes and rivers. Europeans who later settled these lands chose names derived from indigenous languages. Minnesota came from two Dakota words; Mni meaning "water" and Sota meaning "sky-tinted," while Canada is derived from the Iroquois-Huron word Kanata meaning "village" or "settlement." Later on, threads of early French influence were interwoven into each of our historical tapestries. This can easily be seen in the names of streets in the Twin Cities of Saint Paul and Minneapolis, and in our state motto "L'Etoile du Nord", "The Star of the North". Minnesota and Canada share so much culturally, that Canadians will often jokingly refer to Minnesota as the 11th province.

Minnesotans and Canadians continue to share a strong affinity to the land and outdoors pursuits, including, hiking, boating, hunting and fishing. Perhaps nothing defines our bond more clearly today than a love of hockey. Minnesota is proudly known as "the State of Hockey" and Canadians of all stripes similarly display unparalleled energy and passion for the sport.

As we join the nation of Canada in celebrating 150 years since its confederation, let us remember the unwavering friendship and security alliance between not only our two countries, but also between the people of Canada and Minnesota. Rarely is it that two peoples, separated by national borders, hold the other in such high esteem as the people of Minnesota and Canada do for one another. As Canada embarks on another 150 years, let us continue to foster a relationship that is truly unique amongst the nations of the world. On behalf of the residents of Minnesota's Fourth Congressional District, it is my honor to wish Canada a happy 150th birthday.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT P. EVERLY

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contribution to our national security has been exceptional. After eight years

of active duty service in the U.S. Navy and decades of work dedicated to the development and assessment of U.S. Navy weapons delivery platforms as a civilian, Robert "Bob" Everly is retiring on June 30, 2017.

Between his active duty service and civilian work directly supporting the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Corona Division, Mr. Everly spent nearly fifty years supporting the U.S. Navy. That civilian employment includes thirty-three years managing projects and programs supporting weapons and combat systems performance assessment, Fleet exercise assessments, metrology systems engineering, RM&A assessment, range systems engineering, telecommunications engineering, information systems engineering, software development, Information Assurance/Accreditation, and classified network operations.

Mr. Everly has also dedicated a tremendous amount of time as an essential member of various community-based organizations. That includes his service as an Executive Board Member and Co-Chair of the Science and Technology Education Program (STEP). As the Honorary Chairman of STEP, I have been incredibly fortunate to work closely with Mr. Everly to develop a successful program that sparks students interest in math, science and engineering. Mr. Everly also served as Chairman of the Board, President and Vice-President of the Measurement Science Conference, as a member of the Corona and Riverside Chambers of Commerce, and participated as a member of state and local Naval Surface Warfare Center Corona Retention Committees during the Base Realignment and Closer (BRAC) process.

Mr. Everly has contributed immensely to the betterment of our region and military and I am proud to call him a fellow community member, American and my friend. To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. Everly for his service to our country and the Inland Empire—his dedication, insight and passion will be greatly missed.

IN HONOR OF JAMES MARTIN
KIDWELL

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Leesburg Virginia's longest serving Police Chief, James Martin Kidwell, who passed away on June 19, 2017, at the age of seventy-seven. A lifelong resident of Leesburg, Chief Kidwell was renowned for his public service and longstanding community involvement, as he dedicated his career to protecting the people of his hometown. Throughout his life, he was a revered leader in the Leesburg community who brought honor and integrity to his profession and will be remembered as one of the town's finest and most devoted policemen.

Chief Kidwell was born and reared in Leesburg and graduated from Loudoun County High School. After graduation, Chief Kidwell initially intended to follow in the footsteps of his uncle and work as a plumber. However, only after a few days in this occupation, when he came across a nest of snakes, Chief Kidwell realized that he wanted to pursue a

different line of work. Then in 1961, at the age of twenty, he became a police officer in Leesburg, marking the commencement of his thirty-four year career with Leesburg's Police Department. In 1972, he assumed the position of Chief of the Leesburg Police Department and held that post until his retirement in 1995.

Mr. Kidwell's remarkable career spanned multiple decades, and as Chief, he oversaw Leesburg's Police Department during a period of unprecedented development in the town. As the town expanded and confronted new complex challenges, Chief Kidwell ensured that the police department was equipped to handle the city's massive population surge and transformed the department from a meager force of only four police officers, one patrol car, and no radio system into a modern police department. During his tenure, the department burgeoned into a thirty-five person force that was able to effectively combat the increasingly serious crimes stemming from Leesburg's rapid growth. But despite the town's enlargement, Chief Kidwell always remained engaged with Leesburg's residents and maintained a small-town approach to law enforcement.

After retirement, Chief Kidwell spent much of his time playing golf, watching sports, especially his beloved Washington Redskins, and caring for his grandchildren. He is survived by his wife, Dorothy Knox Kidwell, his daughters, Kelly Bradley, Kerri Spinks, and Kristi Kidwell, his sisters Catherine Howard and Page Kidwell, his brother Bradley Kidwell, seven grandchildren, three great-grandchildren, and many nieces and nephews.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me and countless others as we recognize the innumerable contributions of Chief Kidwell. Chief Kidwell's steadfast commitment and selfless dedication to keeping the residents of Leesburg safe will be greatly missed, and the services he provided to the Town of Leesburg and Virginia's Tenth Congressional District will never be forgotten. He was an exemplary officer and the true embodiment of a public servant, and today we honor him for his legacy of a lifetime of service.

IN HONOR OF NEW CITIZENS

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and sincerity that I take this time to congratulate the individuals who will take their oath of citizenship on July 4, 2017. In true patriotic fashion, on the day of our great Nation's celebration of independence, a naturalization ceremony will take place, welcoming new citizens of the United States of America. This memorable occasion, coordinated by the League of Women Voters of the Calumet Area and presided over by Magistrate Judge Andrew Radovich, will be held at the Pavilion at Wolf Lake in Hammond, Indiana.

America is a country founded by immigrants. From its beginning, settlers have come from countries around the world to the United States in search of better lives for their families. The oath ceremony is a shining example of what is so great about the United States of America—that people from all over the world can come together and unite as members of

a free, democratic nation. These individuals realize that nowhere else in the world offers a better opportunity for success than here in America.

On July 4, 2017, the following people, representing many nations throughout the world, will take their oaths of citizenship in Hammond, Indiana: Adriana Solis, Dhanwant Singh, Syneth Lorana Gardner, Roberto Diaz, Virginia Reformina Wilson, Khalid Javed, Maria Wiederhold, Glendie Mallen, Liljana Stojceska, Oliver Cadikovski, Gagandeep Khatra, Hernan Ezequiel Barenboim, Jose Lauro Sanchez Ruvalcaba, Sambath Cheakhun, Mariel Claudia Lopez, Sabine Marie Helene Shive, Maria del Rayo Tirado, Mary Madhulatha Vennamalla, Ding Lin, Aurelia Ruiz, Alanoud Hashem Mahmoud Alshurafa, Yan Zhu, Guadalupe Juan Ramirez, Aleksandra Gardijan, Nevenka Nanic, Brenda Beatriz Medina, Maria de los Angeles Garduno Hernandez, Woo Young Yang, Lucy Amparo Perdomo Lopez, Marjan Risteski, J. Guadalupe Gama Macias, Delroy Anthony Roomes, Sonali Shukla, Erlinda Treyes Alvarez, Ma Dolores Serrano del Real, Gelma Ordaniza Hogue, Damaris Mituki Kariuki, Ravi Nigam, Jayesh Shantilal, Minnie Marchan Damico, Teresa Bautista Alcala, Mico Mileusnic, Mathy Bukassa McKinney, Israel Jacinto-Contreras, Norielyn Langres Heitzmann, Genevieve Blayee, Manuel Angel Corazzari, Martin Gonzalez, Hannan Hassan Sheikh, and Emilio Soria.

Although each individual has sought to become a citizen of the United States for his or her own reasons, be it for education, occupation, or to offer their loved ones better lives, each is inspired by the fact that the United States of America is, as Abraham Lincoln described it, a country “. . . of the people, by the people, and for the people.” They realize that the United States is truly a free nation. By seeking American citizenship, they have made the decision that they want to live in a place where, as guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Constitution, they can practice religion as they choose, speak their minds without fear of punishment, and assemble in peaceful protest should they choose to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in congratulating these individuals, who will become citizens of the United States of America on July 4, 2017, the anniversary of our Nation's independence. They, too, are American citizens, and they, too, are guaranteed the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We, as a free and democratic nation, congratulate them and welcome them.

2016 LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

HON. PAUL MITCHELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Kelmendi, a member of the Albanian-American Community of Michigan.

In 2002, Professor John P. Kelmendi was elevated to Knighthood by his Majesty King Leka I of Albania. This honor represents his leadership and courage in bringing freedom, liberty, and democracy to citizens of Albania.

Dedicating his life to service, Dr. Kelmendi was also presented with the Mother Theresa Humanitarian Award by the President of Albania and now resides in Michigan.

Dr. Kelmendi's efforts continue to influence the lives of high school students as an educator and scholar in Michigan. On March 31, 2017, the Albanian-American Community of the USA awarded Dr. Kelmendi the 2016 Lifetime Achievement Award. His contribution to education and culture in America has been extraordinary.

I join the Albanian-American Community of Michigan, in Shelby Township, in congratulating and thanking Dr. John P. Kelmendi for his service.

HONORING STARK COUNTY COURTHOUSE'S BICENTENNIAL

HON. BOB GIBBS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the Stark County Courthouse, which celebrates its bicentennial this year.

The halls of the Stark County Courthouse have a significant place in American history—recounting the area's evolution into a prominent community in Northeast Ohio. President William McKinley argued cases before the court as Stark County Prosecutor, and citizens would travel to the courthouse to hear news and updates from the battlefield during the Civil War.

The current courthouse is the third constructed on the grounds in Stark County, sculpted from brick, sandstone, and marble. The building itself is an illustration of justice, with the clock tower adorned with four Trumpeters of Justice symbolizing the Courthouse occupants' devotion to truth and integrity. The triangular sandstone pediment on the front of the Courthouse demonstrates figures of commerce, justice, agriculture, and industry produced in Stark County.

The Stark County Courthouse is a treasure of Northeast Ohio, and I am proud to join in celebration of its place in our history.

HONORING OBERLIN COLLEGE PRESIDENT MARVIN KRISLOV

HON. JIM JORDAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to commend to the House the many contributions of Dr. Marvin Krislov. Dr. Krislov is departing the presidency of Oberlin College and Conservatory tomorrow after ten years of distinguished service in that office.

A Rhodes Scholar and a graduate of Yale Law School, Dr. Krislov initially pursued a career in law, clerking for the United States District Court for the Northern District of California in San Francisco. He then spent three years working at the White House Counsel's Office and then in various senior roles at the Department of Labor.

Dr. Krislov came to Oberlin College in 2007 after nine years as Vice President and General Counsel at the University of Michigan.

