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. 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 play in the lives of Americans and the
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 society 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 activities that contribute to a healthy 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. I am blessed with being able to enjoy the 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 Support 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 other individuals 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 long time. Last year he was 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 1896, 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 Marilene, and his 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, the Kreitlow 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.
Mr. Speaker, I am going to stand here and remind the American people of the cost of our silence. We lost 7,490 Americans in the last year. 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; ten dollars—Harry Canady, Jr., 20, killed sitting on a porch in Racine; eleven dollars—Sean Bialas, 23, of Kenosha, shot and killed while physically unable to defend himself; twelve dollars—David Bauspies, 36, of McHenry, accidently shot and killed in East Troy; thirteen dollars—Jose Torres, 36, murdered on the 1600 block of Holmes Avenue in Racine; fourteen dollars—Nicholas Chanlik, 17, of Racine, killed by a domestic abuser, likely while defending his mother; fifteen dollars—David Tilton, 37, of Janesville; sixteen dollars—James Norris, 37, was killed at his job as a restaurant delivery driver in Racine; seventeen dollars—Jeremy Trawitzki, 38, killed in Muskego; eighteen dollars—Thomas Kruse, 41, killed in Muskego; nineteen dollars—Joseph Hensel, 27, killed in Elkhorn; twenty dollars—Andrew Jones, Jr., 27, also killed by his friend in Racine; twenty-one dollars—Maurice Carter was shot and killed in a Racine County robbery; twenty-two 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 Wisconsin (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 today.

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 Collegeville, 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 open with them. 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 illness, 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: “I believe 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 be-
cause 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 grades.’ But I never lis-
tened, and I always argued with him
because I believe that my education
was important enough to take the
risksy 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 must all be proud of him and the
thousands of other young men and
young women every day who are fight-
ning through adversity to achieve, who
will go on to make this a greater coun-
try than it already is; and it is a re-
minder 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 op-
opportunity for the next generation, and
it is they who will make our country an
evener. It is our 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 com-
ments and remarks of the gentlewoman
from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) with regard
to being mindful of the deaths from
gun violence that plague our communi-
cities all across the country, and par-
ticularly as the summer has begun,
these deaths will continue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak
today about another kind of gun vio-
ence 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 moth-
ers 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. 3968, the Preventing Trage-
dies 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 legis-
lation would both save civilian lives
and police lives; however, this idea is
rooted in the Police Executive Re-
search Forum report which both Republi-
cans 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 38 hours of
training on how to employ 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 de-
escalation tactics in crisis interven-
tion. We need to require this deesca-
lation training.

This deescalation training curri-
culum 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 iden-
tified 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 deescalate inter-
actions 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 memo-
ries 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.

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

Lamont Cornwell of the Saline Coun-
ty Economic Development Corporation
described detailed plans to the Arkan-
sas Economic Development Commis-
ion on June 8 for a center that is spe-
cifically 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 ca-
career education environment in central
Arkansas.

As co-chair of the Congressional
Skilled American Workforce Caucus, I
was encouraged to see the recent pas-
sage 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 orga-
nizations dedicated to their recruit-
ment.

According to recent Arkansas data,
the number of foster care beds has out-
paced 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
Black of Searcy, Arkansas, was recen-
tly named Foster Family of the Year by our State’s Division of Chil-
dren and Family Services for their

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 Arkans-
as National Guard, Colonel Ator
served 11 years on Active Duty with
the United States Air Force. He is a
veteran of several major combat oper-
ations, including Operation Desert
Shield, Operation Desert Storm, Opera-
tion Provide Comfort, Operation Pro-
vide Promise, Operation Joint Forge,
and Operation Noble Eagle.

Colonel 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 nu-
erous awards and medals, including
the Legion of Merit, the Meritorious
Service Medal with two oak leaf clus-
ters, the Air Medal, the Aerial Achieve-
ment 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 recognize the importance of foster
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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 it?

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 hard and 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, grandparents with disabilities would find it harder to be cared for, harder to walk, harder to eat, harder to bathe. Nursing homes give seniors 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 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 of the Papillion-LaVista community. Today we honor Ron Cavanaugh Fora, the long-serving Board Chair of the Boys and Girls Clubs of Bryant.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two lifelong servants of the Papillion-LaVista community. Today we honor Ron Cavanaugh Fora, the long-serving Board Chair of the Boys and Girls Clubs of Bryant.

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 the 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 a well-respected voice in the legislature 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 legisliative strategist who knew how to pull the levers with the right 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 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 Without the 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 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, National Security and Civil Rights 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 honor our electric linemen. 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.

Penny 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 Recruit and Training Range. This range not only provides effective training resources to officers but 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 become 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.
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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 proceedings 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 thank 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 unfilled. 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 gang members 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 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 noted 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 one of four 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 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 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 laws. 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. BUCHSHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUCHSHON. 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.

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 was he the proud father of 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, 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 a lasting impact on southern Arizona. His eminently testable to the American heart.

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 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 the 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.

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.

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 cannot 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 American service members.

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,

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Chairman, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(b) 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 a.m.:

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


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 the House 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 period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 2(a) of rule 1.

SEC. 3. 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. 4. The 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. 5. 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. 3004.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. 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 custody of this 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 floor—Mr. Sessions on July 1, 2015, a couple of bills were 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 was an unlawful criminal alien who had previously been deported five times from the United States of America.

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, bearing 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 their lives. The death of innocent Americans, such as Kate, Sarah Root, Grant Roanebeck, and many too 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 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 Senate version 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. 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 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 the like.

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 who, via their own criminal actions, have made sure that their children are taken away from 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, understood that. This is a criminal matter; this is not a politics issue; and, I reserve the balance of my time.

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 of their child, the health and 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. The 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 majority has over here.

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, I have to admit, 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 by $1 trillion 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'sgoing to be so compelled." 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 had 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 no- body knew what it was—well, 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 before anything.

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 replace, 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
Mr. Speaker, Kate's Law, the bill that this rule brings to the floor, is time.

By painstakingly piecing together all 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.

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 convicted 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.

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 entall 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 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 had no criminal history, no history of repeated reentries. The bill expanded the definition of 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 themselves 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 come to an 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 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 reunited, allows the community 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 walk in and out of our borders, who reenter our country with no respect for our laws will be punished.

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 from the United States 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 among our citizens 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 cities enforce 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 illegals who have entered this country illegally, our legislation prohibits them from 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 and negligent immigration enforcement. Then he lived in San Francisco for his continued leadership here in the House of Representatives, and especially on this issue in the Rules Committee.
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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 dramatic and senseless 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 Pascrell’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. PASCRELL) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. PASCRELL. 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. You are impugning through the floor the Second Democra...data 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, 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 Carrier 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 despiteCarrier receiving $7 million in tax incentives from the State of Indiana to keep the plant open.

Chuck Jones, president of United Steelworkers Local 999, who represents Carrier employees, said that the President “lied his” you know what “off.”

The companies will have to add jobs to their bottom lines for stiffer penalties for criminal aliens who continue to reenter the United States illegally. Kate’s Law is the right answer.

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.

Kate Steinle was a clear reminder that we must do more to stop the abuse of our immigration laws by criminals who repeatedly flout 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 specifically 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, 206 of these detention centers were declined by sanctuary city jurisdictions. In other words, local authorities deliberately ignored ICE’s detainee 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 pregnant woman, and possession with intent to distribute a controlled substance. These were the findings of the Department of Justice’s investigation into the release of criminal aliens with final deportation orders in recent years.

Passing the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act is common sense, as it cuts off funding for States and localities that refuse to assist Federal immigration officials to remove criminal aliens from the United States. The message of this legislation is clear: American taxpayers are tired of paying a huge price. There isn’t a way to quantify our loss to a crime. The families of those who have lost a loved one are preventable crimes, 100 percent preventable.

Immigrant alien crimes are preventable crimes, 100 percent preventable. American citizens, or someone who is lawfully present in America—every one of those.

I listened to them announce the case, but here is a message I sent out, with a picture of 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 a suspect. . . .’’

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, 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.

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 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 and 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 something like this healthcare bill this week, 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 smaller 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.

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 we debate 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 is going on 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 just families from people who 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 those criminals in the system. That is Kate's Law.

Both of these bills, H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004, 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:

\[\text{AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 45 OFERRED BY MS. SLAUGHTER.}\]

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:
The vote on the previous question is a vote to allow the Democratic minority to control the time, may offer an amendment or motion which 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 alternate resolution. 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 taken.

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 taken.

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 taken. The vote on the previous question, and there were—yeas 233, nays 190, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 339]
Mr. RUSH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. 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.

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:

\[\text{Roll No. 340}\]

NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS

ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 41, I call up the bill (H.R. 3003) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify provisions to allow individuals to seek assistance from the Secretary of Homeland Security on behalf of individuals who are lawfully present in the United States; and to make other technical and conforming amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL), Pursuant to House Resolution 41, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

\[\text{H.R. 3003}\]

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

\section{SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act."

\section{SEC. 2. STATE NONCOMPLIANCE WITH ENFORCEMENT OF IMMIGRATION LAWS.

(a) In General.—Section 321(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17)) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting

``(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 person from complying with the immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act and 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

\[\text{H.R. 3003}\]
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 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.

"(4) By striking "Immigration and Naturalization Service" and inserting "Department of Homeland Security"; and

"(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 entitled to receive—

"(A) any of the funds that would otherwise be allocated to the State or political subdivision under section 214 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(a)), the 'Cops' espresso under part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 376cd et seq.), or the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program under 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 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 for the alien.

"(3) Transfer of Custody of Certain Aliens Prohibited.—The Secretary shall not transfer an alien with a final order of removal, deportation, or order of exclusion of a State found to be in compliance with subsection (a) or (b), or the political subdivision of a State that is found to be in compliance with subsection (a) or (b), to 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.

"(4) Annual Determination.—The Secretary shall determine for each calendar year whether any State 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 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 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 found to be in compliance 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 the transfer of custody of aliens from States, or from political subdivisions of States, to report or arrest victims or witnesses of a criminal offense.

"(f) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act. Except that 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 the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program under part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3750 et seq.), shall be construed to be in effect as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. CLARIFYING THE AUTHORITY OF ICE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY TO TRANSFER AN ALIEN TO A STATE.

(a) In General.—Section 287(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1257(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Transfer 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 official, entity, or 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 has previously been ordered removed from the United States and such an order is administratively final;

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

"(C) the individual who is the subject of the detainer was previously released from detention pursuant to the terms of a detainer issued by the Department of Homeland Security the individual who is the subject of the detainer, in the appropriate Federal or State court if the State or political subdivision released the alien from custody prior to the submission of a detainer, or in the case of an individual by a State or a political 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.

"(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 costs.

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—".

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

"(C) Section 236(c) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(c)) is amended by striking "Attorney General's" and inserting "Secretary of Homeland Security's".

(b) Length of Detention.—Section 236 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) Length of Detention.—

"(1) In General.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, any alien who 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 the provisions of section 241.

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

(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 impaired by the influence of alcohol or drug),”.

(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 may request the Secretary to issue a new removal order if the detained alien may be detained again for a similar offense.

(1) Aliens in exclusion proceedings.

(2) Aliens described in section 222(a)(3) or 237(a)(4).

(3) Aliens described in subsection (c).

(h) RELEASE ON BOND.—

(1) An alien detained under subsection (a) may seek release on bond. No bond may be granted except to an alien who may be released 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, 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.”.

(5) CHERAL 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 “inaliable” and inserting “recognizable”.

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

(6) 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONyers) each will control 30 minutes.

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 allow criminals to roam 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.

Punish hardy 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 shutting 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 situation where ICE is legally required to take criminal 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, ICE 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.

We believe 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.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the provisions of 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 may request the Secretary to issue a new removal order if the detained alien may be released 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, 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.”

(6) CHERAL 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 “inaliable” and inserting “recognizable”.

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

(6) 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.

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 allow criminals to roam 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.

Punish hardy 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 shutting 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 situation where ICE is legally required to take criminal aliens from criminal detention facilities, which forces ICE agents to engage in the far more time-consuming and
It is important that we consider that this is more than just bad policy. It is also 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 and already strained systems.

In addition, the bill’s changes to the Department of Homeland Security’s detainer authority exacerbate the current Fourth Amendment concerns associated with immigration detention. The bill does not address correctly 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 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. 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 some 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 pay real estate, 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 their community trust policies in place but forgo law enforcement funding, leaving their community in danger.

Now, 600 or more local governments across the country—on what is that 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, what would that funding be? Now, because they are doing that, 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 security laws, they are not enforcing the Federal tax laws, and they are not enforcing the immigration laws of the United States. That means that they call 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 do not get the right 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 gentleman 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 putting communities in peril and conscripting 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 Federation of Order Police about 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 security laws, they are not enforcing the Federal tax laws, and they are not enforcing the immigration laws of the United States. That means that they call 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 do not get the right 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.
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 previous policies is that the Fourth Amendment prevents Federal courts 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. Get a warrant. I don't know why our Federal Government thinks 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 was favorable 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 lawsuit 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.

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

Mr. 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 gentlewoman for her remarks. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I am concerned about the impact of this bill on our immigration system.

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.

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 and committed crimes here, they are putting the very people who they were sworn to serve and to protect at risk. And unfortunately, 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 Latino parents born abroad. 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. 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 did not 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 stand up for those who 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 participating.

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 that would make 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 into the store with 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 2015, 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 the law. 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 immigration 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 is a joint enterprise, particularly in edge cities and jurisdictions with limited law enforcement options, 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 talking 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 make our communities safer. 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 in our police, and limits Federal 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. MART)

Mr. MART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about two very honorable people, 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.

When his 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 we 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.

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. RIXI. Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

HON. KRYN O. MCDONOUGH. Majority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

HON. NANCY G. PELOSI. Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

HON. STYNE H. HOYER. Minority Whip, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER AND REPRESENTATIVES MCDONOUGH, PELOSI AND HOYER: We are writing to oppose this legislation, stating that local police departments answer to local civilian government, and it is the local government which enacts statutes and ordinances.

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 Programs, as well as programs administered by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

The FOP has been very clear on this issue: we stand by our letters to state law enforcement agencies that they should cooperate with their Federal counterparts. That being said, withholding needed assistance to law enforcement the law enforcement is a policy-making role—also hurts public safety efforts. Local police departments are known for in the United States. Letting it take away the mercy that we have compassion for the public safety which enacts statutes and ordinances in their communities. Law enforcement officers are always in the matter of an other citizen and—with laws like the Hatch Act in place—it can be argued they have less. Law enforcement officers are 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 addressing this conflict of the Administration on sanctuary cities as outlined in President Trump’s Executive Order. The President recognized that it is unfair to penalize the local 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 grants programs. In Section 2 of H.R. 3003, 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. 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 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 our communities from violent offenders, 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. 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 is it in our national interest.

