



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 22, 2017

No. 88

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GALLAGHER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 22, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE GALLAGHER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

FREE RAIIF BADAWI AND ALL PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE IN SAUDI ARABIA

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, June 17 will mark the fifth anniversary of the arrest of Raif Badawi, a human activist and writer who created the website "Free Saudi Liberals." He is a prisoner of conscience sentenced to 1,000 lashes, 10 years in prison, and a 10-year travel ban for exercising his fundamental right to freedom of expression.

He was convicted of violating Saudi Arabia's draconian information technology law and "insulting Islam."

Since his imprisonment in 2012, Raif's case has garnered international attention and outrage. For the courage he displayed as a free-speech advocate, he has won many awards, including the Reporters Without Borders World Press Freedom Prize in 2014, the PEN Pinter International Writer of Courage Prize, and the Sakharov Prize for Freedom of Thought in 2015.

His writings were a breath of fresh air in a country that ranks 168 out of 180 in Reporters Without Borders 2017 World Press Freedom Index.

In January 2015, Raif received the first 50 of the 1,000 lashes ordered by the so-called court that sentenced him. Try to imagine what that means, what it would feel like to have someone whip you 50 times in a row, what it would do to your body, and how it would cut you up and make you bleed. The lashing was carried out in public in front of a mosque as men stood around and cheered. It was barbaric.

A week after the first session of flogging, a doctor advised prison authorities that Raif's wounds had not healed enough for him to undergo the second round of this brutal punishing. To date, the lashings have not continued, but they could resume at any time.

Last year, Raif had to resort to a hunger strike to get access to healthcare. It has been 5 years since he has seen his wife, Ensaf, and his three children. They are growing up, and he is missing it because he dared to write what he thought.

I am sorry to say that Raif is not an isolated case. Reporters Without Borders has identified another 10 journalists and citizen journalists detained in Saudi Arabia.

Waleed Abu al-Khair, a prominent human rights defender and Raif's lawyer, was sentenced to 15 years in prison for "harming the reputation of the

state by communicating with international organizations" and other supposed crimes, like "insulting the judiciary and questioning the integrity of judges" and "disobeying the ruler and seeking to remove his legitimacy."

Many other human rights defenders are in prison for doing things like setting up human rights organizations without permission and calling for protests. All of the founders of the Saudi Civil and Political Rights Association have been wrongfully put on trial or imprisoned.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that Saudi Arabia is an ally of the United States, but we also know that Saudi Arabia's human rights record is terrible. According to our own State Department, "The most important human rights problems include citizens' lack of ability and legal means to choose their government, restrictions on universal rights such as freedom of expression, including on the internet, association, movement, and religion, and pervasive gender discrimination and lack of equal rights that affect most aspects of women's lives."

That is not exactly a short list, Mr. Speaker. Yet the President of the United States just traveled to Saudi Arabia without saying a single word in public about human rights, without speaking up even once on behalf of all the people who are wasting away in jails because they chose to defend a client, advocate for minorities, or call for reform.

The President wants to buy cooperation in the fight against extremism with a \$110 billion arms deal, but Saudi Arabia will not achieve security or stability by repressing peaceful dissent. On the contrary, repression creates the conditions for extremism.

Haven't we learned that lesson by now?

Senator JOHN MCCAIN, a former prisoner of war, understands what the President does not. We in the United

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H4393

States have long believed moral concerns must be an essential part of our foreign policy, not a departure from it. Our values are our great strength and greatest treasure. We have been the country that saw the world as it was and made it better.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today in the best tradition of the United States to call for the immediate and unconditional release of Raif Badawi, who must be allowed to be reunited with his wife and children in Canada. And I call also for all of the other prisoners of conscience in Saudi Arabia to be released.

The United States must not be silent while people sit in prison for exercising their most basic human rights.

RECOGNITION OF FALLEN OFFICERS JASON GARNER AND RASCHEL JOHNSON

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I sadly rise to honor two fallen officers from my community, Stanislaus County Sheriff's Deputy Jason Garner, and Community Service Officer Raschel Johnson.

Deputy Garner and Officer Johnson tragically left this Earth on Saturday, May 13, 2017, as a result of a vehicular collision while en route to a reported residential burglary in Modesto. Both were committed public servants whose watches ended all too soon.