Over the last decade, the Oberlin community has benefited greatly from his outstanding management skills and willingness to engage with students, who hold him in the highest regard. Hundreds took advantage of his standing offer to meet personally with any graduating senior seeking career advice.

To fulfill his desire to make the college more inclusive and accessible to students from every economic background, Dr. Krislov created the Oberlin Access Initiative. This initiative helped alleviate the loan burden of many lower-income students.

Dr. Krislov has been hailed for his fundraising efforts—especially his leadership of the most successful comprehensive campaign in Oberlin's history, which came in well ahead of its goal and ahead of schedule. This campaign has allowed for significant campus expansions and renovations.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Krislov will soon assume the presidency of Pace University in New York. On behalf of the people of Ohio's Fourth Congressional District, I offer him my thanks for his long and distinguished career at Oberlin. His legacy of innovative and earnest leadership will benefit Oberlin College for years to come. I wish him and his family every success as they move to this new chapter in their lives.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOHN EDWARD
HASSE

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer congratulations to Dr. John Edward Hasse on his retirement as Curator of Music at the National Museum of American History, a position he has served in since 1984.

Dr. Hasse is a recognized leader in the field of jazz scholarship and education, distinguishing himself through publications, programming, lectures, and public service. Most notably, Dr. Hasse conceived and founded Jazz Appreciation Month, which was endorsed by the U.S. Congress in 2003. Today, Jazz Appreciation Month is celebrated each April in all 50 states and in over forty other countries.

Dr. Hasse also worked with me to found the Smithsonian Jazz Masterworks Orchestra, the jazz-ensemble-in-residence at the National Museum of American History, now in its 26th year of domestic concerts and international tours for the U.S. State Department.

In addition to his work at the Smithsonian, Dr. Hasse is an accomplished writer, contributing chapters to a number of books and articles in *The Washington Post*, *The Wall Street Journal*, eight academic journals, and eight encyclopedias. He has lectured on music, the arts, and leadership in 20 countries on six continents, advancing cultural diplomacy, often on behalf of the U.S. State Department. He has served on a number of boards, including the federal New Orleans Jazz Commission, the board of the International Association for Jazz Education, and as a founding member of the Jazz Educators Network. He has been a consultant with the U.S. Postal Service, the National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences, and UNESCO.

Dr. Hasse earned a B.A. cum laude from Carleton College, M.A. and Ph.D. degrees

from Indiana University, and a Certificate in Business Administration from The Wharton School. His honors include appointment as Herb Alpert Scholar-in-Residence at the Berklee College of Music, two ASCAP-Deems Taylor Awards for excellence in writing about music, two Grammy Award nominations, and two honorary doctorates.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my sincerest thanks to John for many years of friendship, and I know I speak for the entire Smithsonian Institute when I say Dr. Hasse will be sorely missed in his current capacity at the Smithsonian. However, if there is one thing I know about John, it is that he will never be far from the musical community he has fostered for the past few decades. We cannot thank him enough for the many years of service he has offered, and we look forward to seeing what the next stage of life holds for him.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF FLORENTINO "TINO" DURAN

HON. JOAQUIN CASTRO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the life and legacy of Florentino "Tino" Duran, a publisher, veteran, and philanthropist who worked tirelessly to help San Antonians.

Born in San Antonio, Texas in 1934, Tino graduated from Lanier High School and went on to serve in the U.S. Air Force. He attended San Antonio College where he first flexed his journalism muscle while working on the school paper, *The Ranger*. After earning his bachelor's degree in political science, Tino continued his education and completed a master's degree in public administration at St. Mary's University.

Tino later became general manager of Dallas newspaper *El Sol de Tejas* and then served as president and CEO of Fort Worth's *El Infomador Hispano*. But his crowning professional achievement was his tenure as publisher of *La Prensa De San Antonio*, the first bilingual publication in Texas. According to his family, Tino strove to inform, educate, and inspire San Antonians, particularly the Hispanic community.

A compassionate, generous man who understood the power of education, Tino established the La Prensa Foundation in 1995 with his wife Amelia "Millie" Duran to award college scholarships to local students. Since its creation, the La Prensa Foundation has provided more than 200 students with over \$2 million of financial assistance to attend institutions throughout Texas.

Tino is survived by his beloved wife of 62 years, Millie; his three sons Tino Jr., David, and Steve, and their wives Susan, Norma and Virginia; his daughters Nina and Margie, and Margie's husband Kenneth; 13 grandchildren; and 18 great-grandchildren.

I offer my condolences to Tino's family and share the gratitude so many San Antonians have for Tino's tremendous service to our community.

IN APPRECIATION OF BRUCE
NEWCOMB'S SERVICE TO IDAHO

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, Mark Twain once said, "Few things are harder to put up with than a good example." I can tell you there is no finer example of a greater man than my dear friend, Bruce Newcomb. I have had the distinct pleasure and opportunity to be part of Bruce's life for over 30 years and in that time I have known him in several capacities, an Idaho rancher, a state legislator, a majority leader, and the Speaker of the Idaho House. I have seen him as a husband; father, grandfather, uncle and brother. But, the role I know him best as, is friend, and not just to me, but to all he meets.

My friend is retiring for the second time. He retired from the Idaho State Legislature in 2006 where he served for 20 years, the last eight serving as Speaker of the Idaho House—making him the longest-serving speaker in state history. Bruce is the type of leader that defines America, a leader who has strong values and convictions, but is willing to listen and show compassion to all. A leader who isn't afraid to stand up for what is right or take the road that is more difficult, knowing in the end it will lead to a successful outcome.

When Bruce retired from the Idaho Legislature he could have sought any job he wanted in public office or in the private sector. His commitment to students led him to Boise State University where he pursued expanding higher education opportunities in Idaho. Bruce also established a scholarship program for Burley High School students to attend college.

Friday, June 30, 2017, my friend Bruce will retire from BSU where he served as the university's director of government relations. The University recognized Bruce earlier this year and presented him with the 'Commitment to Idaho' Award. There is no one more deserving of this award than Bruce Newcomb.

If you ask Bruce why he entered public service, he will tell you President John F. Kennedy inspired him with his famous quote, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country." But I know that Bruce always wanted to help others; it is simply part of his soul.

Bruce is loyal. That's a simple statement, but a trait that's not easy to achieve. He puts God and family first, and friends are so close to that line it is hard to decipher. I am beyond fortunate to be inside his circle and am forever grateful.

I congratulate Bruce, and look forward to seeing him more.

HONORING CIRCUS JUVENTAS

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate St. Paul's own Circus Juventas, and to congratulate them on their performance in today's opening ceremony for the Smithsonian Folklife Festival.

This year the Folklife Festival marks its 50th Anniversary, and the youth performers of Circus Juventas will be sharing their artistry with hundreds of thousands of visitors in performances throughout the two weeks of the festival.

The founders of Circus Juventas, Dan and Betty Butler, not only build confidence and excellence in their students through a multicultural circus arts education, but also inspire more than 50,000 audience members every year with their professional-level performances. Circus Juventas is a key member of the vibrant arts community in Minnesota's 4th District.

Since its founding in 1994, Circus Juventas has grown into the largest performing arts circus school in North America. Over 2,500 students participate in their year round and summer camp programs. The students of Circus Juventas learn world-class skills in traditional and contemporary circus arts. As these young people come together to put on their collaborative cirque nouveau performances, they also learn the values of teamwork, self-confidence, discipline, dedication, leadership, and collaboration.

As their Member of Congress, I commend all the students of Circus Juventas and Dan and Betty Butler as they bring their renowned performances and community engagement to the National Mall as the Folklife Festival celebrates the Circus Arts.

The creativity that they inspire and the connections they build are a gift to our community, and we are all proud of their chance to share those gifts on a national stage.

IN TRIBUTE TO SISTER JOEL
READ

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sister Joel Read who has served as a mentor, teacher, college professor, a fierce advocate for women's rights and academic administrator. She was the longtime leader of Alverno College and her vision of placing abilities over grades put her among the nation's top college innovators. Sister Joel Read died, May 25, 2017 at the age of 91 years.

Sister Read led her alma mater for nearly 35 years. The women's college located on Milwaukee's south side reflected her trailblazing approach. The depth of her influence reached far beyond the Alverno campus because of her involvement not only in local and national academic issues, but also due to her international network of contacts. She oversaw multi-million dollar fund raising campaigns that expanded the campus footprint, as well as scholarship and academic offerings. Under her leadership, Alverno launched one of the first internship programs in the country and initiated Weekend College targeted at working women. Sister Read focused on students developing abilities, rather than making grades to demonstrate skills and knowledge. The distinctive ability-based, "assessment-as-learning" curriculum approach introduced in 1973, still draws educators from around the world to visit Alverno.

She was a member of the School Sisters of St. Francis since 1945. She was a fierce ad-

vocate for women's rights and was one of the founders of the National Organization for Women in 1966. President Gerald Ford appointed her to the National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year in 1975. National leaders in political and education circles also sought her counsel. President Jimmy Carter appointed her to the National Council on the Humanities. Presidents George H.W. Bush, George W. Bush and Bill Clinton invited her to the White House to discuss educational policy. She was singled out as one of a handful of college presidents who broke educational ground in the past 100 years, in the book, "The Many Lives of Academic Presidents".

Alverno College has opened doors to those who did not see college in their future. Alverno's enrollment is roughly 2,200. Forty-five percent of the undergrad population comes from the city of Milwaukee, and 44 percent are women of color. Nearly seven in 10 are first-generation college students. Alverno consistently receives high ratings in US News & World Report. A 2015 report by The Education Trust found Alverno had both the highest percentage (36.2 percent) of federal Pell Grant recipients and minority undergrads (35.7 percent) among Wisconsin colleges and universities. Pell Grants provide need-based grants to low-income students.

She retired as President of Alverno College in 2003 having served as one of the nation's longest serving college presidents and remained an energetic force in retirement. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Sister Joel Read. She has left a legacy of advocacy and compassion. She was a true trailblazer. The citizens of the Fourth Congressional District, the State of Wisconsin and the nation have benefited tremendously from her dedicated service. I am honored for these reasons to pay tribute to Sister Joel Read.

INTRODUCTION OF THE TRANSFORM STUDENT DEBT TO HOME EQUITY ACT

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the Transform Student Debt to Home Equity Act of 2017—a bill that enables graduates to transform their student debt into an opportunity to purchase and own a home.

With an estimated \$1.3 trillion student debt owed to the federal government, plunging homeownership rates among young people, and 17.2 million habitable homes sitting vacant in the United States, our nation must find a way to address the student debt vs. housing conundrum. Luckily, there is a popular lending instrument already in widespread use that could serve as a significant bridge to the future: the home mortgage. This common lending tool, overtime, has the power to transform student loan repayments into a financial instrument for building equity: the home.

Creating a path for credit worthy student debt holders to convert their debt payment stream into home equity would require many federal departments to collaborate. However, an initial effort to test the concept can take the form of a pilot program through the Depart-

ment of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA).