We respectfully urge you to reject these bills in favor of a more comprehensive and humane approach to immigration reform; an approach that upholds law and order 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,

MAYOR RICARDO L. RAMÍREZ, Houston, TX

POLICE CHIEFS: SB 4 IS A ‘LOSE-LOSE’ FOR TEXAS

[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 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 status.

Police chiefs across the state work extremely hard to develop law enforcement agencies that build and maintain trust, community cooperation, and foster relationships with minority communities through community-based policing and outreach programs. So we know well that no good can come of Senate Bill 4, an 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—and they have already been evidenced 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 as they circle protect their 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 the largest 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 police.

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, expands 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, restrict victim information, prevent individuals from witnessing 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 protection 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 its probable cause to issue a detainer and it eliminates 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 bond in removal proceedings, thereby preventing people who are determined not to be a flight risk or a danger to the community from being released 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 an other step in Trump’s mass deportation plan. 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.

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.

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 my colleagues. In less than 2 years, over 8,000 undocumented immigrants, all subject to local cooperation policies, were released because of local non-cooperation policies.

Sixty-three percent of those illegal aliens who 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 per day to house over 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 his emotionally 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 1 1/2 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 crime 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 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 departments of other 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 gentleman 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 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 leader, and the 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 leader, and the 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.

Oddy enough, the Members supporting this bill are the same Members who sanctioned 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 weakens 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 related 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. 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. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the distinguished leader, the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Michigan 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 sanctum of this sorry bill that 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 political overtones, will alienate local law enforcement officers, do exactly the opposite of what all these speeches claim that they do.

Mr. Speaker, 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 are seated around the Cabinet table with and attempting to intimidate 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.

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 policies, 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 National Sanctions—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, 4,000 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, and it is 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 detainers. 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 American 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.
WASHINGTON, DC, June 27, 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. STEVE HOYER,
Minority Whip, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND REPRESENTATIVES McCARTHY AND HOYER: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to reiterate the FOP’s opposition to any 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 process employed by the Fraternal Order of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (Byrne-JAG) programs, as well as 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 in 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 the enforcement policies preferred with respect to our nation’s immigration laws.

The FOP issued a statement in January of this year regarding the approach of the Administration in cities and counties included 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 determination about the impact without an automatic suspension from Federal grant programs. In Section 2 of H.R. 3003, there is no such discretion and it undermines 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 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 solution that will 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.

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 punitive measures that would undermine these proposals and urge Congress to work to encourage—rather than compel—law enforcement agency cooperation within our federal system.

Immigration enforcement is, first and foremost, a federal responsibility. Making our communities safer means better defining and implementing the relationship between local law enforcement and federal immigration authorities. In attempting to defund “sanctuary cities” and require state and local law enforcement and sometimes problematic undertakings of 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, especially communities safer and would not fix any part of our broken immigration system.

Our immigration problem is a national problem, 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 Molz, Tempe, AZ; Ret. Chief Roberto Villaseñor, Tucson, AZ; Chief Charlie Beck, Los Angeles, CA; Ret. Chief James Lopez, Las Vegas, NV; Sheriff David Clarke, Milwaukee, 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; Sheriff John Carpenter, Marshalltown, IA; Ret. Chief William Bones, Voise, ID; Ret. Chief Ron Teachman, South Bend, IN; Ret. Chief James Hawkins, Garden City, NY; Sheriff Bill 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, Chesire County, NH; Chief Col Rivera, Lorain, OH; Public Safety Commissioner Steven Pare, Providence, RI; Chief William Holbrook, Columbia, SC; Sheriff Leon Oott, 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 Dwayne Vivas, TX; Sheriff John Burroughs, Salt Lake City, UT; Sheriff John Urohurt, King County, WA; Asst. Chief Randy Gaber, Madison, WI; Chief Michael Kowalczyk, Madison, WI; Chief Todd Thomas, Appleton, WI.

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—was drafted with no input from local officials.

As a group, NLC has consistently opposed federal legislation that would impose harmful sanctions on local governments—sanctions that prohibit or restrict compliance when a local government requests that federal immigration enforcement not be conducted in their communities.


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—was drafted with no input from local officials.

As a group, NLC has consistently opposed federal legislation that would impose harmful sanctions on local governments—sanctions that prohibit or restrict compliance when a local government 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 pre-empt local authority over police practices 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 police 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 other programs that provide hundreds of millions of dollars to localities nationwide.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES, June 29, 2017.
3. Compel local governments to honor Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) detainer requests, even though the federal courts have determined that the ICE use of detainers violates the Fourth Amendment, and that localities may be held liable for honoring them.

4. Expand ICE’s detainer’s authority requiring localities to hold undocumented immigrants, which in effect 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 their 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 local 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 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 detaining or releasing resources to enforce federal immigration laws. Unfortunately, these cities are wrongfully characterized as safe havens for undocumented immigrants, and further criminalizes immigration and infringes on the rights of immigrant;

Oppose punitive policies that limit local control and discretion and instead that Congress and the Administration pursue immigration enforcement policies that recognize that local law enforcement has resources, and that community trust is critical to local law enforcement and the safety of our communities;

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.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors represents well over a thousand mayors and nearly 150 major cities; member cities account for over 250 million people; and 70 percent of the nation’s population. We urge members of Congress to withdraw legislation that attempts to cut local law enforcement funding in violation of the Tenth Amendment. We urge you to do the right thing and vote against 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 while opposing provisions in this bill.

Specifically, today, we urge members of Congress to withdraw legislation that attempts to cut local law enforcement funding in violation of the Tenth Amendment. We urge you to do the right thing and vote against 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 while opposing provisions in this bill.

Hon. Kevin McCarthy, Minority 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.

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) to prevent and prosecute criminal illegal aliens from the United States, but sheriffs must follow the law that has rendered current ICE requests illegal. Without proper accountability, 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 found to be in violation of the law of its state or a binding court ruling, it is misused for Congress to cut funding for programs that support State and local law enforcement agencies.

Further compelling and expanding compliance with certain enforcement provisions, such as those mandating new federal agencies, such as the Department of Homeland Security, impose increased reporting requirements for ICE detainer requests and other immigration enforcement actions.

A victim of a crime committed by an immigrant population, and further criminalizes immigration and infringes on the rights of immigrant;

Oppose punitive policies that limit local control and discretion and instead that Congress and the Administration pursue immigration enforcement policies that recognize that local law enforcement has resources, and that community trust is critical to local law enforcement and the safety of our communities;

Oppose federal policies that mandate local law enforcement to honor ICE detainers or require local authorities to violate, or be placed at risk of violating, a person’s Fourth Amendment rights; expand 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 setting punitive 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, it would still be subject to the Fourth Amendment challenges.

Further compelling and expanding compliance with certain enforcement provisions, such as those mandating new federal agencies, such as the Department of Homeland Security, impose increased reporting requirements for ICE detainer requests and other immigration enforcement actions.

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 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. You can take our 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 without violating our nation’s laws. 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 law enforcement, expand homeland security grants, invest in mental health and substance abuse services, reduce gun violence, and reform the criminal justice system and strengthen reentry services.

Sincerely,

Mitchell J. Landrieu, Mayor of New Orleans, President.
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 Collins, 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 losing the city. In a way, that shows the efficacy of the trust policies.

This man, Figueroa-Zarco, 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 these threats come with 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has 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 a warrant. A bunch of courts have made that ruling relative to detainees.

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 murdered 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, her 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. The gentleman from Virginia (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 communicates 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 detainers, 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. In appropriately and out 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 Migration Council of the 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 attack, and assault. We understand the importance of fostering cooperation and information-sharing between immigrant communities and local law enforcement.

We are aware that 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 and community security.

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 Church 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 re-sponse and recovery, naturalization and citizen-ship services, and services for the immi-grant, including victims of human traf-ficking, and services for the community. 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 notches to protect us from those convicted of violent criminal of-fenses, the legislation goes far beyond this goal by expanding the government’s ability to prosecute immigration cases and heightening the criminal penalties in these cases. In an era of fiscal austerity, it is vital that important judicial resources are effi-ciently 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 increasing sen-tencing requirements does not advance the common good nor will it ensure that community safety is achieved. 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 clear and broad humane approach to immigration reform; an approach that upholds human dignity and family unity and places a greater emphasis on family balancing of immi-grants 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, USCBB Committee on Migratio-

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 (NATIONAL) and national leadership organizations advocating on behalf of sexual assault and domestic vio-

ence victims and representing hundreds of organizations across the country dedicated to ensuring all survivors of violence receive the protections they deserve, write to ex-
press our deep concern 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 immi-grant victims of domestic 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 undermining public safety.

Immigration enforcement must be implemented in a way that supports local community policing and community trust in working with local law enforce-

ment. H.R. 3003 runs contrary to community policing efforts and will deter immigrant do-mestic 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 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 vic-

tims by creating trust between law enforce-

ment and the immigrant community, which in turn help protect entire communities. Abusers and traffickers use 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 visible and exploitable. Not only are the individual vic-
tims and their children harmed, but their fear of law enforcement leads many to ab-
stain from reporting violent perpetrators or seeking protection and, as a result, dan-
gerous criminals are not identified and go unprosecuted.

As VAWA recognizes, immigrant victims of violent crimes often do not contact law en-
forcement due to fear that they will be de-pe-nalized. Immigrants are often fearful of con-
tacting the police and HR 3003 proposes to further intertwine federal immigration and local law enforcement systems will only ex-
amperize this fear. The result is that per-

petrators will be able to continue to harm others, both immigrant and U.S. Citizen vic-
tims alike. Since January of 2017, victim ad-

vocates have been determined to 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 and sexual assault programs indicate that immi-grant victims are expressing heightened fears and concerns about immigration en-
forcement, with 78 percent of those and attorneys reporting that victims are describ-
ing 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 for fear of removal

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 and domestic violence among Latinos fell by about 10 percent while the overall violent crime rate dropped 23 percent among Los Angeles’ Latino population since the beginning of the year compared to a three percent drop among Anglos. Similarly, reports of spousal abuse among Latinos fell by about 10 percent among Latinos whereas the decline was 12 percent among Anglos. The Houston Police Department reported that 42 percent of the number of Hispanics reporting rape is down 28.6 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. The city Attorney and Aurora Police Department have viewed the inconvenience of having trust with the immigrant community in order to maintain public safety and prosecute crime.

H.R. 3003 punishes localities that fail to honor detainee 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 federal grants related to law enforcement, and human trafficking, to the detention and incarceration of immigrants. They are deported, with some victims being wrongly accused and being 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 the knowledge that immigration consequences of criminal pleas and convictions—have in the past and will likely continue to result in the conviction of wrongly accused victims who may have pled to or been unfairly convicted of domestic violence charges and prostitution. H.R. 3003 mandates harsh criminal penalties, and H.R. 3004 imposes expanded baselines for detention without consideration of mitigating circumstances or humanitarian exceptions for these victims.

In addition, H.R. 3004 expands the criminal consequences of immigration law violaters. H.R. 3004 penalizes jurisdiction by eliminating federal funding; including funding through the Cops on the Beat program, the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, and any other federal funds 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 (ICE), victims of crimes of violence and human trafficking are less likely to communicate with local law enforcement. Local law enforcement authorities have repeatedly echoed this sentiment that community policing policies are paramount to enhancing public safety. Indeed, “sanctuary” jurisdictions have less crime and 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 dratically increasing penalties for immigrants convicted of unlawful reentry. Operation Streamline encapsulates our nation’s failed experiment with employing criminal penalties to deter migration. 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 promotes public safety, builds trust in our communities, and eliminates mass incarceration, is critical for public safety in general, and particularly essential for domestic and sexual violence victims and their children.

The National Taskforce to End Sexual and Domestic Violence (www.4vawa.org).

JUNE 27, 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 underranked immigrants and immigrant community, civil rights, faith-based, and labor organizations, we urge you to support the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003 and Kate’s Law, H.R. 3004. Washington, DC. 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 survivors of violence, which is critical for public safety in general, and particularly essential for domestic and sexual violence victims and their children.

The National Taskforce to End Sexual and Domestic Violence (www.4vawa.org).

JUNE 27, 2017.
Friends Service Committee (AFSC); American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee; Americans Committed to Justice and Truth; Asian Legal Defense and Education Fund; Asian Pacific American Legal Center; Asian American Advancing Justice–AAJC; Asian Americans Advancing Justice–Asian Law Caucus; Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, AFL-CIO (APALA); Asian Pacific Islander American Small Business Administration; Asian Rights based Violence; ASISTA; Bend the Arc Jewish Action; Black Alliance for Just Immigration; Casa de Esperanza: National Latino Network; Center for Community Action and Research; Center for the New American Dream; Center for Economic Progress; Center for Immigration, Civil Rights and Social Policy; Center for New Community;

Center for Popular Democracy (CPD); Children of the Church; Refugee & Immigration Ministries; Christian Community Development Association; Church World Service; Coalition on Human Needs; CODEPINK; Cuyahoga County for Advocacy and Outreach; Committee in SOLIDARITY with the People of El Salvador (CISVES); Community Initiative for Welcoming Immigrants in Confinement (CIVIC); Defending Rights & Dissent; Disciples Center for Public Witness; Disciples Home Missions; Dominican Immigration Advocacy and Outreach; 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 Missions; Hispanic Women's Coalition (HWC); Interfaith Worker Justice; Isaiah Wilson; Jewish Voice for Peace; Jewish Voice for Peace—Boston; Jewish Voice for Peace—Tacoama chapter; Jewish Voice for Peace—Western MA; Justice Strategies; Kids in Need of Defense (KIND); Lambdalit; 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 Truthful Reporting; 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 Labor Organizing Network (NDLON); National Education Association; National Immigrant Justice Center; National Immigration Law Center; National Immigration Project of the NLG; National Korean American Council (NIAC); National Justice for Our Neighbors; National Korean American Service & Education Consortium (NAKASEC); National Latin@/Latino Health Advocates; 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; Open Society Action Network; People’s Action; People’s Action—National Network; Queer Detainee Empowerment Project; Refugee and Immigrant Center for Education and Legal Services (RAICES); Religious Action Center of America; Sisters of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary; New Jewish Cantor; Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SARAC); South Dakotans Against the Death Penalty; Southern Poverty Law Center; T’ruach: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights;

The Advocates for Human Rights; The Hampton Institute: A Working Class Think Tank; The National Alliance to Advance Adolescents Health; The Quakers in Philadelphia 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; UW College of Social Justice; UURBIE—Unitarian Universalist Refugee and Immigrant Services & Education; Voto Latino; We Belong Together; WOLA; Women’s Refugee Commission; Working Families; Yemen Peace Project; YWCA.