Deputy Garner served with the Stanislaus County Sheriff's Department for 9½ years in the operations division and 1 year 3 months in the adult detention division. He was well-liked on both sides of the department. During his time in service to our community, he was recognized for a wide range of accomplishments, including assisting a mother in locating her daughter at Oakdale Reservoir, working with junior high students from Big Valley Christian School to conduct a successful graffiti wipeout for our community, and assisting the probation department and their firearms instructors with radio training to improve their communication skills with the dispatch center.

Officer Johnson was a 15-year veteran of Stanislaus County Sheriff's Department who was known for going above and beyond. During her time with the department, she was recognized for her contributions to her team as well as our community, which included receiving the Sheriff's Award for Excellence for coordinating the model of the Patterson Police Services substation. She also helped to develop a program to more effectively dispatch community service officers and deputies, and she assisted with the 2006 homicide investigation of California Highway Patrol Officer Earl Scott.

Both Deputy Garner and Officer Johnson leave behind an entire community who grieve their loss. Their

bravery and committed service will never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the lives of Stanislaus County Sheriff's Deputy Jason Garner and Community Service Officer Raschel Johnson. My deepest gratitude and sympathies go out to their families and our law enforcement community as they forge ahead without their loved ones. May God bless and keep them always.

RECOGNIZING MILITARY CAREGIVERS

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, during Military Caregiver Month, I would like to recognize a population of heroes who often remain in the shadows: military caregivers.

Currently there are over 5 million military and veteran caregivers in the United States. This number continues to grow as our troops abroad place themselves in harm's way.

I recently sat down with one of my heroes, Senator Elizabeth Dole, who shed a light on this important population. While she spent time with Kansas Senator Bob Dole at Walter Reed National Military Medical Center in 2011, she noticed the many caregivers around her and the unique challenges that they face. Following this discovery, she established a foundation to raise awareness and serve as a resource for these hidden heroes.

I am a proud member of the Hidden Heroes Caucus, which raises awareness and develops legislation in support of caregivers. I urge my colleagues to join this wonderful congressional caucus of hidden heroes.

STROKE AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address Stroke Awareness Month. Stroke is the Nation's number five killer, the second leading cause of dementia, and one of the leading causes of long-term disability.

During this important month of awareness, we in Congress must realize that we have a chance to make a difference. The FAST Act would expand access to telehealth-eligible home stroke services under Medicare.

I have personally witnessed one of Kansas' greatest victories in healthcare, where my alma mater, Kansas University Medical Center, led the Kansas Stroke Collaborative, where, through telemedicine, we have saved thousands of lives and prevented literally hundreds—perhaps thousands—of long-term injuries as well.

The American Stroke Association says that 80 percent of strokes are preventable, and the more strokes we end, the more lives we will save.

Strokes kill more than 133,000 Americans annually. We can bring that number down, and I hope my colleagues will join us in that effort. As a physician, I know how important and, in

many cases, how necessary these services are. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation and always remain open to innovative solutions in the medical industry, like telemedicine.

ERADICATING POLIO

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about something very near and dear to my heart: the efforts to eradicate polio.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, we are this close to ending polio. Once a widespread global epidemic, it is now only endemic in two countries: Afghanistan and Pakistan.

When I was district governor of Rotary just a few short years ago, we were reporting 17 to 18 cases per year. And I am so excited that we have only had 2 reported cases this year.

There is one organization that has led this charge, though many have helped, but Rotary has led this since 1979, literally vaccinating over 2.5 billion people in 122 countries.

As a former Rotary district governor, I spent some time this past weekend at Fort Hays State University celebrating Rotary and all we have done, including the celebration of international students and the peace awards that they receive through our scholarships.

There is no cure for polio. It is preventable by a very simple vaccine. It is vital that we aid these last handful of countries, get us over the finish line with these resources, and end our fight against polio so we can tell future generations: Like smallpox, polio is no longer in this country.

REMEMBERING PRESIDENT KENNEDY

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, today we are one week away from Memorial Day. On May 29, we will celebrate Memorial Day this year. But this also, remarkably, would be the 100th birthday of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

It is hard to believe when we think of President Kennedy, his youthful vigor, the popular appeal that he had not only in this country and around the world, and forever in our hearts and minds, that vision of grace and dignity and wit and humor and public service and dedication.

It was President Kennedy, of course, who said we will put a man on the Moon and do it within 10 years, and we did it in 9.