This is what the Transform Student Debt to Home Equity Act achieves. The bill authorizes HUD and FHFA to establish a pilot that connects creditworthy federal student debt holders with housing properties for sale but held by the federal government. By arranging financing that recalculates terms, debt-to-income ratios, interest rates, and other factors, short-term student debt could transition into longer-term home ownership. Eventually, participants would help restore neighborhoods, and buoy property values locally and on the federal ledger simply by maintaining and investing in a home mortgage.

The status quo has created a permanent class of millions of student debtors without the opportunity for equity homeownership. We have the resources, the power, and a compelling economic interest to do something about it.

Let's get started. I encourage my colleagues to support this measure and unleash this debt stranglehold on the next generation.

CONGRATULATING NEW YORK CITY MIDDLE SCHOOL DEBATE CHAMPIONS FOR 2016 AND 2017—MIDDLE SCHOOL 50

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and honor that I rise to congratulate the students, and teachers from Middle School 50 (MS 50)—the John D. Wells School on its successful reign as New York City Middle School Debate Champions for 2016 and 2017.

MS 50 is located in the Southside of Williamsburg, Brooklyn of my district. It serves students from 6th thru 8th grade and has an enrollment that is 82 percent Latino with 21 percent of the students being English Language Learners. Despite personal challenges, these students have persevered and are competitive debaters. The school's debate program has helped students develop lifelong skills like critical thinking, verbal and written communication, leadership, teamwork, and determination. They understand that debate is an art form that requires the tactful ability to argue or refute a policy while maintaining proper decorum.

Today, debate remains the bedrock of our constitution and political system. It is uplifting to know that these students recognize the power of words and understand the art of debate. I am extremely proud of them. I also want to recognize and commend Principal Ben Honoroff, Debate Coaches Jason Warren, Matthew Mason, Thuy-An Vo, Andrew Geathers, and Carolina Hidalgo, and teachers for their support of this program and working with the Middle School Quality Initiative, a New York City Department of Education program focused on preparing middle school students for college. Please join me in saluting the MS 50 Debate New York City Champion Debate Team of 2016 and 2017.

Kevin Ascension, Jusue Canatero Nixon, Brandy Flores, Anthony Imbert, Kelvin Imbert,

A-Tiyana Johnson, Leslie Malin, Tracey McKeever, Victoria Paredes, Reynaldo Ramos, Grant Shan, Daiana Valencia, Emma Pichardo, Crisagnelly Canario, Tarek Ali, Denise Merino, Bryan Jacinto, Mohammed Islam, Evelis Rodriguez.

Deirra DuBois, Samantha Espinal, Quanique Walker, Yariel Cruz Hernandez, Solina Perez, Heaven Nesbitt, Wendy Calderon, Ariel Roman, Trystan Keohane, Michel Reyes, Fernando Espinal, Dawlin Paredes, Carlos Francisco, Merelin Penalo, Lisa Diaz, Lesly Deleon Clemente, Albert Sanchez, Yisneiry Rodriguez.

NATIONAL HOMEOWNERSHIP
MONTH 2017

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the House Committee on Financial Services' Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance in recognition of June as National Homeownership Month.

For many families across this country, homeownership is the cornerstone of achieving their American Dream.

It has proven to be one of the most effective ways for lower-and middle-income families to build wealth.

Unfortunately, nearly a decade after the 2008 Financial Crisis, realizing the American Dream is still out of reach for too many Americans due to tightened mortgage credit standards throughout the industry.

Each year, National Homeownership Month provides us the opportunity to recognize and identify the significant benefits of homeownership and the resources needed to help more Americans become homeowners.

In that spirit, it is equally important that we continue to support efforts to improve financial literacy in the home buying process through the many housing counseling programs across the country.

That is why I introduced the Housing Financial Literacy Act, H.R. 851, which will help make homeownership a reality for more families by giving first-time homebuyers who complete a Department of Housing and Urban Development-certified housing counseling course a discount on their Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance premium of 25 basis points.

Let's make the American Dream of homeownership accessible for more Americans this National Homeownership Month and every month throughout the year.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF TRAFFORD REALTY CO.

HON. BILL POSEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a true success story in the world of American small business. Trafford Realty Co., based in Brevard County, Florida, is celebrating its 100th Anniversary, a true milestone for any small business.

In 1917, A. R. "Roy" Trafford and Russell Field opened Trafford and Field Realtors in Historic Cocoa Village to serve the residents of the City of Cocoa and the Brevard County community. Years later, Roy's son Al became Trafford's president and continued to lead the organization until 2009 at which time, at the age of 94, he promoted vice president and general manager Terry Lolmaugh to the position of president. Al continued to be active in the company until his passing in 2014 at the age of 99.

To recognize his many contributions to our community, the City of Cocoa renamed its amphitheater at Cocoa Riverfront Park to the Al Trafford Amphitheater in 2009.

Trafford Realty Co.'s leadership has witnessed the growth of Brevard County, from an area originally known for commercial fishing, citrus, and tourism to the center for space exploration. The company has survived and prospered through every national and local event of the 20th and 21st centuries, successfully enduring the effects of World Wars, economic depressions and recessions, local natural disasters, and man-made catastrophes.

Trafford Realty Co. has managed the sales and purchases of thousands of homes and commercial properties in Brevard County, and was instrumental in the development of some of Brevard County's most well-known subdivisions dating from 1924 through the 1970s, including: Carleton Terrace, Riverview Acres and Hardee Circle, Cocoa Isles, South Merritt Estates, and The Ranches.

Trafford Realty Co. has over 20 professional associates. Together, they have more than 345 years in cumulative real estate selling and buying experience. The Trafford Realty Co. prides itself on its experience, integrity and longevity. It will continue to serve the residents and businesses of Brevard County, with a reputation as one of our most trusted and respected businesses.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Trafford Realty and its employees for their continuing contributions to our community and for achieving 100 successful years in business.

CONGRATULATING JEREMY BOWDEN ON WINNING THE CONGRESSIONAL ART CONTEST FOR THE 24TH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jeremy Bowden for his winning piece in the Congressional Art Competition for the 24th District of Texas. Jeremy's artwork, titled "Lazy Day in Downtown Carrollton," is an oil painting of the center of Carrollton, Texas, where Jeremy lives with his fraternal twin brother Jason, his sister Kyra, and his parents Rhonda and Blake. The Congressional Art Competition is a great chance for students such as Jeremy to showcase their artistic talents and attain national recognition for their work.

As a child, Jeremy's strong interest in art, particularly drawing, was clear to Rhonda and Blake. His parents note that, from a young age, Jeremy had always been able to enter-

tain himself with only a pencil and paper. This interest became even more prominent during parent-teacher conferences, where Rhonda and Blake learned that Jeremy had a habit of drawing and doodling on everything he could get his hands on, including homework and essays.

It wasn't until high school, however, that Jeremy decided to take his interest in art seriously. Once he dedicated himself, he spent numerous hours in art lessons and working on art projects, submitting a few of these pieces in competitions. Some of these projects included work in animation, figure drawings, oil paintings, as well as sculptures. During his junior year in high school, his hard work and dedication to becoming a more skilled artist gained him some prestigious recognitions, including winning the 24th Congressional District of Texas Art Competition.

After Jeremy completes his senior year at Hebron High School, he hopes to attend an art college in the fall of 2018 to continue pursuing his goal of becoming a professional artist. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Jeremy on winning the Congressional Art Contest for the 24th District of Texas: I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in wishing Jeremy the best of luck in his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE BIRTHDAY OF LUCI BAINES JOHNSON, THE YOUNGER DAUGHTER OF U.S. PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AND HIS WIFE, FORMER FIRST LADY, LADY BIRD JOHNSON

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with Congressman BARTON, to recognize the birthday of Luci Baines Johnson. Ms. Luci Baines Johnson is the Chairwoman of LBJ Holding Co. She also serves as Vice President of The Business Suites and as a Director of LBJ Broadcasting Co. Ms. Johnson is also a member of the Board of Directors of the National Wildflower Research Center, a member of the advisory boards of both the Center for Battered Women and of "Believe in Me", and a life trustee of Seton Fund. After many years of service, we are pleased to recognize her today. On Sunday, July 2, 2017, she will be celebrating her 70th birthday.

Ms. Johnson has degrees from Georgetown University School of Nursing, the University of Texas, and St. Edward's University. Ms. Johnson has served as a Trustee of Boston University, is a past chairman of the Affiliate Fund-raising Drive for the American Heart Association, a former chairman of the University of Texas System School of Nursing, and a former member of the Board of Review of the National League of Nursing.

Through our shared passion for public service, we have developed a close relationship that continues to grow stronger by the year. Much like her parents before her, she has dedicated her life to public service and it has been an honor to see the contributions she has made throughout the state of Texas.

Throughout her life, she has constantly displayed the virtues of compassion, passion,

and integrity. By staying true to herself in the midst of adversity, she has managed to accomplish so much. Through her philanthropic efforts, she has been able to turn dreams into realities for so many.

Mr. Speaker, we congratulate Luci Baines Johnson on her successes, and we wish her a happy 70th birthday. We wish her success as she continues to fight for so many people, not only in the Great State of Texas, but across the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the recognition of the birthday and accomplishments of Luci Baines Johnson are worth acknowledging.

TRIBUTE TO ANDREA GUY

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it brings me great pride to announce that an educator from my district has been awarded the Gilder Lehrman Institute's Tennessee History Teacher of the Year Award.

Ms. Andrea Guy was nominated by her own students from Hardin Valley Academy for this very prestigious award.

Just one year ago, Andrea was selected to participate in the Supreme Court History Society's Summer Teacher Institute in Washington, D.C.

The education of our young people can only be as good as our teachers, and Andrea has showcased what great education looks like through her hard work and dedication to her students and to the history of Our Nation.

This is a very high honor that I am proud to recognize.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO TRAILBLAZING HOOSIER DERRICK BURKS ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Derrick Burks as he retires from Ernst & Young, a trailblazing Hoosier whose leadership has been transformative in our community. Derrick, a life-long Hoosier, was born in Indianapolis and is one of twelve children. He attended Indianapolis Public Schools from Kindergarten until graduation. Upon graduation from Shortridge High School in 1974, Derrick and his twin brother Darrell, through the encouragement of an older brother enrolled at Kentucky State University. Despite losing both parents at an early age and in the face of a tight budget both Derrick and Darrell enrolled. They found great success academically and then decided to transfer to Indiana University. They both pursued degrees in accounting and graduated with distinction in 1978.