STAFF AFFECTED ORGANIZATIONS

(MILU) Mujeres Inmigrantes Luchando Unidas; #VigilanteLOVE; 580 Cafe/Wesley Foundation Serving UCLA; Acting in Community Together in Organizing Northern Nebraska (ACTIONNN); Advocates for Basic Legal Equality, Inc.; Allenza; All for All; Alliance San Diego; Allies of Knoxville’s Immigrant Neighbors (AKIN); American Gateway; Appalachian Community Action-Community Health Network; Asian Community Advocates; Asian Diaspora Community Action; Asian Pacific American World Center; Atlanta; Atlanta Alliance; Atlanta Asian Pacific American Community Advocacy (MIRA); Mosaic Family Services; MoveOn.org CivicAction; National Campaign for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; National Korean American Service & Education; Our Revolution; People’s Action; PICO National Resource Center; Project South; Refugee and Immigrant Centers; Southern Poverty Law Center; T’ruach: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights; The Advocates for Human Rights; The Hampton Institute: A Working Class Think Tank; The National Alliance to Advance Adolescents Health; The Quakers in Philadelphia 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; UW College of Social Justice; UURBIE—Unitarian Universalist Refugee and Immigrant Services & Education; Voto Latino; We Belong Together; WOLA; Women’s Refugee Commission; Working Families; Yemen Peace Project; YWCA.

 protector of Jewish Women; National Council of La Raza; Centro Romero; Chelsea Collaborative (CVIIC); Centro Laboral de Derechos Humanos; La Comunidad, Inc.; La Familia, Inc.; MIRCH; Mujeres Inmigrantes Luchando Unidas; #VigilanteLOVE; 580 Cafe/Wesley Foundation Serving UCLA; Acting in Community Together in Organizing Northern Nebraska (ACTIONNN); Advocates for Basic Legal Equality, Inc.; Allenza; All for All; Alliance San Diego; Allies of Knoxville’s Immigrant Neighbors (AKIN); American Gateway; Appalachian Community Action-Community Health Network; Asian Community Advocates; Asian Diaspora Community Action; Asian Pacific American World Center; Atlanta; Atlanta Alliance; Atlanta Asian Pacific American Community Advocacy (MIRA); Mosaic Family Services; MoveOn.org CivicAction; National Campaign for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; National Korean American Service & Education; Our Revolution; People’s Action; PICO National Resource Center; Project South; Refugee and Immigrant Centers; Southern Poverty Law Center; T’ruach: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights; The Advocates for Human Rights; The Hampton Institute: A Working Class Think Tank; The National Alliance to Advance Adolescents Health; The Quakers in Philadelphia 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; UW College of Social Justice; UURBIE—Unitarian Universalist Refugee and Immigrant Services & Education; Voto Latino; We Belong Together; WOLA; Women’s Refugee Commission; Working Families; Yemen Peace Project; YWCA.
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 Immigration Rights (NMR) and Reentry; Northwest Immigrants Rights Project (SWIRP); OCCORD; Occupy Bergen County (New Jersey); OneAmerica; OneJustice; Oregon Interfaith Movement for Immigration Reform; Our Children's Bubble; Organized Communities Against Deportations; OutFront Minnesota; Pangea Legal Services; PASO-West; Peace Café; PEACE Project; Pax Unitary Florida; Pennsylvania Immigration and Citizenship Coalition.

Pilgrim United Church of Christ; Pilipino Workers Center; Polonians Organized to Minis- ter to Our Community, Inc. (POMOC); Portland Central America Solidarity Commit- tee; Progreso; Latino Progress; Progres- sive Jewish Voice of Central PA; Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada; Project Hope-Proyecto Esperanza; Project IRENE; Puget Sound Advocates for Retirement Action and Justice Action Center; Reformed Church of Highland Park; Refugees Helping Refugees; Refugio del Rio Grande; Resilience Orange County; Rocky Mountain Immigrant Legal Center; Rural and Migrant Ministry; Safe Passage; San Francisco CASA (Court Appointed Spe- cial Advocates); Services, Immigrant Rights, and Education; SAFE;

Stickle Cell Disease Association of America; St. Francis, St. Francis Province; Sisters of St. Joseph of Rochester, Inc.; Skagit Immigrant Rights Council; Social Justice Collaborative; South Asian Fund For Education and Community Empowerment; (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 Te- resa Messer; Thai Community Development Center; The Garden, Lutheran Ministry; The International Institute of Metropolitan Det- ritt; The Legal Project; Tompkins County Immigrant Rights Coalition; Transgender Resource Center of New Mexico.

Trinity Episcopal Church; U-Lead Athens; United Asian Women of Maas Asian Net- work; Unitarian Universalist PA Legislative Advocacy Network (UPLAN); United Afri- can Organization; United Families; Univer- sity Leadership Initiative; University of San Francisco Immigration and Deportation De- fense Clinic; UNO Immigration Ministry; UPLIPT; UpValley Family Centers; VietLIFE; Vital Immigrant Defense Advocacy & Services, Santa Rosa, CA; Volunteers of Legal Service; Washetnaw Interfaith Coal- ition for Immigrant Rights; Watertown Citizi- en's Voice; and, the Government; Wayne Action for Racial Equality; WeCount!; WES PAC Foundation; Wilco Jus- tice Alliance (Williamson County, TX).

Women's Watch: A San Diego Inc.; Women Watch: 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 Northeast Ohio; YWCA Northwest; YWCA Philadelphia; YWCA Portland; YWCA Rochester & Monroe County; YWCA South- eastern Arizona; YWCA South Central Arizona; YWCA Tulsa; YWCA Warren; YWCA Westmoreland County.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to reconsider the bill.

The motion to reconsider the bill. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk reads 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 pur- pose of this section, a public safety exception to any legal 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, satisfies to the Attorney General that such compliance would endanger public safety."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuan- t to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida is recognized.

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. H.R. 3003 impedes on law enforce- ment's ability to effectively do its job. It will create an environment that will erode the trust between law enforce- ment 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 immi- gration status of victims and wit- nesses, including victims of sexual assau- lt 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 offer- ing 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 offi- cers are not responsible for creating laws and eliminating Federal grant funding for political reasons impede 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 the mandates and penalties in the bill those juri- sdictions in which local law enforce- ment officials conclude that the mand- ates 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 recom- mit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentle- woman 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 endan- gers public safety, not the opposite, as those on the other side have argued.

How would you trust local govern- ment officials, who have instructed their law enforcement officers to not cooperate with Federal law enforce- ment officers to take dangerous crimi- nals off of our streets, when this move to recommit would say: "Oh, they will have to certify that such compli- ance would endanger public safety and then the law wouldn’t apply?"
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 removed aliens as may be available under such other penalties relating to the reentry of removed aliens as may be available under this section or any other provision of law.

(b) REENTRY OF CRIMINAL OFFENDERS.—Notwithstanding the penalty provided in subsection (a), if an alien described in that subsection was convicted before such reentry 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 25 years, or both; or

(4) for murder, rape, kidnapping, or a felony offense described in chapter 77 (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 or 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 offense 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 DEFENSE.—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, the 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 Congress has heard from citizens 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 life support system performed CPR while 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 5 years. Specifically, only criminal aliens previously convicted of an aggravated felony, as defined in our immigration laws, controlled substance violations, crimes against others, or certain felonies would trigger an enhanced sentence for up to 20 years. Kate’s Law closes the loophole into which so many criminal aliens fall. The bill provides that a criminal alien, previously 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.

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 they were detained even if they had not consented, 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 can it bring 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 sides 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.

This bill 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 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 Sexism 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 misappropriated 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.

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, 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 this 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. It 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. 3911, introduced on July 9, 2015.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, 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 convicted of a series of felonies. 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 aggra-vated misdemeanor and a conviction for a violent 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 individ-uals 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 individ-uals who have lived here, we have met with; individuals 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 get their traf-fickers. 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 wonder-ful it is to add this as an affir-mative defense in the act. What he has neglected to mention is that right now we don’t need an affirmative de-fense because it is not a crime to go to the port of entry and seek a benefit, ei-ther humanitarian or for a purpose that is sometimes granted to travel if a member of your family is dying, to pro-vide 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 af-firmative defense because it is not a crime.

Now, I think the fact that it elimi-nates 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 re-moveal, which happens all the time—in fact, that is the single most prevalent Federal prosecution today; that is number one—you have to—and you did not have an opportu-nity to actually contest the first re-moveal because, for example, you were never notified at a hearing.

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 how important this 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 here, at a higher rate than native-born Americans. 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 nonviolent drug offense. He served 45 days in prison, and, ever since then, for the last 27 years, he has lived a crime-free life with 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 fears because, in fact, two of his brothers back in Colombia have been murdered, he would still be subject to persecution and mass punitive penalties, just for appearing at the border.

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 of New York City to 2 days ago in support of Kate’s Law, and I want to read a sentence from it.

“Recent years, the need to protect our citizens from those aliens who entered 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.


Hon. Paul Ryan, Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR Mr. Speaker: I am working 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 this country is a top concern of the law enforcement community. It is a problem that has been exacerbated 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, served prison sentences, and was on probation in Texas at the time of the shooting. Nearly two years have passed since Steinle’s murder, and little has been accomplished in bringing the 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 toughens the prison terms 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 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 MULINS, President.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA).

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 heartbreaking. 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 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 this important bill.

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 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 knows 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 to consider the problems 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. But, centered on this bill, 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 a tragic and 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 crimes.

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. It is a consensus 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 partnership 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.


Re H.R. 3004, Kate’s Law

Hon. Paul Ryan,

Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, 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. Goodlatte, and Mr. Conyers: We write on behalf of the Federal Public and Community Defenders in response to inquiries for our views on H.R. 3004. We oppose the bill for the following reasons.

H.R. 3004 would make it a crime to openly and directly present oneself to immigration officials seeking asylum, temporary protection, or other immigration relief. In doing so, the bill would incentivize people with genuine claims of fear to enter the country surreptitiously.

Even while criminalizing essentially innocent conduct and drastically increasing potential penalties, the bill would purport to deprive defendants of the right to challenge the validity of fundamentally unfair or unlawful 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 potential 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 occurs 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’ sovereign interests by imposing certain state prison sentences thereby impeding States’ ability to manage their own criminal justice systems and prison populations.

The bill would harm individuals, families and communities not just on the border but across the nation. Nearly 21 percent of reentry 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 perception that illegal reentry is a danger to the safety and security of the country, the reality is that it is an offence. Federal officials seeking asylum, temporary protection, or other immigration relief are not dangerous criminals, the motive for most people returning to the United States after being removed is to reunit with family, return to the only place they know as home, seek work to support their families, or flee violence or persecution in their home countries.

Further, according to a recent Sentencing Commission study, 110,000 of reentry offenders 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 felonies, illegal entry, illegal reentry, and simple possession of drugs. Nearly half (45%) had children in the United States, and over two thirds (67.1%) had living relatives in this country. 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 ENDED CRIMINALS.

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 several offenses as the 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” as the essential part of the definition of entering, at least since the Supreme Court in 1987 held, in United States v. Mendoza-Lopez, 481 U.S. 828 (1987), that a defendant who was in the house of his grandfather and uncle when the government’s agents broke in to arrest his father, could not be guilty of attempt to enter, crosses the border, attempts to cross the border, or “attempts to cross the border,” and 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 of persecution or harm 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 returned, the logical, life-sustaining choice is obvious.

II. THE BILL WOULD PERVERSELY CRIMINALIZE REPEATED UNSUCCESSFUL ATTEMPTS TO GAIN ASYLUM, EVEN AS BORDER PATROL AGENTS INCREASE REPEATED UNSUCCESSFUL ATTEMPTS TO CROSS THE BORDER 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 if the alien 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 toward the three strikes.

As noted above, border patrol agents are increasingly turning away asylum seekers without referring them for appropriate legal safeguards or protections. Asylum organizations have documented at least 125 cases of asylum seekers being turned away without proper safeguards to protect their safety and right to seek protection between November 2016 and April 2017, often repeated. 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 30 miles of the border, were 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 should be entitled to a reasonable opportunity to be interviewed by an asylum officer. When border patrol agents simply expel people who express fear without allowing them a chance to present 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 proposition, if accurate, perhaps more than any other, demonstrates the overarching and unduly harsh nature of these proposed changes to existing law. The bill seeks to visit criminal convictions on those who reenter even when the administrative process that led to their original deportation or removal was fundamentally unfair or 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 or reentry under the [INA].” A criminal 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 simply unreasonably punish 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 upheld the detention of those without 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 be 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
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Re Vote NO on the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003, and Kate’s Law, H.R. 3004.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 407 undersigned local, state, and national immigrant rights, faith-based, labor, and civil rights groups, 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 and undermines the goodwill forged between local police and its residents, and perpetuates the criminalization and incarceration of immigrants.

The bill would mandate that any alien re-entered the United States after 5 years. Under H.R. 3004, if he illegally re-entered there, 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)(i). A handful have entered into a MOU with ICE in which they have agreed to treat unlawfully returned aliens who return 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.

H.R. 3004 would require any State that re-leases under § 1231(a)(4)(B)(ii) to incarcerate such a person for the remainder of the sentence should return unlawfully. It would thus impose an onerous and further punishment 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 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 PRESPECTIVE INTO ADMITTING PRIOR CONVICTIONS THAT THEY DO NOT HAVE

The bill would require that prior convictions upon which increased statutory maxi-ma are based be established in an indigent convicted be proved beyond a reasonable doubt at trial or admitted by the defendant. Reports of prior convictions are notoriously unreliable and national databases that give “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, in many cases ending in 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 re- entered pursuant to § 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 the sentence that was pending at the time of deportation without any re- duction for parole or supervised release” unless the alien affirmatively demonstrates ex- emption. 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 State 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 six 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 there, 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)(ii) 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)(i). A handful have entered into a MOU with ICE in which they have agreed to treat unlawfully returned aliens who return 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.

H.R. 3004 would require any State that re- leases under § 1231(a)(4)(B)(ii) to incarcerate such a person for the remainder of the sentence should return unlawfully. It would thus impose an onerous and further punishment 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.”
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 eleven million unauthorized immigrants in the United States, including Americans and eliminates mass detention and deportation programs that undermine fundamental human rights. Legislation that respects due process, strengthens democratic processes, and preserves constitutional rights is one that is fair and just.

In light of the above, we urge you to vote NO on any legislation that erodes public safety, disrespects local and state governments, and undermines fundamental human rights. Legislation that erodes public safety, disrespects local and state governments, and undermines fundamental human rights. Legislation that erodes public safety, disrespects local and state governments, and undermines fundamental human rights.

Sincerely,

[Signatures and organizations listed]
Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters in opposition to this bill from the National Taskforce to End Sexual & Domestic Violence, the CATO Institute, Church World Service, and the ACLU.

The National Taskforce to End Sexual and Domestic Violence (NTF), comprised of national leadership organizations advocating on behalf of sexual assault and domestic violence survivors and victims, and the National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs, indicated that immigrant victims are declining to testify in court. As of May 31, 2017, 53% reported that some domestic violence victims are declining to testify in court; and 43% reporting working with immigrant survivors.