After graduation, Derrick went to work at Arthur Andersen in Indianapolis while his twin Darrell pursued his successful accounting career in Detroit, Michigan. During his time with Arthur Andersen, Derrick was recognized for

his contributions to the firm on several occasions. In 1991, Derrick was promoted and became a partner at the firm, a position he held until May of 2000. When, at the age of 43, he was selected to become the Managing Partner. He was the first African-American to be named to this position by a large CPA firm in the state of Indiana. As the Managing Partner, Derrick was instrumental in the Arthur Andersen and Ernst & Young merger in 2002. He was then named the Managing Partner for Ernst & Young in 2004. Derrick has displayed exemplary capability and leadership throughout his entire career. As a member of the Ernst & Young's America's Ethnicity Diversity Task Force, Derrick embodied values that encouraged his colleagues to always do the right thing. Derrick's expertise is wide-ranging: his clients include small businesses, large multi-location corporations, and public companies across numerous fields of business. In addition to his work at the firm, Derrick has demonstrated a steadfast commitment to our community through numerous civic and community activities over the years.

Derrick is a prominent leader in the African-American community through his involvement with the Indiana Black Expo, the Indianapolis Museum of African American History, and the 100 Black Men of Indianapolis. Derrick is also involved with two historically African American fraternities, Kappa Alpha Psi, his undergraduate fraternity, as well as Sigma Pi Phi a post-graduate professional fraternal organization. Kappa Alpha Psi, founded in Bloomington, Indiana, strives to support their members in "achievement in every field of human endeavor". Sigma Pi Phi, also known as the Boule, was the first Greek-letter fraternity to be founded by African American men. Its membership consists of men with college or professional degrees who are prominent and contributing members of their communities.

In addition to his career in the accounting field, he is and has been actively involved in civic and community organizations including the Stadium Board, Goodwill Education Initiatives (Indianapolis Met Academy Charter Schools), Goodwill Industries, Boy Scouts of America, the Children's Museum, the United Way, Circle City Classic, the Mayor's Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee, Indianapolis Convention & Visitors Association Board, Indianapolis Metropolitan Career Academy and Kelley School of Business Dean's Advisory Council to name a few. Derrick is a member of the American Institute of CPAs and the Indiana CPA Society. He also served the Indiana community as Commissioner of the Indiana State Board of Accountancy and served as Treasurer for the 2012 Indianapolis Super Bowl Host Committee.

On behalf of all Hoosiers and as a dear friend and soccer parent who spent countless memorable hours over many years with the Burks family, I wish to extend a heartfelt thank you to Derrick for his contributions to Indiana businesses as well as his exemplary service and leadership to our community. I wish the very best to Derrick, to his special partner in life his wife Celeste, and his three amazing daughters, Channing, Ciersten, and Courtney in his well-deserved retirement and in the next exciting chapter of his life.

H.R. 3003 AND H.R. 3004

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to two punitive, anti-immigrant bills: H.R. 3003, the so-called "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act," and H.R. 3004, the so-called "Kate's Law." These cruel and unnecessary bills help to convert Donald Trump's vicious immigration rhetoric into policy that threatens the safety of our country and our communities.

H.R. 3003 coerces states and localities to cooperate with federal immigration enforcement, and bans them from receiving crucial federal funds if these jurisdictions don't comply. The bill also expands DHS's authority to detain individuals, even allowing them to be held in detention indefinitely, a provision which may violate the Fourth Amendment.

H.R. 3004 expands prosecutions for individuals for unauthorized re-entry and attempted re-entry into the United States. Under this bill, even asylum seekers and victims of human trafficking could be prosecuted by the federal government for simply entering the country. It would even allow prosecution of individuals who seek to re-enter the U.S. with legal authorization to do so.

These bills do clear and direct damage to America's safety and America's values. We do not make America more secure by holding ransom local law enforcement funds that keep us safe. We don't fight crime by making residents less likely to report crime. We do not honor America's humanitarian history by prosecuting asylum seekers and human trafficking victims. We do not honor family values by keeping immigrant families separated. We do not preserve America's strength as a thriving nation of immigrants by encouraging fear of those who have come to make our nation stronger. We do not preserve, protect, and defend the U.S. Constitution by letting law enforcement flout the Fourth Amendment, or by detaining individuals indefinitely.

These bills leave American communities less protected in the face of threats large and small. These bills insult America's reputation as a welcoming beacon for every nation, race, and faith. We must keep America safe, but we will not do so by demonizing and persecuting innocent immigrants. We need a sensible immigration policy, not one rooted in fear and hate. I call on Republicans to join me and my Democratic colleagues in developing a comprehensive immigration reform plan that keeps our borders secure, addresses the need for temporary workers, resolves the status of DREAMers and millions of other undocumented immigrants, and provides a path to citizenship.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004.

IN RECOGNITION OF ROGER THOMAS

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise with Congressman JARED HUFFMAN and Congressman

MIKE THOMPSON to recognize Roger Thomas, Captain of the Salty Lady, member of the California Outdoor Hall of Fame, and lifelong advocate to keep west coast salmon fisheries alive and sustainable. Many in this chamber, the California Legislature and multiple agencies have worked with Roger for decades and are proud to call this honorable and remarkable man a friend, mentor and colleague. He is one of the most decent and hard-working human beings one can know.

Roger's passion for fishing started as a child. Born in Gilroy, California, he started fishing at an early age for striped bass from the beaches along Monterey Bay and later for salmon from a small boat launched at the Monterey Pier. He was hooked on salmon fishing and became a regular customer on charter boats out of San Francisco. Before too long, one of the captains offered Roger a job as a deck hand and, as they say, the rest is history. Roger received his captain's license in 1968.

While working full-time for the County of Santa Clara on housing issues, he ran charter boats on weekends. At one point he had acquired a fleet of five boats that were run by several captains. In 1981, he retired from his government job and dedicated all of his time and energy to fisheries and ocean conservation. There hasn't been a salmon related association or council that Roger hasn't served on.

Since 1973, he has been the President of the Golden Gate Fishermen's Association which represents charter boats from Fort Bragg to Monterey and carries some 200,000 anglers each year. He is also the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Golden Gate Salmon Association which represents commercial and recreational fishermen and works on protecting salmon habitat. For 14 years, he has served on the Pacific Fisheries Management Council which, among other duties, sets the ocean salmon seasons. Roger is a member of the Bay Delta Advisory board, the Winter Run-Captive Broodstock Committee, the Central Valley Fisheries Coalition, the Marine Advisory Committee to the Secretary of Commerce, the Coastal Resources Foundation, the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission, the National Sea Grant Review Panel and the Marine Resources Committee.

Roger runs his charters on the Salty Lady out of Sausalito and Half Moon Bay. He proudly calls himself a salmon charter operation, but additionally runs whale watching and nature trips and has introduced thousands of children and adults to the magic of marine life. He has spent more than 10,000 days on the ocean and you will be hard-pressed to find someone with deeper knowledge and appreciation for that ecosystem. He also has the gift of storytelling and a mind that remembers every detail, including one of his most vivid ones from his childhood. He saw the last of the San Joaquin Spring run chinook salmon before they went extinct. His uncle took him to Friant Dam right after it was constructed. The salmon were stuck at the end of the line imposed to divert water to fields in the San Joaquin valley. They were "big fish," Roger says stretching out his arms, "just big fish."

Roger is a familiar face in Congress where he has represented the interests of the charter boat fleet and the health of west coast salmon stocks for decades. In the 1980s, he was appointed by then Vice President George Bush to the National Sea Grant Review Panel. In

this role he traveled to ports around the country and helped decide which projects were worthy and would be funded.

Roger was instrumental in former Representative George Miller's 1992 Central Valley Improvement Act and its eventual passage. The CVP is a key law to stop environmental harm to salmon and the Bay Delta. When salmon populations collapsed in 2008 and 2009, Roger worked closely with Representative MIKE THOMPSON to provide disaster relief to salmon fishermen.

Roger Thomas' tireless work has earned him the respect and adoration of countless people. With his recent tragic diagnosis of late stage cancer, it is our intention to express our appreciation for his outstanding work and lasting contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members of the House of Representatives to join us in celebrating the life of Roger Thomas who loves fish, loves the ocean, and above all loves people. He has touched many hearts, protected many livelihoods and has earned the admiration of coastal communities up and down the western seaboard.

IN HONOR OF THE 100TH YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA TROOP 100 OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. CHRIS COLLINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Boy Scouts of America Troop 100 of the District of Columbia on its 100th anniversary, and for its long history of heritage and service. As a co-chair of the Scouting Caucus and a life-long eagle scout, I am proud to recognize the oldest Troop in Washington, D.C.

The Boy Scouts of America was founded on February 8, 1910, here in Washington, D.C., when Chicago Publisher Mr. William D. Boyce and Washington, D.C. Railroad Tycoon Mr. Colin H. Livingstone filed the papers of incorporation. Less than a month later, in March 1910, the first Troop in Washington, D.C., Troop I, was formed at the G Street branch of the Y.M.C.A. On June 15, 1916, the Federal Charter of the Boy Scouts of America was signed into law by President Woodrow Wilson.

In the summer of 1917, due to size limitations, Troop I split, with the majority of its membership forming a new Troop. Subsequently, this newly formed Troop was ceremoniously given the Troop number of "100" by the District of Columbia Boy Scout Council, now known as the National Capital Area Council.

Over the years, Troop 100 has become the preeminent Troop in the Council by virtue of winning almost every special Scout Award available, including the Service Awards, Drill Awards, Signaling & Orienteering Awards, the Evening Star Inspection Trophy, and the coveted Washington Post Advancement Trophy. Additionally, Troop 100 has a history of demonstrating patriotism and heroism. Members have earned the War Service Awards for selling War Bonds, rescued individuals from burning buildings, and answered the call of duty by serving in one of the branches of the United States military.

Today, the Boy Scouts of America has more than 2.4 million active members, and 1 million adult volunteers. The Boy Scouts of America and Troop 100 continues to prepare young people to exercise ethical and moral judgments by teaching them the values of the Scout Oath and Scout Law, and remains faithful to its mission of "patriotism, courage, self-reliance, and kindred values," and its goal of providing "citizenship, service, and leadership."

Again, I would like to congratulate Washington, D.C.'s Boy Scouts of America Troop 100 on the occasion of their 100th anniversary, and its over 100 years of service, character and leadership development, and for instilling the values of the Scout Oath and the Scout Law in America's youth.

HONORING THE 154TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today we remember the Battle of Gettysburg, a clear turning point in our American history. I'm privileged and humbled to represent these hallowed grounds. This weekend, we commemorate the 154th Anniversary of the Battle—one that pit brother against brother, neighbor against neighbor, for three days of horrific and abject combat—not for hatred, but rather unbridled passion and loyalty to their respective causes; a loyalty that drove these Soldiers to give, in President Lincoln's words, "the last full measure of devotion."

Everything our Nation has achieved since that time—the expansion of freedom and liberty, civil rights, and centuries of human achievements—was borne of the sacrifice and struggle of the Soldiers who valiantly fought this Battle.

Beginning in 1888, Veterans from both sides of the conflict held reunions in Gettysburg to celebrate our unity and hopes for the future. The reunions would culminate with the lighting of the Eternal Light Peace Memorial in July 1938, the 75th Anniversary of the Battle, and the final Veteran's reunion. In the years since, millions of people from all over the world annually travel to Gettysburg to learn about our Nation's "new birth of freedom," and the National Park Service and an array of dedicated citizens and partners perform the critical work of inspiring us to learn and appreciate the significance of the Gettysburg Campaign, the Gettysburg Address and the Civil War.

On this 154th Anniversary, may God continue to bless the brave men and women who served and sacrificed at the Battle of Gettysburg. And may He rededicate us to "...the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced."

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RETIREMENT OF IRELAND'S AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES ANNE ANDERSON

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Ambassador Anne Anderson, the Irish Ambassador to the United States, as she retires from her position in the Irish Department of Foreign Affairs.

Throughout her time in the Irish Department of Foreign Affairs, Ambassador Anderson has served in assignments of great prestige as well as been the first woman to represent Ireland in all these positions. Her first post was as Ireland's Ambassador to the United Nations (UN) in Geneva in 1995. While there, she chaired the World Trade Organization (WTO) Trade Policy Review Body in 1996, followed by chairing the UN Commission on Human Rights in 1999. In 2001, she became Ireland's Permanent Representative to the European Union (EU), the first woman from any EU country to represent their nation in the European Parliament. In 2005, Ambassador Anderson became Ireland's Ambassador to France before being appointed as Ireland's Ambassador to the United Nations in New York in 2009. During her time at the UN, Ambassador Anderson focused on human rights, development, and gender equality issues. Furthermore, the Ambassador oversaw a review of the UN Peace-building machinery and facilitated preparations for the 2013 UN Special Event on the Millennium Development Goals.

On January 15, 2013, Ambassador Anderson was appointed as Ireland's 17th Ambassador to the United States. Throughout her time in Washington, Ambassador Anderson has focused on further strengthening Ireland-U.S. relations in regards to economics, trade, immigration, and culture. She especially did an exemplary job with all the U.S. events around the centenary of the 1916 Rising. Furthermore, Ambassador Anderson has focused on keeping the U.S. engaged in issues regarding Northern Ireland. Her engagement with the Friends of Ireland Caucus throughout her tenure has been critical in our country's continued involvement with the entire island of Ireland. In recognition of her outstanding service, Ambassador Anderson was presented with the International Leadership Award by the Ireland Funds this past March.

Mr. Speaker, as a co-chairman of the Friends of Ireland Caucus, I have gotten to know Ambassador Anderson very well as both a colleague and a friend. Anne has made momentous strides in strengthening Ireland-U.S. relations on numerous fronts and has been a great influence to our country. She will be greatly missed and I wish her all the best with her retirement and future endeavors.

HONORING THE LIFE OF EARLINE MILES

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Ms. Earline Miles, a beloved

member of the Fort Worth community and dear friend, who passed away on June 23, 2017.

Earline Dolores Miles was born on March 2, 1930, in Sherman, Texas, to Henri Jewel and William Andrew Miles. Earline was the only girl in a household with four brothers. She attended I.M. Terrell High School and was presented as an Assembly Debutante in 1948. After high school, Ms. Miles attended Sam Houston State University where she pledged Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. and was a member of the Ivy Leaf Club. She then went on to finish her undergraduate studies at Huston-Tillotson University, where she graduated Cum Laude with a Bachelor's of Arts in Business Administration in 1952.

In 1971, Earline achieved the great accomplishment of becoming the first black female lawyer in Tarrant County after earning her law degree from Thurgood Marshall School of Law at Texas Southern University. She also became the first black attorney to work for Rattikin Title Company as a Title Researcher.

While Ms. Miles had an extensive professional career as a lawyer and teacher, most people remember Earline for her fierce passion for political activism and civil rights. She spearheaded countless voter registration drives and fought hard to ensure that African Americans had equal opportunities in Tarrant County and equal representation in the media.

As part of her political career, Earline worked tirelessly to ensure that African Americans were elected to public office. She broke fundraising records for Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and worked on several campaign campaigns for African American politicians in Texas.

In addition to being a fierce advocate for civil rights, Earline was a devoted daughter, sister, and true friend. She was also just as much fun as she was known as the "cool aunt" to her nieces and nephews. Earline is survived by her goddaughter, two younger brothers, several nieces and nephews, and a host of cousins, great nieces and nephews, extended family members, and friends.

I honor Ms. Earline Miles's significant impact on the African American community.

RECOGNIZING ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month this June and to honor the over five million Americans that are currently living with this disease right now.

Alzheimer's is a progressive neurodegenerative brain disorder that disables the memory of individuals and causes cognitive decline. Of the top ten leading causes of death in the United States, Alzheimer's is the only disease that cannot be prevented, cured, or even slowed. On top of that, more than 15 million Americans are currently providing unpaid care for loved ones that suffer from Alzheimer's.

As a nation, we have a duty to serve all members of our community. We cannot allow this disease to progress unchecked, which is

why I ask my fellow Members of Congress to join me in honoring Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month and ensuring that the National Institutes of Health (NIH) has the necessary funding to continue Alzheimer's research. When it comes to the health of Americans, we cannot afford to take shortcuts.

Though Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month has come to an end, our efforts must continue. Mr. Speaker, it is with situations like this that our nation must come together. I am honored to help raise awareness for this worthy cause and invite my colleagues in Congress to join me on this fight.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF MR. WILLIAM SINKLER

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the life Mr. William Sinkler, 79, a dedicated educator who spent his life committed to serving the children and schools of Southwest Virginia. William (Bill) Sinkler was born on October 9, 1937, in Eutawville, South Carolina and his contributions to his community, particularly to young students, are impressive.

Mr. Sinkler was a true Southern gentleman, dignified, and held in high regards by all of us who know him. As an educator, he set high expectations for his students and modeled respect and integrity.

At the time of his retirement, Mr. Sinkler had spent 40 years as an educator, and was the first African-American to serve on the Salem School Board. For his commitment to the young minds of Lynchburg, Roanoke, and Salem, Mr. Sinkler received a Virginia General Assembly Resolution to recognize his devotion to the students. In the Resolution, he was recognized for his life motto, "I've got to be me," and how he brought his personality and talents into each endeavor he undertook.

He grew up in South Carolina, graduated from Morris College in 1960, and then served in the United States Army. After his service in the armed forces, Mr. Sinkler studied at Virginia State College and earned a Master's Degree in Education at University of Virginia. He taught Math and Science, and served as an Assistant Principal and a Principal. By the time of his retirement, Bill was the Vice-Chairman of the Salem School Board, where he had served from 1993 to 2009.

I remember Mr. Sinkler's friendship and his ability to work closely with officials on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Sinkler was a very involved member of the community, for years he served on the City of Salem's Fair Housing Board and Planning Commission, and was an active member of the Salem Rotary Club, Boule, The Links, Inc., NAACP, Kappa Delta Pi, and Phi Beta Sigma. He was also a dedicated member of the Shiloh Baptist Church, in Salem, Virginia. There, he served as a member of the Board of Trustees, and the superintendent of the church's Sunday school, as well as teaching Sunday school classes.

Mr. Sinkler was recognized through numerous awards, such as the Salem Police Department Citizen Academy Certificate of Recognition,

and Roanoke Valley Father of the Year, for Education.

My thoughts and prayers are with Mr. Sinkler's wife of 52 years, Marzetta; two sons, William and Wayne; two grandchildren, Karis and Mitchell; Sister Mary Q. Sinkler, and numerous extended family, as well as friends and loved ones.

It is impossible to measure the impact of such a dedicated educator. Mr. Sinkler's legacy as an educator will live in the achievements of all the students who were positively impacted by his hard work and devotion.

SOUTH KOREA'S NEW PRESIDENT,
MOON JAE-IN

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate South Korean President Moon Jae-in on his recent election. He will be visiting the U.S. this week and I'd like to be among the first to extend a hand of welcome.

South Korea is one of the United States' most critical allies. Not only do our two nations share a thriving economic partnership, but we cooperate closely on some of the most important security threats facing our world.

South Korea's neighbor to the North is one of these threats. Little Kim is no friend to the United States and he is no friend to the Republic of Korea.

I look forward to seeing how President Moon and the Trump Administration use this opportunity to deepen our friendship and further our economic and security cooperation. The U.S.-ROK alliance was forged in blood and continues under our shared commitment to democratic principles.

Working together, we can combat the forces of evil in this world.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING THE CAREER OF
GENERAL DANIEL B. ALLYN

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of the 35th Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, General Daniel B. Allyn. General Allyn's work ethic took him to the highest ranks of the military, serving as Commanding General of the United States Army Forces Command and XVIII Airborne—this in addition to leading forces on the Korean Peninsula and the Middle East.

After graduation from the United States Military Academy at West Point, and several years of military experience, General Allyn attended the United States Naval War College where he received a Master of Arts degree in National Security and Strategic Studies. Beginning his career at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, General Allyn was a member of the venerated 82nd Airborne Division.

Deployed on numerous operational assignments all over the globe and through some of our nation's toughest times; General Allyn

stood ready to answer the call to serve our great nation. Some of his most notable engagements were Operation Urgent Fury in Grenada during the Korean War, Operation Desert Storm in Saudi Arabia, Operation Desert Spring in Kuwait, Operation Iraqi Freedom in Iraq, and Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan. Throughout these operations, he delivered on the promise to keep America safe and confront our enemies head on under the most difficult conditions.

During these deployments, General Allyn received numerous medals, including the Distinguished Service Medal, Silver Star, Defense Superior Service Medal, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, and Joint Service Commendation Medal. These stunning achievements propelled General Allyn to one of the highest posts in the military, Vice Chief of Staff of the Army.

Confirmed by the United States Senate on July 23, 2014; General Allyn served as Vice Chief of Staff of the Army for nearly three years. This country cannot repay the debt we owe to General Allyn; he was truly one-of-a-kind.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in commemorating the retirement of the 35th Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, General Daniel B. Allyn.

IN HONOR OF THE PINEY WOODS
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
POST 4816

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I honor the 50th Anniversary of The Piney Woods Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 4816 in Porter, Texas.

Since the founding of Post 4816, on May 30, 1967, it has grown from a small unit of just forty members to a far-reaching organization of over three-hundred and fifty dedicated, engaged, and inspiring veterans.

For fifty years, this post has been an integral part of the Porter Community. Its members have dedicated their time and resources to giving back to local veterans and the entire Porter population. Every year, their fundraising efforts allow them to contribute over \$300,000 to local causes, improving the lives of everyone in their community. Among the recipients are local children's hospitals, community assistance centers, and veterans and military families in need.

In an effort to encourage community involvement and civil awareness, Post 4816 has created an awards program that recognizes outstanding teachers and students who display academic excellence and patriotism. Similar awards are reserved to recognize local law enforcement officers, medical first responders, and other public servants who show a clear dedication to improving their community.

Post 4816's commitment to service has gone far deeper than just public recognitions and charitable donations. By organizing hospital and home visits to sick and disabled veterans, Post 4816 has left a lasting impact on the lives of many of our community's former service members.