The National Taskforce to End Sexual and Domestic Violence, (H.R. 3003) punishes localities that follow the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)
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 federal grants to various law enforcement agencies, 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 very practice it was designed to deter, and non-violent immigration 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. 3006 will unnecessarily punish victims

By greatly expanding mandatory detention and expanding criminal penalties for re-entry violations, H.R. 3004 will have far-reaching consequences for immigrant survivors. Victims of human trafficking, sexual assault, and domestic violence are often at risk of being deported or 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 exist, the survivor from full disclosing the abuse suffered, a survivor faces charges and tremendous pressure to plead guilty (without being advised as to 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 families avoiding their arrest for pending trial. These factors—combined with poor legal counsel, particularly about the immigration consequences of criminal pleas and convictions—result in the practice of trying to keep the past likely continue to lead to deportation of wrongly accused victims who are often victims who have not had a fair hearing. Victims of domestic and sexual violence that trafficking and 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 understand 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 being arrested and being forced to leave their country of origin remain unabated and victims subsequently attempt to reenter the United States in order 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 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 and sexual violence, stalking, and human trafficking that our organizations serve, we urge you to vote against H.R. 3003 and 3004, and to affirm the 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 law,” it should be classified as a criminal justice—and a harsh one. The bill 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 United States, without compelling reasons. The past likely continue to lead to deportation of wrongly accused victims who may have pled to or been unfairly convicted of domestic violence offenses. Furthermore, the bill 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 United States, without compelling reasons. The past likely continue to lead to deportation of wrongly accused victims who may have pled to or been unfairly convicted of domestic violence offenses. Furthermore, the bill imposes harsh criminal penalties and H.R. 3004 imposes expanded bases for detention without consideration of mitigating circumstances or humanitarian exceptions for these victims.

Immigration offenses are already the top reason for a federal arrest, comprising 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 for services, clothed and un-, like U.S. citizens who are released into the interior, their incarceration does not prevent other U.S. residents from being exposed their criminal behavior. Locking illegal crossing is a concern in that regard.

While naturally locking people up has some deterrent effect on future crossing, it comes with a high price tag. The 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 terminology, “inadmissibility,” is a misnomer. It is not the law that 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 people from prosecution on 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, which is a key part of 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 prosecution of immigrants who attempt to enter the United States successfully. Under current judicial interpretation, an alien must must be “free from official restraint”—that is, not in the custody or control of a government official. The 9th Circuit Court of Appeals did so in 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 minimum 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 approved the new version—revealed late last week—without an estimate of either its financial impact or its impact on the federal prison population. But the bill could likely reverse the recent 5 percent decline in the federal prison population, the first reduction since the 1980s.

Immigration offenses are already the top reason for a federal arrest, comprising 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 for services, clothed and un-, like U.S. citizens who are released into the interior, their incarceration does not prevent other U.S. residents from being exposed their criminal behavior. Locking illegal crossing is a concern in that regard.

While naturally locking people up has some deterrent effect on future crossing, it comes with a high price tag. The 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 terminology, “inadmissibility,” is a misnomer. It is not the law that 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.
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 Oklahoma state attorneys 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 wholeheartedly opposes 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 24 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 urges Congress to end the U.S. Congress to refrain from politicizing tragedies or conflating the actions of one person with an entire community of our immigrant neighbors. The law enforcement officials targeted by 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 make 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 understanding with communities and are deterred 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 and their un-jailed 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 detector requests even when such compliance would violate federal court orders and the U.S. Constitution. Local police that refuse ICE detector requests see an increase in public safety due to improved trust from the community. It is precisely this trust that enables immigration officials to report dangerous situations without the fear of being deported or separated from their families. When local police comply with ICE detector requests, unreported crimes and witnesses are afraid of being deported if they contact the police. This bill would also undermine local criminal prosecution 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 cases. This bill would also reduce community safety by preventing state and local jurisdictions from holding people accountable.

The federal government already spends more than $38 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 those cases—even though prosecutions for migration-related offenses already make up more than 50% of all federal prosecutions. Yet, this bill does not include new procedures that would target those 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. Border Patrol’s current practices violate existing U.S. law and treaty obligations by preventing viable asylum claims from moving forward. DHS’s current policies are causing Border Patrol refers asylum seekers for criminal prosecution despite the fact that they have expressed fear of persecution. In May 2017, a report found 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. Congress should end the federal government’s war on states and localities that refuse to enforce federal immigration law, the result of which is correlated with significantly higher violent and property crime rates. Immigrants, and the sharp decline in violent and property crime rates. Immigration is correlated with significantly higher unemployment, higher rates of under-employment, 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 officials’ 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 opposition to the Sanctuary for Criminals Act, H.R. 3003, Kate’s Law.

NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT (H.R. 3003)
H.R. 3003 conflicts with the principles of the Fourth Amendment. In sum, 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 an untested mandatory detention system and reduce 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, because localities have recognized that by entangling local authorities and federal immigration enforcement, immigration detention upends community and local law enforcement. In this way, immigration detainees ultimately undermine public safety, as entire communities become impeded by the continued presence of convicted criminals.

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 of a warrant expiration date, or 7 days required by DHS to intervene. H.R. 3003 also eliminates the ability for authorities to confer with individuals, removing the ability to undertake determinations of probable cause, or risk losing federal funding. This is despite the fact that an “increasing number of federal court decisions” have held that H.R. 3003’s mandatory detention provision and local law enforcement agencies violates the Fourth Amendment,” as recognized by former Department of Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson in 2014.
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 system by amending Section 236(c) of the INA to authorize mandatory detention "without time limitation." This empowers DHS to detain countless immigrants without specific hearings—event even if that takes years—without the basic due process of a bond hearing to determine if their imprisonments are justified. This is a clear constitutional violation, as the federal courts have overwhelmingly held that jailing immigrants for as long as it takes to conclude their cases is irrational, and unconstitutional. The Supreme Court has permitted brief periods of pretrial detention in immigration proceedings in those cases where in-country removal proceedings—the only form of detention currently available to non-convicted illegal re-entries—were necessary to ensure removal of the non-convicted illegal re-entries. A federal judge, in her capacity as a judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, has ruled in United States v. Mendoza-Lopez, that "federal courts have no authority to allow the indefinite detention of an alien...." This ruling in United States v. Mendoza-Lopez was reaffirmed in United States v. Gonzales, with a clear statement by the same judge that this ruling is "a clear constitutional violation, as the federal courts have overwhelmingly held that jailing immigrants for as long as it takes to conclude their cases is rational, and unconstitutional. The Supreme Court has permitted brief periods of pretrial detention in immigration proceedings in those cases where in-country removal proceedings—were necessary to ensure removal of the non-convicted illegal re-entries. A federal judge, in her capacity as a judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, has ruled in United States v. Mendoza-Lopez, that "federal courts have no authority to allow the indefinite detention of an alien...."

I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided legislation ripped from the pages of Donald Trump’s mass deportation and anti-immigrant playbook.

Moreover, according to the U.S. Sentencing Commission, illegal immigrants commit less crimes. It enhances criminal penalties against immigrants, the vast majority of whom have come here peaceably to join their families and live in our communities in the belief that the United States is a nation of sanctuary. Congress should be offering workable reforms that will strengthen our economy and our country.

H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 are piecemeal immigration enforcement that expands America’s federal prison population and lines the coffers of private prison companies. Increasing the maximum sentences for illegal re-entries is unnecessary, wasteful, and inhumane. H.R. 3004 envisions a federal criminal justice system that prosecutes asylum-seekers, refugees, and other non-citizens providing them with deportation bonds only on certain criminal convictions. The Supreme Court has prohibited mandatory detention in immigration proceedings in those cases where in-country removal proceedings—were necessary to ensure removal of the non-convicted illegal re-entries. A federal judge, in her capacity as a judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, has ruled in United States v. Mendoza-Lopez, that "federal courts have no authority to allow the indefinite detention of an alien...."

H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 are piecemeal immigration enforcement that expands America’s federal prison population and lines the coffers of private prison companies. Increasing the maximum sentences for illegal re-entries is unnecessary, wasteful, and inhumane. H.R. 3004 envisions a federal criminal justice system that prosecutes asylum-seekers, refugees, and other non-citizens providing them with deportation bonds only on certain criminal convictions. The Supreme Court has prohibited mandatory detention in immigration proceedings in those cases where in-country removal proceedings—were necessary to ensure removal of the non-convicted illegal re-entries. A federal judge, in her capacity as a judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, has ruled in United States v. Mendoza-Lopez, that "federal courts have no authority to allow the indefinite detention of an alien...."

H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 are piecemeal immigration enforcement that expands America’s federal prison population and lines the coffers of private prison companies. Increasing the maximum sentences for illegal re-entries is unnecessary, wasteful, and inhumane. H.R. 3004 envisions a federal criminal justice system that prosecutes asylum-seekers, refugees, and other non-citizens providing them with deportation bonds only on certain criminal convictions. The Supreme Court has prohibited mandatory detention in immigration proceedings in those cases where in-country removal proceedings—were necessary to ensure removal of the non-convicted illegal re-entries. A federal judge, in her capacity as a judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, has ruled in United States v. Mendoza-Lopez, that "federal courts have no authority to allow the indefinite detention of an alien...."

H.R. 3003 and H.R. 3004 are piecemeal immigration enforcement that expands America’s federal prison population and lines the coffers of private prison companies. Increasing the maximum sentences for illegal re-entries is unnecessary, wasteful, and inhumane. H.R. 3004 envisions a federal criminal justice system that prosecutes asylum-seekers, refugees, and other non-citizens providing them with deportation bonds only on certain criminal convictions. The Supreme Court has prohibited mandatory detention in immigration proceedings in those cases where in-country removal proceedings—were necessary to ensure removal of the non-convicted illegal re-entries. A federal judge, in her capacity as a judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, has ruled in United States v. Mendoza-Lopez, that "federal courts have no authority to allow the indefinite detention of an alien...."
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 and crime victim assistance programs, including the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP), Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), and Byrne JAG grants. These funds provide hundreds of millions of dollars to localities nationwide.

In an effort to force localities to engage in civil immigration enforcement, including those against nonviolent undocumented immigrants, the bill would make it far more difficult for many localities, including local sheriffs, 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 and weaken important programs.

By prohibiting localities from restricting or limiting their own cooperation with federal immigration enforcement, H.R. 3003 strips localities of their due process rights. Under the bill, nearly anyone who is undocumented, including those who have overstayed their visa would be subject to detention without a custodial hearing. Under current law, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has the authority to detain individuals “without time limitation” during the pending removal proceedings. These provisions to continue indeterminate detention would undermine 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.

**KATIE’S LAW, H.R. 3004**

H.R. 3004 would expand the already severe penalties in federal law for illegal reentry (INA § 276). 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 who have reentered the country multiple times or 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 allow ICE to detain 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 United States 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 or more misdemeanor offenses 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 and 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, the bill 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 attempting to seek asylum 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 it was fundamentally unfair in the first place. The Supreme Court held in U.S. v. Mathis-Lopez, 467 U.S. 828 (1984) 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.**

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 SB-54 (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, compromises 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, and would cost communities needed funds for 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.
protect the public, and make our nation’s immigration laws even meaner 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 effect or impact on prison overcrowding. Those affected would include immigrants who have only committed minor misdemeanors such as driving without a license or other nonviolent offenses, and others who have never committed any crimes besides unauthorized entry. H.R. 3004 would also penalize persons fleeing violence in their home countries by targeting 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 and criminalize individuals based on 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 local and state efforts to increase public safety by encouraging cooperation between law enforcement and the communities they serve. There is nothing to suggest that localities which already 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 they 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 their immigration enforcement, even for local agencies funded by local taxes. And, if that weren’t enough, a separate provision would significantly increase the categorization 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. FIRM 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,
ROCO SAENZ, Executive Vice President.

ASIAN AMERICANS ADVANCING JUSTICE,

FAIR IMMIGRATION REFORM MOVEMENT,

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 over 100 organizations fighting for immigrant rights at the local, state and federal level.

Mr. GODDATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGOMAN). Mr. BERGOMAN. 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 and support the American Dream seek to join us, and we are better for it.

Alexander Hamilton, Levi Strauss, Albert Einstein, and so many others have defined themselves as 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 those felons who decide to come 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 lonely, 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. GUTIERREZ).

Mr. GUTIERREZ. 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 going, 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, not a hardened criminal, never killed anyone.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Tahirih Justice Center. 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 into a situation of 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 apply for asylum in the U.S., but were improperly denied access to the asylum process the first time around.

H.R. 3004: The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act: The Act seeks to erase the distinction between federal and local immigration enforcement. Such measures erode immigrant 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 the asylum process and their legal rights. Despite longstanding protections under the Violence Against Women Act, even victims who hold lawful immigration status suffer to intimidate or fear of deportation if they come forward. For some survivors, deportation means sentencing a US citizen child to the custody of a violent abuser. Police and courts often pass a state of law to increase local immigration enforcement, a client aptly noted, “This is exactly what [my abuser] has been waiting for.” We then make it easier for perpetrators to commit crimes.

The Act will also increase prolonged detention of survivors, resulting in trauma, 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 uniquely denied access to the asylum process by US 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 like Tahirih, who have been raped, abused, and terrorized by perpetrators and who 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 restrictive, 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 struck down the constitutionality. It 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 booted 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 a choice person 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 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) 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 non-governmental 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 into a situation of 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 apply for asylum in the U.S., but were improperly denied access to the asylum process the first time around.

H.R. 3004: The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act: The Act seeks to erase the distinction between federal and local immigration enforcement. Such measures erode immigrant 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 the asylum process and their legal rights. Despite longstanding protections under the Violence Against Women Act, even victims who hold lawful immigration status suffer to intimidate or fear of deportation if they come forward. For some survivors, deportation means sentencing a US citizen child to the custody of a violent abuser. Police and courts often pass a state of law to increase local immigration enforcement, a client aptly noted, “This is exactly what [my abuser] has been waiting for.” We then make it easier for perpetrators to commit crimes.

The Act will also increase prolonged detention of survivors, resulting in trauma, 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. 3003: 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 uniquely denied access to the asylum process by US 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. 3003 will punish women like Tahirih, who have been raped, abused, and terrorized by perpetrators and who 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 restrictive, 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?

H.R. 3004—Kate’s Law

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 for the refugee resettlement program.

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 would be subjected to wrongful criminal prosecutions.

Maria, a Salvadoran woman from Honduras, who had been raped and subjected to other sexual violence, fled to the United States seeking asylum. In 2018, USCIRF found that in a significant number of cases, border agents have failed to respond to her requests for asylum and she was deported back to Honduras through expedited removal without ever seeing an immigration judge to assess 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 again apprehended and automatically referred for a credible fear screening. After her transfer, she was transferred back to immigration custody, where 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.

CITIES FOR ACTION

June 29, 2017.

Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter opposing the bill from Cities for Action.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. 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.

H.R. 3004 makes notable efforts to protect us and 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.

We urge you for your time and consideration in this matter.

CITIES FOR ACTION.

June 29, 2017.
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 that embraces a greater commitment to 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 moves 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 “No Sanctuary for Criminals Act” (H.R. 3003) and “Kate’s Law” (H.R. 3004).

The Friends Committee on National Legislation: A Quaker Lobby in the Public Interest.

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)

June 27, 2017.

The Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) is a Quaker lobbying group in the public interest committed to pursuing policies that build just societies, peaceful communities, and equitable relationships among all people. As a Quaker faith leader, I urge Congress to protect those who have been marginalized. In keeping with our Quaker faith, as well as in our shared constitutional, legal, and moral values, we urge Congress to abandon the brokenness of our 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 nation formed of immigrants. As a nation of diverse peoples and immigrants, Congress has the opportunity to enact practical solutions for comprehensive reform that includes reestablishing processes for legal entry and eventual citizenship. FCNL urges to support such efforts, and seek the fundamental policy changes we need to truly prosper.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter opposing the bill from the NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CONOVER:
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 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. One such community leader is a former member of the U.S. military who cooperates 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 families. Punishing immigrants for the crimes of 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-only” approach we’ve been down by a five-time deported criminal 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 immigation 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 undocument 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 unspeakable 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. WOMBACK). The gentleman from Michigan has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (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 this 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.

Mr. Speaker, 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 special 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 United States port of entry, and they ask the Customs and 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, then removed, 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.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.
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Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
for community policing, or exposing themselves to the significant legal and financial liability that accompany compliance with detainer requests under the Fourth Amendment of 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 courts, even where there are strong indications that it deems in non-compliance with other provisions of the bill.

H.R. 3003 vastly expands ICE’s authority to force the removal of 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 give 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 thums 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 of 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 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 those women and men 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 sentences for individuals seeking to return to the United States after a previous removal on the basis of prior convictions 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 spent $7 billion to incarcerate migrants for migration-related offenses over the past decade.

H.R. 3004 punishes immigrants for illegal reentry even though 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 the bill.

Ms. LOFGREN. I am.

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

The Clerk reads 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 amendments:

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:

“(1) 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 status as a victim of trafficking.

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 gentlewoman from California?

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 attempt 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 or asylum seekers at ports of entry. As should be evident at this stage of debate, the provisions of this bill extend well beyond immigrants with illegal 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 ports of entry seeking protection as victims of sex trafficking.

Let’s be clear on the law. Today, it is now Criminal to be 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 seek to reenter our country, 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 criminal; it is punishable by up to 5 years in jail to 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 liberty be restored.

I mentioned earlier, we put in the RECORD, the opposition of the Tahiri 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 prosecuted as criminals. 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 unwelcome 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 United States is subject to possible criminal prosecution.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Barragaña, one of its clerks, announced that the Secretary of the Senate be directed to request the House to return the Senate bill (S. 722) “An Act to provide congressional review and to direct the Senate the bill (S. 722) “An Act to provide congressional review and to direct the Senate to the Senate the bill (S. 722) “An Act to provide congressional review and to direct the Senate to the Senate to consider the Senate. In the meantime, it has been determined that the Senate has no further action to take on the Senate bill (S. 722).”

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.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:
Ms. FRANKLAND 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 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
Adolf
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Banks (IN)
Barlett
Barren
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MO)
Black
Blackburn
Blunt
Brad (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun
Buchanan
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carte (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chapman
Coffman
Culbertson
Curfman
Culver
Crawford
Davis (AZ)
Davidson
DeLauro
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dingell
Drew
Dunn
Emanuel
Estrada
Eshoo
Falwell
Farr
Farr
Figueroa
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Goldsmith
Gowdy
Grau
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
NOT VOTING—22

Beatty
Beyer
Bishop (UT)
Bono
Burr
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chu
Coffman
Franklin (FL)
Gosar

Barletta
Barton
Bennet
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MO)
Black
Blackburn
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun
Buchanan
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carte (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chapman
Coffman
Culbertson
Curfman
Culver
Crawford
Davis (AZ)
Davidson
DeLauro
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dingell
Drew
Dunn
Emanuel
Estrada
Eshoo
Falwell
Farr
Farr
Figueroa
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Goldsmith
Gowdy
Grau
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
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"yea" to "nay."

Messrs. VELA, DOGGETT, HOYER, SWALWELL of California, SHERMAN, and COHEN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 257, noes 167, not voting 9, as follows:  

ROLL CALL NO. 343  

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill. The vote was taken and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.
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 WHEREEVER THEY DESIRE

Whereas Liu Xiaobo was diagnosed with terminal liver cancer in May 2017 and granted permission to access medical treatment in the United States or elsewhere; and

Whereas in December 2009, a Beijing court decided to transfer him to Beijing No. 2 Prison; and

Whereas Liu Xiaobo was one of the original drafters of Charter 08 and was taken into custody one day before the manifesto was released; and

Whereas in December 2009, a Beijing court sentenced Liu Xiaobo to 11 years in prison for "inciting subversion of state power", in part for his role in Charter 08; and

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; and

Whereas Liu Xiaobo's 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. R. 353

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H. R. 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 homeownership.

By recalcultating 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 aspirng 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. 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 re-capture 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 90,000 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 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.

Congratulations, 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 which focused on someone we all know and love: fellow Pennsylvanian Fred Rogers. Joanna used to watch reruns of his PBS show with enormous and overwhelming enjoyment.

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.

Honor 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. Mr. Speaker, July 4, 1776, Philadelphia, 56 misfits, rebels deriding only three hits and one unearned run.

Zigan, came back to win their very first State Championship since 2010. They had 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.
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 the 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 democracy defenders 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 crimes—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.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend this body, especially our colleague, Congressman CHRISS 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.

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.

Under Nicolás Maduro, a country that had been one of Latin America’s wealthiest is having its democratic institutions shred-ded amid rising poverty and corruption.

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 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.

Under Nicolás Maduro, a country that had been one of Latin America’s wealthiest is having its democratic institutions shredded amid rising poverty and corruption.

Under Nicolás Maduro, a county that was one of America’s wealthiest is seeing its democratic institutions collapse, leading to levels of disease, hunger and destruction more often seen in war-torn nations than oil-rich ones.

Mr. Chávez’s successor, President Nicolás Maduro, has called for a National Constitu-tional 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 change the way Venezuela was governed. This led to the downfall of the number of political prisoners over the past year to 391, according to the Venezuelan human rights group Foro Penal—nearly four times the number of prisoners 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 “robulacón” rather than a “revolución,” using the Spanish word for robbery. If Cuba is an island-wide 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 sufficed Mr. Maduro’s own family. Two nephews of Venezuela’s first lady, Cilia Flores, are awaiting sentencing for a drug sting found guilty last year of conspiring to import 800 kilos of cocaine to the U.S. through Honduras. They pleaded not guilty.

In recent years, Venezuela has aligned itself with Russia and China, and other officials have dismissed accusations “politically motivated.” The Trump administration has criticized the country’s democratic institutions. They 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 the U.S. Treasury Department’s kingpin list.

Mr. Maduro’s own family. Two nephews of Venezuela’s first lady, Cilia Flores, are awaiting sentencing for a drug sting 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 Tareck El Aissami is on the U.S. Treasury Department’s kingpin list. More than 125 Venezuelan officials have been put on a blacklist, accusing him of being a drug cartels. And the head of Venezuela’s supreme court is on another Treasury blacklist for funding the country’s democratic institutions. They say that they are innocent and accuse the U.S. of trying to destabilize Venezuela.

The government didn’t respond to requests for comment. 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.
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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 multimillion-dollar legal fees in 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’s generous, patriotic generosity on 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 bolívares. But they can turn around and sell those dollars on the black market for 8,300 bolívares.

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 $39 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 Venezuela 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 return to the country’s democratic past. Idelsohn Martinez, who helped write one of the country’s most beloved soap operas, says that hope is 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 has not played in 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 Contemporary 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—until recently—when one county in New York State.

For the past 200 years, the Utica Observer-Dispatch has kept our region 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.
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 has 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 into law, including 14 bills passed under the Congressional Review Act, stopping harmful regulations handed into law, including 14 bills passed under the 111th Congress under President Clinton, 67 bills by the 107th Congress under Bill Clinton, 158 bills, compared to the 60 bills passed 158 bills, compared to the 60 bills passed

By June 8, we had 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 two ideas.

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 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 intellec-
tual human being, the physical human being, the knowledge base that is there, and the spirit within us, and our thought, and our 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 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 right not to be violated. The very foundations of 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 life that we 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 the 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 graduated the day before with a perfect 4.0 grade point average, and her major was in criminal investigation. She would, today, be in jail for murder.

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 just cost to bury 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, 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 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 American citizens, 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 her grave today because Eswin Mejia.

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 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. But I think, especially, of the onset of this discussion, and I think of Sarah Root. And the 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 graduated the day before with a perfect 4.0 grade point average, and her major was in criminal investigation. She would, today, be in jail for murder.

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 just cost to bury 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, 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 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 American citizens, 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 her grave today because Eswin Mejia.

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 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.
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 prison who are illegal aliens—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 arrive to this substantia 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? 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 I finally got the message back that I had 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 the streets of America.

You can see what happens to the crime in this country. If you are importing people from this other 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 into 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, 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 laws 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, went to tell the law enforcement 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 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 I convinced 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 to Sarah Root.

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 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 sanctuary city law?

That is the right thing for us to do. What her family wants is that no other families have to suffer like she 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 can’t seem close to having as big a name 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 talk things to either things 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 I didn’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 their children can play, 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 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 alien gang member. I 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 gangster 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 not enacted 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 jars 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 have run 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—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 detained at least once and probably more times than that running on 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 ran 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 is not our country who didn’t have a driver’s license, didn’t have insurance, and it has got nothing 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.

I think that was at my district, Mr. Speaker. 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 me to, 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 those families, we 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. He absconded, we think, to Honduras. Those numbers have gone up, not down. 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 that 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 the day I heard on the news 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 that those who have come from some of those countries.

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 who 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. The people record the 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 the 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 look here are 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 with that line of 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 one 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 standalone 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.

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 detainee 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 relates 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. If you have 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, and to our 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, 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 the city 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 work, 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 Austin.” 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 the people.

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 their time of need.

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 on 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 to try and 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 internal and external threats, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
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 such as 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 therefore offensive to the people. In other words, they are starting to say, “We do not like what you are saying.” 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’s position on Islam, including the Murjiah.

In the Middle East, Egypt has recently come under scrutiny because of the increase in attacks from Islamic extremists who target Christians.

In May, guerriver force 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 at 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. At least 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 Iraq, 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 Iraq, 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, 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, once they are Christians, they have nowhere to go.

My 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 Ghashaniye, 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 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 in Russia?

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 went to church, 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. I call him the despot 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 if you try to worship, 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 make sure that that religion does not exist. 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 Union 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 a 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 combat 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.

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 minority groups, 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, they got together and they wrote the Constitution, they added 10 Amendments to the Constitution.

The First Amendment of the Constitution is the 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.” 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.

Mr. Speaker.

MARIJUANA GROW OPERATIONS ARE HAVING ON OUR NATION’S PUBLIC LANDS

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 Members and to the news that the death 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, something that has been a priority 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 supporting 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 that China and, of course, the ranking member, ELIOT ENGEL.

The majority member, ELIOT ENGEL.
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nonviolent struggle for fundamental human rights in China."

to get this important recognition that important award. Others, including the joint recipients of this most prestigious award. Others, including the Nobel Peace Prize and, at the same time, was this chair without the 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 empty, conveying that we have not reciprocated this important recognition which we had hoped would help push the human rights agenda in China.

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 there to give his courage and hopefully freer 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 envy of tyrants. To stifle 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 years, 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.

Sad! 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 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 extraordinary aggression against 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.- China 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 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—particularly on public 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 well.

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 burns 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 are bending over backwards to recover, to try to protect, have tested positive for these poisons and other contaminants used at these illegal grow sites.

Preliminary tests of game animals, including birds and deer, have also tested positive for these illegal pesticides. Again, 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 illegal 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 least until recent months with the new administration and the new administration 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 continue.

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 after 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 on 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-related criminal organizations 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 armed drug-related criminal activity 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 upon illegal grow operations 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 public hands 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, even before the rains—there are expectations 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 they aren’t equipped with the national 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, not some that is supposed to be overseeing these lands. So we are talking about something 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 would 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. HAND, 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. Wilsey, 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. 260); to the Committee on Armed Services.
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 establish a program 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 study the needs of 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. FRTITZUK):
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, perfluorooctane sulfonic acid and perfluorooctanoic acid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Ms. MAST, Mr. REED, Ms. BARRAK, 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 assure increased consumer protection and product traceability with respect to commercially marketed sea food 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. LAHOD (for himself, Mr. RUSH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ROSSKAM, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):
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. TERRY SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. VALENSQUEZ, Mr. DENNIS MOORE of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MEeks, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SHEERAN, Mr. KILDER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MESSER, Ms. BRATT, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. POLQUIN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. TROTT, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. GROTHENDIECK, and Mr. CARPENETI):
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. BLEUMAUSER, Mr. HOGINS of New York, Ms. SERRILL of Alabama, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. PASCHEN, and Mr. BURKhardt):
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 Medicaid 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.
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.

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.

H.R. 3123. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal posthumously 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 Oversight and Government Reform.

H.R. 3124. 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.

H.R. 3125. A bill to direct the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund to perform an outreach program for the new markets tax credit and to provide 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.

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.

H.R. 3127. A bill to amend section 111 of the Clean Air Act to encourage energy efficiency projects, pollution control projects, and reliability projects from the definition of a modification; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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 Committees 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.

H.R. 3129. A bill to direct the Community Development Investment Institutional Fund to increase the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund. To be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 3130. A bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to promote active citizenship, including volunteering, 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.

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.

H.R. 3132. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the occurrence of diabetes in Medicare beneficiaries by extending 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.

H.R. 3133. A bill to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

H.R. 3134. A bill to abolish the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

H.R. 3135. A bill to provide for the federal share of the costs of providing voter registration forms at certain naturalization ceremonies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

H.R. 3136. 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.

H.R. 3137. 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.

H.R. 3138. 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.

H.R. 3139. A bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to promote active citizenship, including volunteering, 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.

H.R. 3140. A bill to extend 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.

H.R. 3141. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Retirement Home Act of 1959 to establish a new method of operation and management of the Armed Forces Retirement Home; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3142. A bill to establish the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3143. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to change the method of operation of 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.

H.R. 3144. A bill to abolish the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

H.R. 3145. A bill to provide 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.

H.R. 3146. A bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to promote active citizenship, including volunteering, 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.
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.