This support system is just one way that Post 4816 embodies the mission of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. By fostering a comradery amongst the veterans of overseas conflict, serving the current service members and veterans in our community, and advocating on behalf of all United States veterans, the members of Post 4816 have completed this mission many times over.

It is my honor to join our local veterans, the citizens of Porter, and the entire Eighth District of Texas to congratulate the veterans of Post 4816 on their fifty-year anniversary, to recognize their history of public service, and to thank them for their dedicated work for our veterans and our community.

IN MEMORY OF BILL SHEALY

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on December 14, 2016, South Carolina lost an American Hero with the passing of Bill Shealy. Bill and his brothers have an extraordinary history of military service during World War II. Of the seven brothers in the Shealy family, five served at the Invasion of Normandy, including Bill.

Bill and his twin brother, Bobby Shealy, served with the U.S. Navy on the same ship, the USS *Dale W. Peterson*. Remarkably, the USS *Dale W. Peterson* captured a German submarine headed to New York and the crew held the submarine for ten days until relief arrived to transport the submarine and its crew. During its final deployment to Japan, the Enola Gay dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and the ship was ordered to return to Pearl Harbor.

I am grateful for the admirable service and sacrifice of Bill Shealy and his brothers. The following thoughtful obituary was published in The State on December 16, 2016:

WEST COLUMBIA—Services for Billy "Bill" Shealy, 91, will be conducted at 11:00 am, Saturday, December 17, 2016, at Mt. Hermon Lutheran Church with The Rev. Eric Friedrichs officiating. Burial will follow in the church cemetery. Visitation will be from 6 to 8 p.m., Friday, December 16, 2016, at Barr-Price Funeral Home and Crematorium, Lexington Chapel. Memorials may be made to Mt. Hermon Lutheran Church "Growing on Holy Ground Fund", 3011 Leaphart Rd., West Columbia, SC 29169. Mr. Shealy died Wednesday, December 14, 2016.

Born December 2, 1925, in Cayce, SC, he was a son of the late Thad Shealy and Lizzie Derrick Shealy. A member of Mt. Hermon Lutheran Church, the Henri Bishop Sunday School Class, and Woodmen of the World Lodge 1276, he had retired from SC Department of Mental Health as an electronic technician. A US Navy and WWII veteran, he was in the Normandy invasion along with four of his brothers.

Survivors include his daughter Renee Coleman-Greenbaum (Dave); son Edwin Shealy; grandchildren; Amanda Robinette (Eddie), Russell Coleman (Brandy); great grandchildren Alex and Parker Greer; Zeke Coleman; brother Joe Shealy (Margie); along with many nieces and nephews whom he loved dearly. In addition to his parents, he was preceded in death by his wife, Doris Risinger Shealy, brothers Ryan Shealy, Carroll Shealy, Muller "Mutt" Shealy, Charles

“Chick” Shealy, Bobby Shealy; sisters Fredia Keisler, and Vanna Royalty.

TRIBUTE TO CHERYL DEATLEY

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to someone who has spent her career making a difference in the lives of children across Maryland and the National Capital region. I've known Cheryl DeAtley for many years and seen her passion and commitment to early childhood education up close. Cheryl started as a coordinator for Charles County's Judith P. Hoyer Early Child Care and Family Education Center, named in honor of my late wife, who dedicated her career to early childhood education and achievement as well. Since 2007, she has been at the Maryland State Department of Education, overseeing the entire network of Judy Centers, as they are known.

In leading the Judy Centers, Cheryl has presided over a period of rapid expansion. Under her guidance, the number of Judy Centers has more than doubled, growing from twenty-four locations in 2007 to fifty-one today. They serve more than 18,000 children across our state, helping to close the achievement gap for those entering elementary school by ensuring they and their families have access to a range of beneficial services. These include early education, medical and dental screenings, family literacy courses, and early intervention for children with special needs. For parents, adult education takes place on-site as well. Judy Centers are a one-stop-shop for low-income families to prepare their children to enter school ready to learn and grow alongside their peers.

Cheryl DeAtley has been critical to the program's success. Tirelessly, she's written grant proposals, overseen program finances, advocated before state and federal agencies, and publicized the merits of the Judy Centers in support of expanding the full-service, community school model around the country. Particularly, she's been instrumental in creating public-private partnerships, such as with the Baltimore Community Foundation, to sponsor new Judy Centers. Cheryl has made a point of visiting every single Judy Center annually. I've worked closely with her to ensure that Judy Centers and the Maryland children and families they serve have the resources they need. Sadly for the program, Cheryl will be leaving next month to become a Program Manager at the non-profit Center for Children for its Healthy Families Southern Maryland Program, serving Charles and St. Mary's counties. Thankfully, this means Maryland families will continue to benefit from Cheryl's talent and experience.

Earlier in her career, before a stint in the private sector with a company operating after-school programs, Cheryl served for seven years with the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA). There, she oversaw the GSA's child care program for the entire National Capital Region, supervising a network of twenty-six child care centers serving federal employees. For her last two years at GSA, Cheryl held the position of Child Care Policy Advisor

to the Associate Administrator for Child Care, bringing her depth and breadth of experience to the shaping of nation-wide federal child care policies. Cheryl holds a bachelor's degree in Management Studies from the University of Maryland University College and a master's degree in Early Childhood Human Development from the University of Maryland College Park.

I want to thank Cheryl for her outstanding contributions to early childhood education and to furthering the full-service, community school model in Maryland. It's been a real pleasure working with her over the years to enhance the work of the Judy Centers, and I look forward to working with Cheryl in her new capacity to advance the cause of early childhood health and wellness in Maryland's Fifth District. I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating Cheryl DeAtley on all she has achieved in service to Maryland and wish her well in her next endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE
FERNANDES FAMILY

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Fernandes Family on being nominated the 2017 Kings County Dairy Family of the Year.

The Fernandes Family legacy began when Adao Fernandes immigrated from the Terceira Island of the Portuguese Azores to Tulare, California, in 1977 with dreams of owning a dairy. Once in the United States, Adao worked as a herdsman for Phillipe Ribeiro and Sons, a dairy in Tulare. In 1979, Adao met his wife, Maria Osvalda Avila, who also immigrated from the Azores at a young age, at the Tulare County Fair. The couple married on June 21, 1981 in Tulare at Saint Aloysius Catholic Church.

Mr. and Mrs. Fernandes spent the next nineteen years in Tulare, while Adao continued to work at Phillipe Ribeiro and Sons dairy. In this time, the couple raised three children, Adam, Osvaldo, and Mark. Their eldest son, Adam Fernandes, was born on April 21, 1983. Adam and his wife, Christen, have two boys, Adam and John, and own a local small business, Lost Sock Laundromat. Osvaldo “Ozzie” Fernandes and his wife Katie have two children, Carsyn and Ella. Ozzie, recently made partner, works with his father on the dairy as a partner in the family business. The Fernandes' youngest son, Mark, resides in Hanford, California, and is an employee for the County of Kings.

In 1990, Adao Fernandes partnered with his brother in law, Arnold Avila. With the help of the Valadao Family, the partners established the Avila and Fernandes Dairy consisting of four hundred and fifty cows. In 1999, Adao and Arnold ended their partnership to each manage their own dairy, and Adao's operation became known as the Fernandes Dairy. Adao Fernandes expanded his dairy to host approximately 1,300 cows. In 2016, Fernandes Dairy received the Dairy Herd Improvement Association Lifetime Milk Award.

This year, the Fernandes Family is being honored as the 2017 Kings County Dairy Cou-

ple of the Year at the Kings County June Dairy Month Committee Dinner in Hanford, California. This award is given to prominent dairy families in the community. The Fernandes Family upholds the principles, responsibility, and dedication this award stands for by successfully representing the dairy industry.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Fernandes Family for their influence in the dairy industry, and congratulating them on being Kings County Dairy Family of the Year.

GAGGING THE LAWYERS: CHINA'S
CRACKDOWN ON HUMAN RIGHTS
LAWYERS AND ITS IMPLICA-
TIONS FOR U.S.-CHINA RELA-
TIONS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I made the following remarks at the hearing held by the Congressional-Executive Commission on China which I co-chair with Senator MARCO RUBIO regarding China's crackdown on human rights lawyers:

Chinese officials repeatedly tell me I should focus more on the positive aspects of China and not dwell so much on the negative.

That is an extremely difficult task when you read the horrifying and sadistic accounts of torture and enforced disappearances experienced by lawyers and rights advocates.

It is hard to be positive when you contemplate Liu Xiaobo's cancer diagnosis and the fact that China effectively silenced its most brilliant democracy advocate.

The empty chair at Oslo speaks volumes about the Communist Party's abiding fear that freedom will upend the power of the privileged few when they should be seeing liberty as a path to greater peace and prosperity.

At a hearing last month in the Subcommittee on Global Human Rights in the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I heard testimony from the wives of five detained or disappeared human rights lawyers. These courageous women have become effective advocates from their husbands and for all those detained in the “709” crackdown.

They described in horrifying detail the physical, mental, and psychological torture experienced by their husbands, including marathon interrogation sessions, sleep deprivation, beatings, crippling leg torture, and prolonged submersion in water.

Many of their husbands also were forced to take alarming quantities of drugs including tranquilizers, barbiturates, antipsychotic drugs, and other unknown substances daily.

What they described was shocking, offensive, immoral, and inhumane. It is also possible that Chinese officials believe the international community will not hold them accountable.

After the hearing, I wrote to the heads of the American Medical Association, the American Psychological Association, the World Health Organization, as well as to Secretary of State Tillerson and Ambassador Nikki Haley.

I have asked for condemnation of the practice of torture and medical experimentation on

prisoners of conscience. I have also asked for investigations so that serious questions will be asked of the Chinese government.

Finally, I have asked for accountability. I have urged Secretary Tillerson to start investigations under the Global Magnitsky Act, a bill that I lead on the House side last year, so that any Chinese government officials complicit in torture should never be allowed to benefit from entry to the U.S. or access to our financial system.

The issues of torture and “residential surveillance in a designated location”—effectively enforced disappearances—will be priorities of mine and of this Commission moving forward. I believe these are issues where diverse and multi-level coalitions can be built to raise issues with the Chinese government.

I would also like to do more to prioritize the protection of human rights lawyers and their families.

At the hearing last month I heard the phrase “The War on Law” used to describe the systematic effort to eviscerate the network of human rights lawyers.

That phrase struck me because, though the number of human rights lawyers in China is small, what they stand for was nothing less than the rule of law for everyone—particularly those persecuted or aggrieved by the Communist Party.

They stand for the right of everyone in China—religious believers, ethnic minority, petitioners, labor activists, or victim of corruption or a barbaric population control policies—to have a fair hearing, due process, and a justice that is not politicized.

The Communist Party sees this as a dangerous idea. It means that they should be accountable to the people—to hundreds of millions of people in fact seeking redress for persecution and Party corruption.