By Mr. LABRON of North Carolina, for himself, Mr. BRADFORD of North Carolina, Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona, Mr. GUEZ of Florida, Mr. VAUGHN of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 3140. A bill to establish a National and Community Service Corporation 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. VENEZIA):

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. Delany):

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 electric 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, Mr. Walorski, 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. Money 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 for the United States a bilateral free trade agreement with Turkey; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NolAN:

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 Mr. 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 increase the Federal-aid highway program funds for the time 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 Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 3150. 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 Secretaries of Veterans Affairs to hire, rehire, and train employees, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, 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 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. 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. Barragan, 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 the establishment 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 H. 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 project plans for purposes related to expanded uses of the Fund, and to reduce the Capitola Public Housing Authority property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3156. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to establish a special counsel for the Department of Justice Inspector General; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

H.R. 3157. A bill to amend the Safe Schools Act of 2011 to improve the handling of incidents 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. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. Chaffetz, Mr. Israel, Mr. Honda, and Mr. Smith of New Jersey):

H. Res. 422. A resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the over-time 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. Chaffetz, Mr. Israel, Mr. Honda, and Mr. Smith of New Jersey):

H. Res. 422. A resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the over-time 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. 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 NAFTACA) on the celebration of its 30th anniversary and recognizing its members' vital and motivated service to the public, and for ensuring the safety of the nation's airspace.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself, Mr. Nadler, Mr. Jeffries, Ms. Clarke of New York, Mr. Crowley, Mr. Meeks, Mrs. Carolelynn Maloney of New York, Mr. Serrano, Mr. Escobar, 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. Nortcutt, Ms. Torres, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Peters, Mr. Gallego, Mr. Panetta, and Ms. Titus):

H. Res. 424. 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 the draft and the draft process in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia:

H. Res. 427. 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 the draft and the draft process in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.
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 I, 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 I, 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.

By Mr. LEVIN:
H.R. 3111.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
"The Congress shall have Power To . . . establish Post Offices and post Roads . . ."

By Mr. SMITH 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.
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. GRIFFITTH:
H.R. 3129.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. HECK:
H.R. 3129.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. HUIZENGA:
H.R. 3131.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. NOLAN:
H.R. 3133.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. RICHMOND:
H.R. 3145.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. SUOZZI:
H.R. 3156.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. TAKANO:
H.R. 3156.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. PASCRELL:
H.R. 3149.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:
H.R. 3150.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. REICHERT:
H.R. 3152.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. MESSER:
H.R. 3145.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. SCHRADE:
H.R. 3155.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. SOTO:
H.R. 3156.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. SUOZZI:
H.R. 3157.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. TAKANO:
H.R. 3158.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
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. WILLIAMS, 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. BEIDENSTINE, Mr. PALAZZO, Ms. Seward, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2996: Mr. BABIN, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 2997: Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. WESTHMAN, Mr. FASO, Mr. LA MALFA, Mr. LUKYANCHUK, Mr. DUCHEENE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 2999: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 3000: Mr. TROTT and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 3001: Mr. CORREA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MACK, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 3030: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. KINZINGER.
H.R. 3031: Mr. NORTON.
H.R. 3040: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 3059: Mrs. BRAT, Mr. PLASKETT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON of Georgia, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. KILDEER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PUDGE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. BASS, Mr. McEachin, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CONEY, and Ms. DELAUR
H.R. 3067: Mr. JACKSON of New York.
H.R. 3073: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. WILLIAMS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3087: Ms. JACKSON of New York.
H.R. 3088: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 3097: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. COLE, Mr. LA MALFA, 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. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 3101: Mr. CORREIA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3102: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 3103: Mr. WILSON.
H.R. 3104: Mr. NOGAL, Mr. KUSSICK, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CONEY, and Ms. DELAUR
H.R. 3105: Mr. TROTT and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 3106: Mr. WILSON.
H.R. 3107: Mr. STALLWORTH.
H.R. 3108: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 3109: Mr. COLE, Mr. LA MALFA, 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. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 3110: Mr. CORREIA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3111: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 3112: Mr. WILSON.
H.R. 3113: Mr. STALLWORTH.
H.R. 3114: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 3115: Mr. CORREIA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3116: Mr. WILSON.
H.R. 3117: Mr. STALLWORTH.
H.R. 3118: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 3119: Mr. CORREIA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3120: Mr. WILSON.
H.R. 3121: Mr. STALLWORTH.
H.R. 3122: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BARRAGÁN.
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 resources 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 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.
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 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 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 enemy fire continued unabated, making all of the enemy. ’’

Arthur Jackson was one of the greats, and like with many great men, his career had a somewhat tragic ending. After leaving 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 tried the locked gate 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. Instead of reporting the man’s death, 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. 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 it never forgot why he was there, and it almost cruel because he left behind a daughter at such a young age. In fact, it seems approximately succumbed to disease at home well loved by all who did know him. Today I want to recognize him briefly for his service.

Joe Dale Burgess was one impressive man—a quiet man, a humble man, a man whose only ambition was to serve his country, who put everything on the line 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 had complete and total respect. 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 trooper.

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 ailments: 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 Himalayas, 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 who only and exclusively served 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.
CLOSURE 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:

CLOSURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII or 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.


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 Connecticut (Mr. CANTWELL), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

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. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, every week I have been coming down to the floor of the Senate to talk about a special Alaskan story. My State is one of the most unique and diverse places on the planet, where so many Alaskan military veterans have served our country, and, 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 many of you, 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 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 William Atkinson. He spent years reaching out to his community. He was a co-founder of the island and was instrumental in starting that organization. He also had the honor of training 48 as a SEAL, including the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart. But what is truly remarkable 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, 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 Alaskan Natives 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 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 mentored, the flyers 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 bill that 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 backwards, so out of step with what America wants and what we can afford. 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 making the fraudulent promise of 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 up for this. Oh, and 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 $8,000 a year and the deductible for the average 40-year-old 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 is better off and the American people are as riled up 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 actually asking for it. President Trump, and the majority leader 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.

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 and 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 riled up 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 actually asking for it. 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—but in this situation, 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 unified voice that 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. It is important for Speaker Ryan to get the House to act on this legislation before the July 4th recess. If they interfere with our legislation, we will be punished. These new sanctions should also help to deter future Russian interference.

Parallel to the protests, chaos is becoming commonplace. In the past 72 hours, people 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 of her criticism of President Maduro. The legislative clerk proceeded to 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.

VENUEZULA

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak about the risk 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 result, thousands have been injured and hundreds more have been killed. 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 democracy, and this week the people 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 scrounge for food and water. 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, people 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 of her criticism of President Maduro. We have seen lootings and the burning of government buildings. Alarming, a rogue police officer commandeered a helicopter and launched grenades and small arms fire while flying over the National Guard. 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 is a political appendage of the executive branch.

In the 18 months since the opposition coalition won control of the National Assembly—and I must say there was hope when we knew 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 330 political prisoners recognized by Venezuela’s 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.

I urge all colleagues to think 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 has a 49.9 percent of Citgo’s mortgage and control over an important critical U.S. energy infrastructure, including refineries, terminals, and a large network of pipelines. This should
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.

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.

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

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. Cassidy). 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 commonsense bills we can and should take up 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.

In the Senate 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 Representativen
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 budget 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 our families and entities 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 our ability to grow, 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 addiction behavioral health services. In the traditional hospital setting, about 14 to 15 percent of the patients are on Medicaid. He believes 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 just on the public dole, and that they are just sitting there waiting for 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 the Congressional Budget Office. seniors and those enrollees 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 other Medicare plans, 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 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 of other pre-existing 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 for 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 Restemeyer. This is her story.

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 were just turning three 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 help her become better able to walk 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, who 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 life-line, and it has been a lifeguard. But what is more telling about these Medicaid cuts would also 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 Thoresen. 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.

If it weren't for Medicaid, Fran doesn't have the level of care she needs. If it weren't for Medicaid, 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 a career in 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.

Now she is one of many seniors on Medicaid who are losing their independence and their dignity. Medicaid provides almost $5 million in services for convicted traffickers, and last year it provided over $1 billion in services for victims. Let me dwell on that for just a minute.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The Senate Republican bill threatens the coverage that Fran has and that so many others rely on. You know what the problem is? They don't have any money or savings left. She spent it all on her healthcare.

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.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I want to come to the floor to talk about healthcare, a subject I know the President 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, but 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 because she was forced to have sexual intercourse with strangers.

A virtual version of this bill is an extension of the Domestic Trafficking Victims Fund, which provides critical resources that victims need to recover from human crime. Funds are financed through fines collected on convicted traffickers, and last year it provided over $17 million in services for victims. Let me dwell on that for just a minute.
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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.

As I suggested, many of our military servicemembers have experience driving trucks 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 trained to do in the Armed Forces. 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 literally 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 new job and a meaningful career. I expect the Commerce Committee to consider and pass this bill, as well, today.

I happened to be in the Senate Chamber on Christmas Eve in 2009, at 7:30 in the morning. The Senate was in session. 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 it. 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. As we pointed out, what he showed 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, not selling insurance in certain States, 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 the Republican conference 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 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 one thing that our Democratic colleagues are not willing to lift a finger to help. Surely, they have constituents, as I do in Texas, who are contracting 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.

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 can 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

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.

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. Too many of us have observed 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 people who had to pay out of pocket to hire veterans, it helps our veterans easier for our veterans to get jobs in our Nation’s trucking industry. The Jobs for Our Heroes Act of 2017, this legislation I want to mention is the bipartisan example of my colleague from Minnesota, Senator Klobuchar, as well as the Judiciary Committee members like 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 trucks 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 trained to do in the Armed Forces. 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 literally 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 new 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 ways that will help all of our States and the people we serve.
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 called 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 the 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 with 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 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 important 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 everyone 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. It is an increase in Medicaid. The Better Care Reconciliation Act does to Medicaid.

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 this and 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 ceding 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 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.
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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.


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 adjourns until the next pro forma session: Monday, July 3; Monday, July 10; 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, so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I present 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.

(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 violence 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 following:

[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 and deploying one of the most feared symbols in American racial history. Instead, the vandals unintentionally offered a contemporary reminder of one of the black experiences in America, so believing 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 noose 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 era of Jim Crow 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 1869 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 African 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 racism.

So, what does it mean to have found three nooses on Smithsonian grounds in 2017? A
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 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 up our positions 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 agreed 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 Appropriations Committee on Appropriations turned 150 years old. For its first quarter-century, the Senate operated without permanent legislative committees. Instead, at the end of a session, Senators decided what committees would consider bills. In 1865, the Senate's approach to such bills, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

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 workload was expanded 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 and their directors simply spent those funds as they pleased. By the 1860s senators realized that they needed to gain better control over appropriations. 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 approval.

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 unanimous consent—passed subsequent legislation to better regulate how such funds were used.
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 event 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.

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.
(iii) Description and Quantity of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:
Major Defense Equipment (MDE):
One hundred sixty-eight (168) MK-54 Light-weight 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
(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.

*As defined in Section 47(b) of the Arms Export Control Act.
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old . . . Cannon, was broken up . . . just short of physical violence," noted the Washington Post on August 19, 1900.

While meeting in conference, Senator McKellar dead shot him, commented on Can-
non’s personality, using language peppered with words such as blind, stupid, and pig-
headed. Furiated, 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 move Cannon’s head.

“In the nick of time,” the Post reported, a staff member “grabbed Cannon” and “two senators selered from the floor from McKellar.”

Peace was restored . . . for the moment.

A decade later, another chairman of the Appropriations Committee—Senator Carl Hayden—suggested a special meeting to be held on the Senate side of the Capitol Hill. Hayden countered. In that case, 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.

Then, for the Senate lasted for months. Meeting after meeting produced no agree-
ment. 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. “Mansfield and Senator Cannon spoke so bitterly that he would not be so much as an eighth of an inch more on one side than the other.”

Presented with this option, Chairman Can-
non 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 himself, the Senate sacrificed a few of its cherished privileges, and government operations returned to nor-
mal.

Pundits dismissed the battle as a tempest in a teapot, but more astute observers recog-
nized that this high-profile battle was an-
other chapter in an on-going struggle over the shared discretionary powers of the Sen-
ate and the House.

Finally, this evening I would like to high-
light an important but mostly forgotten milestone in this struggle to achieve 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 Com-
mittee.

Her name was Leona Wells. She joined the Senate’s clerical staff in 1901 and remained on the payroll for 23 years. I believe her to be the first woman to hold a top committee po-
sition in the Senate.

Born in Illinois in 1877, Wells moved to Wy-
oming when she turned 21, because this young suffragist could cast a vote in Wy-
oming. There she met Senator Francis E. Warren, whose patronage brought her to Wash-
ington.

As chair of the Military Affairs Com-
mitee, Senator Wells dealt with the committee’s clerical staff. When he be-
came chairman of Appropriations in 1911, he brought Wells with him, giving her the posi-
tion 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,” 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 was the 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 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 has been widely acknowledged. “I believe her to be one of the most envied women who have served in Congress,” wrote the Globe in 1911. 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 Com-
mittee.

Her name was Leona Wells. She joined the Senate’s clerical staff in 1901 and remained on the payroll for 23 years. I believe her to be the first woman to hold a top committee po-
sition in the Senate.

Born in Illinois in 1877, Wells moved to Wy-
oming when she turned 21, because this young suffragist could cast a vote in Wy-
oming. There she met Senator Francis E. Warren, whose patronage brought her to Wash-
ington.

As chair of the Military Affairs Com-
mitee, Senator Wells dealt with the committee’s clerical staff. When he be-
came chairman of Appropriations in 1911, he brought Wells with him, giving her the posi-
tion 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,” 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 was the 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 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 has been widely acknowledged. “I believe her to be one of the most envied women who have served in Congress,” wrote the Globe in 1911.
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 containners, torpedo support, torpedo spare parts, publications, training, weapon system support, engineering and technical assistance for the MK-54 LWT 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 defensive deterrence 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.

The will be various contacts involved in this case.

There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

1. There is no Critical Program Information associated with 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 MK4 Mod 0 LWT. The purchaser currently does not have this weapon system in its inventory. The proposed sale consists of 168 MK-54 Mod 0 LWT conversion kits, containers, spare and repair parts, weapon system support and integration, personnel training, equipment, technical and logistics support services and other related elements of logistical support.

2. The technical manual is required for operation of the MK 54 Mod 0 LWT. The highest classification of the software is SECRET.

3. A determination has been made that the recipient country can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technical information contained in the technical manual that will be 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.

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.

3. A determination has been made that the recipient country can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technical information contained in the technical manual that will be 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.

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. 16–69
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 fulfills a request for the MK 48 Mod 6 Advanced Technology (AT) version of the system. The recipient 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, equipment, technical and logistics support services and other related elements of logistical support.

2. 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. A determination has been made that the recipient country can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technical information contained in the technical manual that will be 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.

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 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 fulfills a request for the MK 48 Mod 6 Advanced Technology (AT) version of the system. The recipient 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, equipment, technical and logistics support services and other related elements of logistical support.

2. 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. A determination has been made that the recipient country can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technical information contained in the technical manual that will be 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.

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 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.
Hon. BOB CORRER, Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the report 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 (TECRO) in the United States.

This proposed sale serves U.S. national, economic and security interests by supporting the recipient's continuing efforts to modernize 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 IIIs to be used for self-defense against air and cruise weapon threats on board their destroyer-class surface ships. The recipient will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed 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.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXEY,
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

Enclosures.

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
(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 (GSs);
Fifty (50) MK 45 MOD 14 SM-2 Block IIIA Target Detecting Devices (TDDS) Shrouds.

Non-MDE includes: Seventeen (17) MK 11 MOD6 SM-2 Block IIIA Autopilot Battery Units (APBUs) maneuverability upgrades on the GSs, sixty-nine (69) section contains 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 TV-1, TV-7,
(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.
(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Article or Service: No Duplicative 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 (GSs), 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 GSs, sixty-nine (69) sections, 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.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the report 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 new report 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 Missiles Planning System 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 Article or Service: No Duplicative 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 Missiles 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 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 the 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 the 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-15C Joint Standoff Weapon (JSOW) is a low observable, 1,000 lb. class, inertial navigation and global positioning sat-
ellite guided family of air-to-ground glide weapons. JSOW consists of a common airframe and avionics that provides for a mod-
ular payload to attack any stationary and moving massed flight-armed and ar-
mored vehicles, surface-to-air, soft to hard, relocatable, and fixed targets. JSOW provides combat forces with an all-weather/day
ight/multiple kills per pass, launch and leave, and standoff capability.
2. The highest classification of the hard-
ware 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 source code will be disclosed and 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 capab-
ilities.
4. 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 are authorized for release 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 re-
porting 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 Re-
presentative Office in the United States for defense articles and services estimated to cost $400 million. After this letter is deliv-
ered to our office, we plan to issue a news re-
lease 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 Quan-
tities of Articles or Services under Consider-
ation for Purchase:
Non-MDE includes: Follow-on sustainment package for the Surveillance Radar Program (SRP) that includes contractor logistics sup-
port (sustainment); engineering services and technical updates to address equipment obso-
lescencce; 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 train-
ing equipment; U.S. Government and con-
tactor engineering; technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support.
(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: TW-D
(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Of-
fered, 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 476 of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION
Taipei Economic and Cultural Representa-
tive Office (TECRO) in the United States—Surveillance Radar Program (SRP) Oper-
ation and Maintenance Support

TECRO requested a possible sale of SRP Operation and Maintenance follow-on sustainment package that includes, con-
tactor logistics support (sustainment); engi-
nering services and technical updates to ad-
dress equipment obsolescence and standard transpor-
tation and material costs associated with contractor repair and return services; spare and repair parts; support and test equip-
ment; publications and technical documentation personnel training and training equip-
ment; U.S. Government and contractor engi-
nering services and 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 U.S. law and policy as expressed in Public Law 96-8.

The 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 recipi-
ent, which has been and continues to be an important force for political stability, mili-
tary 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 Recon-
naisance architecture. It will be used the re-
quested updates and sustainment as a defense-
deterrent to regional threats and to strength-
then its homeland defense. This potential sale will not introduce new capabilities, but will continue a previous sustainment package to one currently in place.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military bal-
ance in the region.

Currently, market research is being con-
ducted to determine the viability of a quali-
cified contractor in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulations. The purchaser typi-
cally 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 representa-
tives 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 crit-
icall element to its Command, Control, Com-
munications, Computers, Intelligence, Sur-
veillance, and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) infra-
structure. The radars provide a robust capa-
bility 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 envi-
ronments 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 hard-
ware to be exported is UNCLASSIFIED. The highest classification of the technical docu-
mentation to be exported is SECRET. There are technical manuals as well as Engineering Change Proposals, drawings, and specifi-
cations required as part of the sustainment up-
dates. 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 infor-
mation 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 capab-
ilities.
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, containing the Department of the Air Force proposed Letter(s) of Acceptance to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States—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, containing the Department of the Navy proposed Letter(s) of Acceptance to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States—Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States.

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 $80 million.
   Total $127.5 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 (QZB)

(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 This Sale or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 29, 2017.

* As defined in Section 476 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 (HARMs)

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.

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:
   - Major Defense Equipment (MDE):
     - AN/SQX–32(V)3 Electronic Warfare System upgrade hardware, software, support equipment and parts, publications, training, engineering and technical assistance.

   - IV. Military Department: Navy (LH)

   - 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 This Sale or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

   - VIII. Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 29, 2017.

* As defined in Section 476 of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION
Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) in the United States—AN/SQX–32(V)3 Upgrade

TECRO has requested a possible sale to upgrade the AN/SQX–32(V)3 Electronic Warfare Systems in support of four (4) ex-KIDD Class (now KEELEUNG Class) destroyers. This sale will include AN/SQX–32(V)3 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.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXLEY,
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.
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 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 for the period of performance.

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 cataloguing of the electronic signature of missiles and aircraft. The system consists of sensors and computing which process data within parameters established in a threat library. The customer currently has an earlier version of this equipment in inventory.
2. 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.
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.

In summary, the requested release of AN/SLQ–32(V)3 equipment will enhance the recipient’s overall defense capability and improve the recipient’s overall defensive national security objectives in the Policy justification.

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 MURIN, as a fair reading of the Affordable Care Act text 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 is a 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 it affordable by reducing the often daunting costs, such as copayments and deductibles, that even those with health insurance must pay to obtain healthcare. The 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 requiring surrender 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 intended by 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. For too long, our LGBTQ brothers, sisters, fathers, mothers, children, and grandparents have fought for 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 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 the threatening 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 achieved, 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.

In 1969, with a simple的话語, the Stonewall Riots began, and the doors to the future opened. Today, amid 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 anyone 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 Equal Rights 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 protections.

The Marketplace Certainty 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 torch by introducing the bipartisan 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 people.

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 peculiarly 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.

Just as with the Obama administration that put 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 congressional 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 Vindicating 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 LGBTQ Americans 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 our 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 not protected and will not turn back the clock on hard-fought civil rights for the LGBTQ community.

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 and 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 $80 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 resi-
dents, and approximately 75 miles of
developed commercial, municipal, and
residential shoreline. It also allows for
ergency 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 up-
stream to freshwater spawning
grounds, which is important to ful-
filling Federal Tribal treaty responsi-

ble 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 stu-
dents in the Froid and Medicine Lake
communities safely reach their des-
tination.

Both behind the wheel and behind
the whistle, Marvin’s commitment to safe-
ty and fair play has helped a genera-
tion of Montana students. Officiating
high school sports is often a thankless task. Looking back on Marvin’s distin-
guished 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 retire-
ment from a 40-year teaching career.
As Mary Jo Codey wraps up her final
school year as a second-grade teach-
er in a public school in West Orange, NJ, we
congratulate her on a long and fruitful
career inspiring and educating our chil-
dren 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 re-
 fused 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 at the core of my pas-
sion. Her dedication to her students
and to her State will not soon be for-
gotten.

While teaching may have been Mary Jo’s first passion, her drive to make
life better for children and families ex-
tends 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 treat-
ment for it. Instead of hiding her ill-
ness or being ashamed of it, Mary Jo’s
personal struggle became the motiva-
tion for her to raise awareness for
postpartum depression and work tire-
lessly to improve diagnostic and treat-
ment options on the State and Federal
level.

Thanks to her leadership, New Jersey
became the first State to provide re-
sources to ensure that uninsured moth-
ers can receive postpartum depression
screening and treatment. I am proud to
say that Mary Jo and I worked to-
gether to pass the Melanie Blocker
Stokes Mom’s Opportunity To Access
Health, Education, Research, and Sup-
port for Postpartum Depression Act, or
MOTHERS Act, as part of the Afford-
able 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 depres-
sion and other aspects of maternal
mental health are given the awareness
and resources that they deserve. How-
ever, 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.

With that, I look forward to con-
tinuing to work with Mary Jo in the
coming years, thank her for her incred-
sible service to New Jersey and all of
us, and congratulate her on her retire-
ment.

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 Of-

er 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 pro-
cedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by
Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, an-
ounced 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 bur-
den 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 392 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 bur-
den 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 392 as “Robert Emmet
Park”, and for other purposes; to the Com-
mittee 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.

By Mr. STRICKLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with amendments:

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. Brown, Mr. Carper, Mrs. McCaskill, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Reed, Ms. Warren, and Mr. Wyden):

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.

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. Corzine):

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. Paul):

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. HATCH:

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 Ms. HURST:

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 Mr. 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 SHEA Atka, Incorporated, under the Cape 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 Ukpaevik 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. Brown, Mr. Carper, Mrs. McCaskill, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Reed, Ms. Warren, and Mr. Wyden):

S. 1489. A bill to amend section 3121 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 Wrangel, 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 require a study and report identifying the impacts on Chuuk-Chukotka Corporation land that resulted from changes in Federal law or Federal or State land acquisitions in the Chuuk region, 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 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. 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. MARK K. HARKIN, Mr. Pordinator, Mr. MENDENDEZ, 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. MURCHISON):


By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. RICHARDSON):

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. WARNER (for herself, Mr. McCAIN, Mr. MARKY, Mr. L. BLUNT, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. MENDENDEZ, 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. RUHLO):

S. 1504. A bill to direct the Attorney General to report on human trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1505. A bill to provide that silencers be treated the same as firearms accessories; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1506. 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 using 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. CRAPAO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HATCH, and Mrs. MURR:

S. 1508. A bill to amend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 to modify the authorized use of certain funds to extend the deadline for participating counties to initiate projects and obligate funds; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PACHUK (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. 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, as 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. LANKFORD (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. COONS):

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. CAPITTO, 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. PETERS):

S. 1515. A bill to facilitate access to university technical expertise in support of Department of Defense missions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 1516. A bill to expand health care choices by allowing American 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 enrollment of S. 722, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. RUHLO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. Young, Mr. LELAY, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CASEY, 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, Ms. SHAHEEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. REED):

S. Res. 211. A resolution denouncing 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, Mr. HINCHI, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. KLOBuchar, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENDENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. COONS, Mr. CASPER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WYDEN):

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, Ms. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BURRE, 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. KAINES, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBuchar, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERRICK, 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. WATERS, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG:

S. Res. 214. A resolution designating June 19, 2017, as "Junteenth 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 4, 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. BUCHanan, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. WARNER, Mr. MARKY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Con. Res. 20. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the over-time rule published in the Federal Register by the Secretary of Labor on May 23, 2016, would protect 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. 47
At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 47, 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 extend the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

S. 497
At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. Daines) and the Secretary from New Hampshire (Mrs. Shaheen) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Murphy) were added as cosponsors 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 (Ms. Capito) was added as a cosponsor of S. 736, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for college 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 for those 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. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. Feinstein) was added as a cosponsor 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.

S. 1028
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. 1028, supra.

S. 1031
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. 1031, 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 Ms. ANTWELL, her name 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. 1139
At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1139, a bill to improve the structure of the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 1162
At the request of Mr. 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. CANTWELL, her name 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.
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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

At the request of Mr. Trump, 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.

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.

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.

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, identify, and dismantle unaccounted-for personnel of the United States.

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:

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:

8138a. Defense Siting Clearinghouse for review of mission obstructions

(1) In general.—(A) The Secretary of Defense shall establish a Defense Siting Clearinghouse in this section referred to as the ‘‘Clearinghouse’’.

(B) The Clearinghouse shall be—

(A) organized under the authority, direction, and control of an Assistant Secretary of Defense designated by the Secretary; and

(B) assign adequate 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 47118 of title 49 and received by the Department of Defense from the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 47118 of title 49.

(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 the Secretary of Transportation a proper application for an energy project under section 47118 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 military operations 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 47118 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 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 impact of energy projects, including the coordination of federal, State, tribal, and local governments and the timely notification and involvement of parties carrying out energy projects.

(2) The Secretary shall—

(A) assess the magnitude of interferences posed by projects filed with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 47118 of title 49.

(B) for the purpose of informing preliminary reviews under subsection (c)(1) and
HAZARD ASSESSMENT.—An action taken pursuant to section 4718 of title 49 where such projects could have an adverse impact on military operations and readiness and categorize the risk of such adverse impact on military operations and readiness, conduct studies of mitigation options, and to conduct studies on military operations and readiness, including:

(i) modifications to military operations to accommodate applications for such projects;

(ii) modifications to military operations to accommodate applications for such projects;

(iii) recommended upgrades or modifications to existing systems or procedures by the Secretary of Defense in such areas as may be filed in the future, with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 4718 of title 49, on military operations and readiness, including:

(iv) acquisition of new systems by the Department of Defense with respect to research and development;

(v) modifications to the projects for which such applications are filed, including changes in size, location, or technology.

(2) The term ‘military installation’ means a person that owns a fee interest in real property on which a proposed energy project is planned to be located.

(3) The term ‘military installation’ includes any training or operation that could be relocated to combat readiness, including testing and evaluation activities.

(4) The term ‘military training route’ means training route developed as part of the Military Training Route Program, carried out jointly by the Federal Aviation Administration and the Secretary of Defense, which identifies military training routes for the purpose of conducting low-altitude, high-speed military training.

(5) The term ‘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 area that would alter the meaning given that term in section 183a of title 10.

(6) The term ‘endanger safety in air commerce, related to the activities of the Department of Defense’ includes any training or operation that could be relocated to maintain military readiness.

(b) CONFORMING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—


(2) REFERENCE TO REGULATIONS.—Section 47178(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’’ and inserting ‘‘313a(i) of title 10’’.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF EXISTING RULES AND REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding the amendments made by subsection (a), any rule or regulation promulgated under section 358 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (49 U.S.C. 47172 note) that is in effect on 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 amended by subsection (a), until such rule or regulation is otherwise amended or repealed.

S. 497

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

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 3315, 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) the term ‘appropriate authority’ means the term ‘appropriate authority’ as defined in section 183a(i) of title 10, United States Code, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) the term ‘appropriate authority’ means the term ‘appropriate authority’ as defined in section 183a(i) of title 10, United States Code, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act;

(b) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Secretary of Defense may only accept and use contributions from any source for the purpose of providing space for, or in connection with, a facility used by the Federal Government and the Secretary of Defense, to expand facilities in public buildings for business or other purposes.

(c) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Secretary of Defense may only accept and use contributions from any source for the purpose of providing space for, or in connection with, a facility used by the Federal Government and the Secretary of Defense, to accommodate applications for such projects;
“(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) in case of an appropriate celebration.—The term ‘appropriate 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; and
“(B) is free from intrusion; and
“(C) contains—
“(i) a chair; and
“(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) COVERED PUBLIC BUILDING.—If 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 shall authorize 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, national 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 ‘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 making this goal reality by passing 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 Federal 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. KENEDDY, 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 legislation 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. Each 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 Presidential-declared flooding disasters, which have cost the Federal government over $66 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 as reducing disaster pays out for 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 help people invest 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 risks. While the bill creates 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 reduced 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 States to put 20 percent of their capitalization fund into the revolving fund, which would allow States 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 communities, including low-income and historically marginalized areas, 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) paragraph (5)(A)—

(i) in clause (1), strike “section 216 A3 that is described as” and insert “subsection (a)(3)(A) that relates to”;

(ii) in clause (2), strike “section 216 A3 that is described as” and insert “subsection (a)(3)(B) that relates to”;

(iii) in clause (7)(A), strike “but applicable” and insert “that follows through “disapproval”.”;

and (2) in section 226, 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. RUHIO, Mr. WARNER, 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. KROUCKER, 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 individuals whose sexuality, actual or suspected, is of concern to them;

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 statements by the spokesman for Chechen leader Ramzan Kadyrov that “You cannot arrest or repress people who don’t exist in the republic.”;

Whereas the Russian Ombudsman for Ramirez 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 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 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 on the basis of 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 these allegations.