Xi Jinping is feted in Davos for his commitments to openness and the rule of law, but it is rule of law for the few and privileged and rule by law for the rest.

The failure to implement the rule of law, to favor a type of lawlessness in the pursuit of keeping the Communist Party in power, has serious and lasting implications for U.S.-China relations.

We must recognize, after the failure of two and a half decades of the engagement policies, that China’s domestic repression drives its external aggression, its mercantilist trade policies, and its unimaginable decisions to keep propping up a murderous North Korean regime.

I know the Chinese government wants me to focus on positive things. I think one positive development here is that the spouses (and families) of rights advocates and lawyers have given Beijing a rightly deserved headache. They have refused to be silent about their spouse’s detentions or disappearances and have used the Internet and media to get out their message.

This trend is something new, something different, something we need to honor because they are under great pressure to be silent—through intimidation, harassment, and detention.

I want to say to our witness Chongyu (CHONG—YOU) that we appreciate your testimony here today and the fact that you are speaking out on behalf of your father. We want you to know that this Commission is an advocate for you, your family, and your father.

If you or your family face reprisals because of your testimony here today, the Congress will take it as a personal affront to the work of this body.

I know your petition has gathered 94,000 signatures, please make sure that my name is 94,001.

The one thing that gives me hope is that the people of China long for liberty, justice and opportunity.

The need for principled and consistent American leadership is more important than ever, as China’s growing economic power, and persistent diplomatic efforts, have succeeded in dampening global criticism of its escalating repression and failures to adhere to universal standards.

The U.S. must be a beacon of liberty and a champion of individual rights and freedoms. The U.S. must also continue to be a voice for those silenced, jailed, or repressed in China.

We cannot . . . will not . . . forget those in China bravely seeking liberty and justice and the unalienable rights we all share. Like China’s human rights lawyers—and like Liu Xiaobo—those who bravely seek peaceful change in China.

It is their stand for liberty, human rights, and the rule of law that remain the best hope for a peaceful and prosperous future for the U.S. and China.

RECOGNIZING MACKENZIE GORE AS 2016–17 GATORADE NORTH CAROLINA BASEBALL PLAYER OF THE YEAR

HON. DAVID ROUZER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I’m proud to say that North Carolina is home to many great student athletes that serve as community role models.

One prime example is MacKenzie Gore who graduated from Whiteville High School this month and has been named the 2017 Gatorade North Carolina Baseball Player of the Year. And, not only that, he was just recently selected 3rd overall in the Major League Baseball draft by the San Diego Padres!

MacKenzie not only demonstrates athletic excellence, but also exemplary character and work ethic—the two primary traits necessary for great success. Very few have achieved as much as early in life, and it’s the culmination of years of hard work and commitment.

As with all who earn success, MacKenzie is blessed to have a big decision to make: go pro and play for the Padres or head to East Carolina University to play for the Pirates. Whatever MacKenzie decides, we are all proud of him and wish him the very best.

CELEBRATING IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH

HON. DAN NEWHOUSE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of Immigrant Heritage Month.

The month of June is a time for us to celebrate the people that have come to the United States to make a better life for themselves and their families. These individuals have come from all over the globe and play an integral part in the development of our country.

Since its founding, America has been a nation of immigrants. It is important that we acknowledge their contributions to our communities and remember that it was the goals and dreams of immigrants that formed our great nation. I am honored to represent Central Washington, where our culture and economy are deeply enriched by our immigrant neighbors and friends.

Please join me in honoring Immigrant Heritage Month, as I continue to work to ensure opportunity and prosperity for immigrants in my district and across the country.

H. CON. RES. 67—LIU XIAOBO

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, and urge the House to pass this resolution. We need to signal the Congress’s unanimous support for Liu Xiaobo, and his wife Liu Xia, in this time of need.

The news of Liu Xiaobo diagnosis with terminal liver cancer was a jarring shock to everyone who admires this champion of freedom and democracy.

Unfortunately, I have heard talk that the world has forgotten Liu Xiaobo. The Chinese state media says he is irrelevant.

We must never forget this Václav Havel of China because his efforts to bring human rights and political reforms are so critical to the future of U.S.-China relations.

We must never forget his enduring contributions—whether during the Tiananmen Massacre where he helped save the lives of many students or with Charter 08—the treatise urging political and legal reforms in China based on constitutional principles.

For the past seven years, Members of Congress have repeatedly called on China to release unconditionally Liu Xiaobo and Liu Xia.

Today, we similarly ask that the Chinese government end this absurdity and its unjust and lawless treatment of these noble citizens—release them, allow them to freely meet with friends and family, and allow them to seek urgent medical care wherever they desire.

In February 2010, I led a bipartisan group of lawmakers in nominating Liu Xiaobo for the Nobel Peace Prize, at the same time nominating two other persecuted human rights advocates, Chen Guangcheng and Gao Zhisheng, to be joint recipients of that most prestigious award.

The Nobel Committee rightly awarded the Peace Prize to Liu Xiaobo for his “long and non-violent struggle for fundamental human rights in China.” I attended the Oslo ceremony at the invitation of the family—along with Leader PELOSI.

It was a moving ceremony; the now famous empty chair spoke volumes about the Chinese Communist Party’s abiding fear that human rights and democracy will undermine its power.

I will always remember the moving words of Liu Xiaobo's speech that day:

"Freedom of expression is the foundation of human rights, the source of humanity, and the mother of truth. To strangle freedom of speech is to trample on human rights, stifle humanity, and suppress truth."

Chinese authorities have gone to great lengths to stifle Liu Xiaobo's ability to speak truth to power. In 2009, Liu was given 11 years in prison for "inciting subversion of state power."

His wife Liu Xia was also detained in de facto form "house arrest" since 2010. Liu Xia also is in urgent need of medical care having been hospitalized for a heart condition. Over the past year, authorities have allowed her to visit her husband only on a very few occasions.

According to Chinese authorities, Liu's conviction was based on Charter 08, a treatise signed by over 300 intellectuals and activists. That document states that freedom, equality, and human rights are universal values of humankind, and that democracy and constitutional government are the fundamental framework for protecting these values.

Sadly, Liu Xiaobo and Liu Xia are not alone in facing unjust repression. As of September 2017, the Congressional-Executive Commission on China" (CECC) Political Prisoner Database, perhaps the most complete database of its kind in the world, contains information on 1,400 cases of known political or religious prisoners.

According to CECC's Annual Report, the government of President Xi Jinping has engaged in an extraordinary assault on the rule of law, human rights, ethnic minority groups, and civil society in recent years.

Under Xi's leadership, the Chinese government has pushed through new laws and drafted legislation that would legitimize political, religious, and ethnic repression, further curtail civil liberties, and expand censorship of the Internet.

It is tempting to be pessimistic about China's future and the future of U.S.-China relations. I am not pessimistic, despite the circumstance we consider here today. Constant repression has not dimmed the desires of the Chinese people for freedom and reform. I attribute this fact, in part, to Liu Xiaobo's ideas and example.

Nevertheless, the U.S. cannot be morally neutral or silent in the face of the Chinese government's repression of fundamental freedoms. We must show leadership and resolve because only the U.S. has the power and prestige to stand up to China's intransigence.

The U.S. must not shy away from meeting with China's other Nobel Laureate the Dalai Lama or other dissidents. We must use Congressionally-authorized sanctions to hold Chinese officials accountable for torture and gross abuses. We must connect Internet and press freedoms as both economic and human rights priorities. And we must demand, repeatedly and clearly, that the unconditional release of political prisoners is in the interest of better U.S.-China relations.

I believe that someday China will be free. Someday, the people of China will be able to enjoy all of their God-given rights. And a nation of free Chinese men and women will honor and celebrate Liu Xiaobo as a hero. He will be honored along with all others like him who have sacrificed so much, and so long, for freedom.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3837–S3867

Measures Introduced: Forty-six bills and eight resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1472–1517, S. Res. 210–215, and S. Con. Res. 20–21.

Pages S3857–59

Measures Reported:

H.R. 1029, to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to improve pesticide registration and other activities under the Act, to extend and modify fee authorities, with amendments.

Page S3857

Measures Passed:

Engrossment Correction: Senate agreed to S. Res. 210, to correct the engrossment of S. 722.

Page S3842

Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act—

Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Secretary of the Senate be directed to request the return of papers for S. 722, to Provide Congressional Review and to Counter Iranian and Russian Governments' Aggression, from the House of Representatives.

Page S3842

Pro Forma Sessions—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn, to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted on the following dates and times and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Monday, July 3, 2017, at 6 p.m.; and Thursday, July 6, 2017, at 9 a.m.; and that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, July 6, 2017, it next convene at 3 p.m., on Monday, July 10, 2017.

Page S3847

Rao Nomination—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the nomination of Neomi Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

Pages S3837–42

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 59 yeas to 36 nays (Vote No. 155), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

Page S3839

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, July 10, 2017, Senate resume consideration of the nomination, post-cloture; and that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, the post-cloture time on the nomination expire at 5:30 p.m.

Page S3847

Hagerty Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of William Francis Hagerty IV, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador to Japan.

Pages S3846–47

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of David C. Nye, of Idaho, to be United States District Judge for the District of Idaho.

Page S3847

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.

Page S3846

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding Rule XXII, it be in order to move to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

Page S3846

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

Page S3846

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Matthew P. Donovan, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Ellen M. Lord, of Rhode Island, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

Christopher Campbell, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Peter B. Davidson, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

Robert L. Sumwalt III, of South Carolina, to be Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term of two years.

Brenda Burman, of Arizona, to be Commissioner of Reclamation.

Douglas W. Domenech, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Jason Kearns, of Colorado, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission for the term expiring December 16, 2024.

Luis E. Arreaga, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Guatemala.

Krishna R. Urs, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Peru.

Jerome M. Adams, of Indiana, to be Medical Director in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, and to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for a term of four years.

Janet Dhillon, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2022.

William J. Emanuel, of California, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring August 27, 2021.

Gerald W. Fauth, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2020.

Joshua A. Deahl, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals for the term of fifteen years.

Susan M. Gordon, of Virginia, to be Principal Deputy Director of National Intelligence.

Eric S. Dreiband, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Brendan Carr, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2018.

Brendan Carr, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2018.

Kay Bailey Hutchison, of Texas, to be United States Permanent Representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador.

A routine list in the Foreign Service.

Pages S3866–67

Messages from the House: **Page S3856**

Measures Referred: **Page S3856**

Measures Placed on the Calendar:
Pages S3837, S3857

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S3857**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S3859–60**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:
Pages S3860–66

Additional Statements: **Page S3856**

Notices of Intent: **Page S3866**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S3842**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—155) **Page S3839**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 11 a.m. and adjourned at 5:45 p.m., until 6 p.m. on Monday, July 3, 2017. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3847.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

H.R.1029, to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to improve pesticide registration and other activities under the Act, to extend and modify fee authorities, with amendments; and

The nomination of J. Christopher Giancarlo, of New Jersey, to be Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

CONSERVATION AND FORESTRY IN THE FARM BILL

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine conservation and forestry, focusing on perspectives on the past and future direction for the 2018 Farm Bill, after receiving testimony from Tom Tidwell, Chief, Forest Service, Jimmy Bramblett, Deputy Chief for Programs, Natural Resources Conservation Service, and Misty Jones, Director, Conservation and Environmental Programs Division, Farm Service Agency, all of the Department of Agriculture; Steven Horning, Horning Farms, Watertown, South Dakota; Paul D. Dees, Delta Wildlife, Stoneville, Mississippi; Barbara Downey, Downey Ranch, Wamego, Kansas, on behalf of the National Cattlemen's Beef Association; Adam Sharp, Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Columbus, Ohio; Salem G. Saloom, American Forest Foundation and the National Wild Turkey Federation, Brewton, Alabama; Chuck Roady, F.H. Stoltze Land and Lumber Company, Columbia Falls, Montana, on behalf of the Federal Forest Resource Coalition; and Christopher Topik, The Nature Conservancy, Arlington, Virginia.

APPROPRIATIONS: NASA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, after receiving testimony from Robert Lightfoot, Acting Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

APPROPRIATIONS: SENATE SERGEANT AT ARMS AND CAPITOL POLICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch concluded open and closed hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Senate Sergeant at Arms and the Capitol Police, after receiving testimony from Frank J. Larkin, Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate; and Matthew R. Verderosa, Chief of Police, Capitol Police.

HOUSING FINANCE REFORM

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine principles of housing finance reform, after receiving testimony from Edward J. DeMarco, Housing Policy Council of the Financial Services Roundtable, Silver Spring, Maryland; and David H. Stevens, Mortgage Bankers Association, and Michael D. Calhoun, Center for Responsible Lending, both of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1405, to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 875, to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study and submit a report on filing requirements under the Universal Service Fund programs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1426, to amend the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act to expand the purposes of the corporation, to designate the United States Center for Safe Sport, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1393, to streamline the process by which active duty military, reservists, and veterans receive commercial driver's licenses; and

The nominations of David P. Pekoske, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, Robert L. Sumwalt III, of South Carolina, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board, and Derek Kan, of California, to be Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1312, to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1311, to provide assistance in abolishing human trafficking in the United States, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nomination of Stephen Elliott Boyd, of Alabama, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 58 public bills, H.R. 3104–3161; and 10 resolutions, H.J. Res. 107; H. Con. Res. 68; and H. Res. 422–429 were introduced. **Pages H5373–77**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H5379–80**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Jody B. Hice (GA) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5299**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:51 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H5305**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Bishop Stephen E. Blaire, Diocese of Stockton, Stockton, CA. **Page H5305**

No Sanctuary for Criminals Act: The House passed H.R. 3003, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify provisions relating to assistance by States, and political subdivision of States, in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws, by a yea-and-nay vote of 228 yeas to 195 nays, Roll No. 342. **Pages H5316–33, H5353–55**

Rejected the Demings motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 181 yeas to 230 nays, Roll No. 341.

Pages H5332–33, H5353–54

H. Res. 414, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3003) was agreed to yesterday, June 28th.

Kate’s Law: The House passed H.R. 3004, to amend section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to reentry of removed aliens, by a recorded vote of 257 yeas to 167 noes, Roll No. 344. **Pages H5333–53, H5355–56**

Rejected the Lofgren motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 193 yeas to 232 nays, Roll No. 343. **Pages H5352–53, H5355**

H. Res. 415, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3004) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 236 yeas to 191 noes, Roll No. 340, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 235 yeas to 190 nays, Roll No. 339.

Pages H5308–16

Urging the Government of the People’s Republic of China to unconditionally release Liu Xiaobo, together with his wife Liu Xia, to allow them to freely meet with friends, family, and counsel and seek medical treatment wherever they desire: The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to H. Con. Res. 67, urging the Government of the People’s Republic of China to unconditionally release Liu Xiaobo, together with his wife Liu Xia, to allow them to freely meet with friends, family, and counsel and seek medical treatment wherever they desire. **Page H5356**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Monday, July 3rd. **Page H5356**

Senate Messages: Message received from the Senate and message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on pages H5308 and H5353.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5315–16, H5316,

H5353–54, H5354, H5355, and H5355–56. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:39 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Appropriations: Full Committee held a markup on the Defense Appropriations Bill, FY 2018; and the Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, FY 2018. The Defense Appropriations Bill, FY 2018; and the Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, FY 2018, were ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a markup on the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2018. The Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2018, was forwarded to the full committee, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a markup on the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Bill, FY 2018. The Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Bill, FY 2018, was forwarded to the full committee, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 986, the “Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2017”; H.R. 2776, the “Workforce Democracy and Fairness Act”; and H.R. 2775, the “Employee Privacy Protection Act”. H.R. 986, H.R. 2776, and H.R. 2775 were ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a markup on H.R. 767, the “SOAR to Health and Wellness Act of 2017”; H.R. 880, the “MISSION ZERO Act”; H.R. 931, the “Firefighter Cancer Registry Act of 2017”; and H.R. 2422, the “Action for Dental Health Act of 2017”. H.R. 767, H.R. 880, H.R. 931, and H.R. 2422 were forwarded to the full committee, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Middle East and North Africa held a markup on H. Res. 185, to call on the Government of Iran to fulfill repeated promises of assistance in the case of Robert

Levinson, the longest held United States civilian in our Nation's history; H. Res. 218, to recognize the importance of the United States-Israel economic relationship and encouraging new areas of cooperation; H. Res. 274, to condemn the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights; H. Res. 317, to call for the unconditional release of United States citizens and legal permanent resident aliens being held for political purposes by the Government of Iran; H. Res. 359, to urge the European Union to designate Hizballah in its entirety as a terrorist organization and increase pressure on it and its members; and H.R. 2646, the "United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Extension Act". H. Res. 218, H. Res. 274, and H. Res. 317 were forwarded to the full committee, as amended. H. Res. 359, H.R. 2646, and H. Res. 185 were forwarded to the full committee, without amendment.

RECENT TRENDS IN INTERNATIONAL ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law held a hearing entitled "Recent Trends in International Antitrust Enforcement". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXAMINING ACCESS TO OIL AND GAS DEVELOPMENT ON FEDERAL LANDS

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled "Examining Access to Oil and Gas Development on Federal Lands". Testimony was heard from Katharine MacGregor, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior; Laura Nelson, Governor's Energy Advisor, Utah Governor's Office of Energy Development; and public witnesses.

IN-SPACE PROPULSION: STRATEGIC CHOICES AND OPTIONS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Space held a hearing entitled "In-Space Propulsion: Strategic Choices and Options". Testimony was heard from William Gerstenmaier, Associate Administrator, Human Exploration and Operations Directorate, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Stephen Jurczyk, Associate Administrator, Space Technology Mission Directorate, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and public witnesses.

A REVIEW OF SBA'S 504/CDC LOAN PROGRAM

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax, and Capital Access held a hearing entitled "A Review of SBA's 504/CDC Loan Program". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on H.R. 2006, the "VA Procurement Efficiency and Transparency Act"; H.R. 2749, the "Protecting Business Opportunities for Veterans Act of 2017"; H.R. 2781, the "Ensuring Veteran Enterprise Participation in Strategic Sourcing Act"; and legislation to improve the hiring, training, and efficiency of acquisition personnel and organizations of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes. Testimony was heard from Thomas Burgess, Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Logistics and Supply Chain Management, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a hearing on H.R. 282, the "Military Residency Choice Act"; H.R. 1690, the "Department of Veterans Affairs Bonus Transparency Act"; H.R. 2631, the "Justice for Servicemembers Act of 2017"; H.R. 2772, the "SEA Act"; legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish assistance for adaptations of residences of veterans in rehabilitation programs under chapter 31 of such title, and for other purposes; and legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit appraisers approved by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make appraisals for purposes of chapter 37 of such title based on inspections performed by third parties. Testimony was heard from Representatives Stefanik, Wittman, Tenney, Cicilline, and Taylor; Curtis L. Coy, Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Opportunity, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

COMPLEXITIES AND CHALLENGES OF SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE AND PAYROLL TAX COMPLIANCE FOR STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security; and Subcommittee on Oversight held a joint hearing entitled "Complexities and Challenges of Social Security Coverage and Payroll Tax Compliance for State and Local Governments". Testimony was heard from Marianna LaCanfora, Acting Deputy Commissioner, Office of Retirement and

Disability Policy, Social Security Administration; Sunita Lough, Commissioner, Tax Exempt and Government Entities Division, Internal Revenue Service; and a public witness.

ONGOING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Ongoing Intelligence Activities”. This hearing was closed.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D701*)

S. 1083, to amend section 1214 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for stays during a period that the Merit Systems Protection Board lacks a quorum. Signed on June 27, 2017. (Public Law 115–42)

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY,
JULY 3, 2017**

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

6 p.m., Monday, July 3

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will meet in a pro forma session.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

11 a.m., Monday, July 3

House Chamber

Program for Monday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 11 a.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Beatty, Joyce, Ohio, E932
Blum, Rod, Iowa, E923
Brady, Kevin, Tex., E924, E936
Brooks, Susan W., Ind., E933
Budd, Ted, N.C., E925
Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E922, E923
Calvert, Ken, Calif., E928
Carson, André, Ind., E928
Castro, Joaquin, Tex., E930
Collins, Chris, N.Y., E927, E934
Comstock, Barbara, Va., E928
Conaway, K. Michael, Tex., E926
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E930
Correa, J. Luis, Calif., E935
Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E927
Duncan, John J., Jr., Tenn., E933
Dunn, Neal P., Fla., E927

Gibbs, Bob, Ohio, E929
Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E935
Guthrie, Brett, Ky., E921
Hensarling, Jeb, Tex., E921
Hill, J. French, Ark., E925
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E923, E937
Hudson, Richard, N.C., E924, E936
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E932
Jordan, Jim, Ohio, E929
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E925, E931
Katko, John, N.Y., E924
Keating, William R., Mass., E926
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E921
Krishnamoorthi, Ill., E921
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E932
Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E926
McColum, Betty, Minn., E928, E930
Mitchell, Paul, Mich., E929
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E931

Neal, Richard E., Mass., E935
Newhouse, Dan, Wash., E938
Perry, Scott, Pa., E934
Poe, Ted, Tex., E924, E936
Posey, Bill, Fla., E932
Rouzer, David, N.C., E938
Roybal-Allard, Lucille, Calif., E933
Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E922
Shuster, Bill, Pa., E927
Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E930
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E937, E938
Smith, Jason, Mo., E926
Speier, Jackie, Calif., E933
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E924
Valadao, David G., Calif., E922, E937
Veasey, Marc A., Tex., E925, E935
Velázquez, Nydia M., N.Y., E931
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E929
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E923, E936



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.