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 dehumanization 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 their activities, investigation, 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 against individuals 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 all those individuals who have engaged in this persecution;

The 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 fundamental 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, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKKYY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARNEN, 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, intersex, and questioning (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, in 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 in 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 that same-sex couples have a constitutional right to marry and acknowledged that “many same-sex couples provide loving and nurturing homes and form families and communities that our society recognizes as part of our pluralistic society” and that “laws prohibiting same-sex marriage ‘harass’ 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 bullying and adverse policies and laws prohibiting 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 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) 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 celebrate 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. 2383) 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 12, 2016 in pouring rain at the makeshift memorial to the victims of the Pulse nightclub shooting in Orlando, Florida on June 12, 2016, were singing a lawful, peaceful, nonviolent song 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 Orlando;

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 fallen officer from DART in the line of duty;

Whereas, on 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 brave men and women of local law enforcement for the dedicated service that local law enforcement provided to the community. 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 agreements;

(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 both recognize and challenge the discrimination and inequality that the LGBTQ community endures, 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 LORRENE ARHENS, SERGEANT MICHAEL SMITH, 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.

Whereas, on June 26, 2015, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in Obergefell v. Hodges that same-sex couples have a constitutional right to marry and risked being killed for the safety of the people of Texas. 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 this attack and pledges continued support for the recovery of the survivors;

(3) expresses the belief of the Senate that any 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

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

Whereas, on June 19, 1865, 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 provided 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;
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 130 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 RESTORATION OF HISTORIC AND CLASSIC CARS IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF PRE-SERVING THE TECHNOLOGICAL ACHIEVEMENTS AND CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MARKEY (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 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 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 the development of 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 Secretary of Labor—
(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 and automobile enthusiasts to share their important participation in the economic success of preserving the cultural heritage of the United States, including through the collection and restoration of collector cars.


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 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 relating 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 the 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; and
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. 25091) 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; provide overtime compensation protections to 4,200,000 new employees and strengthening overtime compensation protections for 9,000,000 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 supported issuance 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 $841 per week or $43,188 per year, which would be necessary to fully account for the value of the salary threshold since 1975 due to inflation;
(3) the salary threshold of $1,122 per week or $58,004 per year, which would be necessary to cover the same percentage of all salaried workers as were covered in 1975 after accounting for changes in the consumer price index; and
(4) the salary threshold of $1,372 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; and
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
Liberation from the final overrule rule; and
Whereas millions of workers eagerly await a fair day’s pay for a hard day’s work: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the final rule issued on May 23, 2016, by the Secretary of Labor entitled “Defining and Delimiting the Exemptions for Executive, Administrative, Professional, Outside and Certain Computer Employees” (81 Fed. Reg. 32391)—
(1) would provide more than 13,000,000 workers with greater economic security; and
(2) was upheld through the legally valid exercise of the congressionally-delegated authority of the Secretary of Labor under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; and

(3) urges the Congress to object to proceeding to the nomination of Luis E. Arreaga, of Virginia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Peru.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

JEROME M. ADAMS, of Indiana, to be Medical Director in the regular corps of the Public Health Service, subject to the International Investments Act of 1982, as amended, for a term of four years. VICE VIVIK HALLGREN, M.D., resigned.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

JANET D. DIHELON, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term of five years. VICE N. REBECCA BRENNER, resigned.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

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. VICE KENT YOSHIO HIROZAWA, resigned.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

GERALD W. FAUST, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2021. VICE HARRY R. HOGLANDER, resigned.

THE JUDICIARY

JOSHUA A. DEARL, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals for the purpose of appeal for a term of fifteen years. VICE ERIC T. WASHINGTON, retired.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE

SUSAN M. GORDON, of Virginia, to be President and Director of National Intelligence, vice STEPHANIE S. O’SULLIVAN, resigned.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BY A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A CONSULAR OFFICER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLAENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

ANDREW K. ABORONADO, of California
KAREN A. ANTONY, of Nevada
TOBE R. ARAL, of Georgia
CLAIRE T. BEA, of the District of Columbia
KAREN D. BERTINSCOUT, of the District of Columbia
BRENDA BURMAN, of Arizona
HARLEY M. CHASE, of New Hampshire
JOHN T. CHENG, of the District of Columbia
BERNARDO A. DIAZ, of New Mexico
NANCY A. ESCALERA, of Florida
RESURRECTA E. FAULCON, of North Carolina
PAUL A. FUGLISTER, of North Carolina
BRIAN W. HOFFER, of New York
ERIC W. GROFF, of Washington
CURTIS J. HILDRETH, of Illinois
CHERYL L. HO, of the District of Columbia
ANGEL M. HUPLER, of Florida
GREGG P. KRAUS, of Colorado
CHRISTOPHER D. JOHNSON, of New York
JOSHUA R. JOHNSON, of California
HENRY C. JONES, of New York
CHARLES R. JURIS, of California
KENNETH A. KUSCHE, of Pennsylvania
NICHOLAS A. LARRABEE, of California
CARRIE D. LAWTON, of North Carolina
JULIAN A. RIDDLE, of the District of Columbia
RUSSELL C. ROBERTS, of New Mexico
THOMAS R. ROY, of South Carolina
STEPHANIE R. RYAN, of New Jersey
LAURA J. TRAVIS, of Virginia
LAUREN B. ROBERTS, of Virginia
STELLA M. WARD, of Alabama
LAURIE A. WILSON, of Montana

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

PETER B. DAVIDSON, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, vice NICHOLAS A. LARRABEE, resigned.

NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR

ALAN A. DELL, of Virginia, to be the National Security Advisor, vice HAYDEN C. WILLIAMS, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, vice THOMAS E. PEREZ, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

CHRISTOPHER CAMPBELL, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, vice CYRUS AMIR-MOKRI, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

PETER S. DAVIDSON, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce, vice ERIK T. WEST, resigned.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

ROBERT L. SUMWALT III, of South Carolina, to be Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term of two years, vice CHRISTOPHER A. HAST, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BRENDA BURMAN, of Arizona, to be Commissioner of Reclamation, vice ERIK T. WEST, resigned.

JASON KERRANS, of Colorado, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission for the term expiring December 18, 2021, vice DIAN A. FINKELSTEIN, resigned.

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

JASON KERRANS, of Colorado, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission for the term expiring December 18, 2021, vice DIAN A. FINKELSTEIN, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

LUIS E. ABBREDO, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Peru.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

KRISHNA R. URS, of Connecticut, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Peru.
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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.
HONORING HIS HOLINESS GURDEV RAKESHBHAI JHAVERI, SPIRITUAL LEADER OF THE SHRIMAD RAJCHANDRA MISSION IN DHARAMPUR

HON. RAJA KRISHNA MOORTHI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. KRISHNA MOORTHI. 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 Puja. Following in the footsteps of his guru Shrimad Rajchandra, Puja 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 Jainism and its values. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support my many friends who follow Jainism and its values. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support my many friends who follow Jainism and its values.

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 Dean of the School of Education at Western, Lee was 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 in Cameroon. 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.

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 communities continue 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.

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.

LEON R. 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.

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.
Medicaid and reforms to the individual insurance 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.

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 the same 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 on 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 insurance 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 RECOGNITION OF EDUARDO AND MARIA VALADAO

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. VALADAO of California, 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 flowered the 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. From 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. In 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 four 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 a 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 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. We were 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 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 house 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 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. Thank you 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.
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 variety of men's wear 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.

Spawning 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 Hartwell, 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.
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 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 gave it well but it was no 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 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 serve 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 Louisciana 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 restauranteurs 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, Louise 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 then began rising through the ranks as a field representative, operations supervisor, operations officer, area administrative assistant, executive assistant and district manager. He then served as District Manager in Chillicothe, Ohio, moving to Toledo, Ohio in 1993 where he had 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 2001 “in recognition of his dedication to 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 completed his career as a District Manager of the 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 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 numerous 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 benefited 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 Mohammed Ali’s call that “Service to others is the payment you make for your space here on earth.”
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 footwear company 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 child'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 personal 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 the United States Army Corps of Engineers was 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 peril's 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 need for a twelfth carrier to our fleet.

Maintaining the required operational tempo with 12 carriers relieves significant stress both in terms of U.S. military readiness and proper maintenance cycles of the carriers themselves. When the carrier fleet is at full strength of 12, regional combatant commanders 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 THORNBERY 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 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 automation 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 descendant 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 beloved grandchildren, 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 menudo, 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 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 extraordnary 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.


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 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 2023.

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.
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 way 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 and 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 for the land and outdoor 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, I am proud to wish Canada a happy 150th birthday.
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 Calhoun County, will be presided over by Magistrate Judge Andrew Radovich, and 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 law of this country exemplifies 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 oath of citizenship in Hammond, Indiana. The families of Adriana Solis, Dhanwant Singh, Syneth Lorana Gardner, Roberto Diaz, Virginia Reformina Wilson, Khalid Javed, Maria Wiederhold, Glendie Mallen, Liliana Stojescaja, Oliver Cadikovski, Gagandeep Khatra, Hernan Ezequiel Barenboim, Jose Laura Sanchez, Sambath Cheakhun, Mariel Claudia Lopez, Sabine Marie Helene Shive, Maria del Rayo Tirdo, Mary Madhulatha Vennamallia, Ding Lin, Aurelia Ruiz, Alonoud Hashem Mahmoud Aishurafa, 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, Erilda Treyes Alvarez, Ma Dolores Serrano del Real, Gelmi Ordanzia 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 Biayee, Manuel Angel Corazza, 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, they, too, have grappled with 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 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 senator 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, sculptured 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 students.

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 fund-raising 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 and congratulations in his new capacity at the Smithsonian. How-ever, if there is one thing I know about John, it is that he will never be far from the 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 of El Laboratorio of Fort Worth’s El Informador 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 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 Prena Foundation in 1995 with his wife Amelia “Millie” Duran to award college scholarships to local students. Since its creation, the La Prena 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 Seth; 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.

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.
Draws educators from around the world to visit. The curriculum approach introduced in 1973, still effective ability-based, “assessment-as-learning” leadership, Alverno launched one of the first internship programs in the country and initiated new scholarship and academic offerings. Under her involvement not only in local and national academic circles, she also founded Alverno’s team of academic advisors, 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 performance 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 circles, 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 for 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 advocate 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 barriers against women for a minimum of 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 undergraduate population comes from the city of Milwaukee, and 44 percent are women of color. Nearby 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’s retention rate was both the highest percentage (36.2 percent) of federal Pell Grant recipients and minority undergraduates (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 educational 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 Department 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 credit worthy 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 have the opportunity to purchase the 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 reargrade 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. VELAZQUEZ. 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 a 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 Geathers, 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,}

...

During the month throughout the year.

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 the opportunity to receive a discount on their Federal Housing Administration-certified housing counseling course.

Trafford Realty Co. has managed the sales and purchases of thousands of homes and commercial properties in Brevard County, and it 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 brothers 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 school supplies.

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 for 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.

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 entertain 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 school supplies.

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 for 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.

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 entertain 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 school supplies.

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 for 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.
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 pleasure 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 and then went on to graduate 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. As the result of his influence and involvement, he has been selected to serve on the Board of 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 Metropolitan Academy Charter Schools), Goodwill Industries, Boy Scouts of America, the Children’s Museum, the United Way, Circle City Classic, the Mayor’s Greater Indianapolis Partnership, 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.

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 deport unauthorized individuals, even those who have been detained 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, respects 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 Congresswoman JARED HUFFMAN and Congressman
Roger is a familiar face in Congress where he has worked full-time for the County of Santa Clara on housing issues, 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 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 Council on Fisheries Conservation, the National Sea Grant Review Panel and the Marine Resources Committee.
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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 2008. 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 Development and Peace.

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. informed 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, Earline is 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 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 the shortfalls.

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 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 Depart 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.

IN HONOR OF THE PINY 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 Piny 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 in numerous Operation 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 addition to encouraging community involvement and civic awareness, Post 4816 offers a number of awards programs that recognize 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 hospice 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 a.m. Saturday, December 17, 2016, at Mt. Herman Lutheran Church. The Rev. Eric Friedrichs officiating. Burial will follow in the church cemetery. Visitations will be from 6 to 8 p.m., Friday, December 16, 2016, at Harr–Price Funeral Home and Crematorium, Lexington Chapel. Memorials may be made to Mt. Herman 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 Porter Shealy. A member of Mt. Herman 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 of Alex and Parker Greer; Zant 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
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 onsite 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, establishing a network of over sixty 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 her achievement in service to Maryland and wish her well in her next endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE FERNANDEZ 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 Fernandez Family on being nominated the 2017 Kings County Dairy Family of the Year.

The Fernandez 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 Philipe 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. Fernandez spent the next nineteen years in Tulare, while Adao continued to work at Philipe 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, Loss Sock Laundromat. Osvaldo “Ozzie” Fernandez 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 Fernandez’ 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 Valadalo Family, the partners established the Avila and Fernandez 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 Fernandez Dairy. Adao Fernandez expanded his dairy to host approximately 1,300 cows. In 2016, Fernandez Dairy received the California Achievement for Improvement Association Lifetime Milk Award.

This year, the Fernandez Family is 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 prominent dairy families in the community. The Fernandez 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 Fernandez 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 IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S.-CHINA RELATIONS

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 gagging the lawyers: 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, 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, and the U.S. Department of State Tiller 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 introduced in the House six years ago. We 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 popping 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 their message.

They have refused to be silent about their 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.
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I want to say to our witness Chongyu (CHÖNG- YU) you were appreciated 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 . . . 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.

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 Vaclav 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.

Since its founding, America has been a nation that is proud of him and wish him the very best.
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.

Sadie, Liu Xiaobo and Liu Xia are not alone in facing unjust repression. As of September 2017, the Congressional-Executive Commission on China’s 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.
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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.

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.

Measures Passed:

Engrossment Correction: Senate agreed to S. Res. 210, to correct the engrossment of S. 722.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Hagerty Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of William Francis Hagerty IV, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador to Japan.

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.

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.

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.

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

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.

NOTICES OF INTENT:

AUTHORITIES FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET:

RECORD VOTES: One record vote was taken today. (Total—155)

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

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.

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.

Recess: The House recessed at 10:51 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon.

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Bishop Stephen E. Blaire, Diocese of Stockton, Stockton, CA.
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 ayes 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, H5355–56

H. Res. 415, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3004) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 236 ayes 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


MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE


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 Hezbollah 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.
June 29, 2017

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.
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