Amongst his great legacies, of course, is that President Kennedy founded and was the creator of the Peace Corps. President Kennedy felt in those troubling times when there was the threat of nuclear annihilation, that what we needed to do is send forward America's best, let the world see what America is truly about. So he engaged this great Nation in the effort of sending our brightest and best abroad.

Today, many Americans might be surprised to know that in a nation of more than 330 million people, less than 1 percent—let me repeat that again, less than 1 percent—of the Nation serves in all of our military, including our Reserves and National Guard and in the Peace Corps, AmeriCorps VISTA, Teach For America, Senior Corps, City Year, and Corporation for National and Community Service.

□ 1215

The Corporation for National and Community Service has indicated, last year more than 400,000 of your fellow Americans wanted to serve their country, and yet they were turned away because of a lack of financing. Imagine in this day and age, with our budgets coming out, when we know, in fact, from all sources that the volunteerism that is provided more than pays for itself at almost a 4-to-1 clip.

That is why, this Thursday, we are going to drop a bill on national service. It is called ACTION, because that is what this country needs. We find too many Americans who want to serve their nation but are unable to do so, especially those who want to serve in a capacity other than the United States military. So it is up to this Congress to make sure that we provide an alternative to do just that. So we will drop a bill this week and are looking for original cosponsors who will sign on to that bill that says simply this: If you are willing to serve your country in any of those capacities, if you are willing to serve your country, we will help you get a college education. If you have a college education and you have been out looking for a job, and you have been unsuccessful, but you still would like experience and to serve your country, we will pay for that as well. The bottom line: Serve your country, and we will take care of your college debt or help you get to college.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing upon the men and women of this, the people's House, as they return from a weekend at

home. Help them, and, indeed, help us all to obey Your law, to do Your will, and to walk in Your way.

We ask Your blessing this day as our President visits holy sites in the Middle East and the various leaders in the region. Grant that Your children of different cultures and faiths might come together in peace and understanding.

May all that is done this day be done for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KILDEE 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.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S FIRST OVERSEAS VISIT

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President Donald Trump gave a remarkable speech yesterday during his first overseas visit. Speaking to over 50 representatives from Muslim nations, the President outlined the future for positive relations between the United States and predominantly Muslim nations around the world.

The President's remarks in Saudi Arabia were extraordinary. I was especially grateful to hear his call for unity of all people and all regional faiths—Islam, Christianity, and Judaism—as well as a strong condemnation of Islamic extremism and terrorism.

President Trump remarked: "We pray this special gathering may someday be remembered as the beginning of peace in the Middle East—and maybe, even all over the world. But this future can only be achieved through defeating terrorism and the ideology that drives it." The President also cited 95 percent of victims of terrorism are Muslim.

I appreciate the warm welcome the President received in Saudi Arabia as he promotes peace through strength.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Our sympathy to the family of Navy Captain Ken Clark of Swansea, South Carolina, a Naval Academy graduate of great service.

INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION INTO RUSSIAN MEDDLING IN U.S. ELECTION

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that a special prosecutor has been named to conduct an independent investigation into Russia's meddling in our 2016 election and any connections between the Trump campaign and Russia.

Appointing Robert Mueller is a step in the right direction, but he must be able to operate independently, without interference from the White House, without interference, even, from the Justice Department or any other administration officials.

We must also keep in mind that this particular investigation will be limited in its scope in the sense that it will be looking only at counterintelligence issues and only at potential criminality arising out of the investigation. What it won't do is give us that bigger picture, give the American people the sense of the connection that may have occurred between the campaign of Donald Trump and the Russians.

In order to get to that, in order to restore faith and confidence in our democracy and our national security, we need an independent commission to look at that bigger picture and let Congress deal with the big questions that the American people sent us here to address. That is the direction we must take.

VICTOR ACT

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the promise we made to our veterans and introduce the Veterans Increased Choice for Transplanted Organs and Recovery Act of 2017, the VICTOR Act.

The VICTOR Act will allow veterans who live more than 100 miles from one of the Nation's 14 VA transplant centers to receive care at a local, federally certified facility.

From Florida's Second District, the closest VA facility which performs heart, lung, and liver transplants is in Nashville, Tennessee. A veteran in Ocala would have to travel more than 600 miles to receive a new liver, despite there being seven federally certified centers in Florida.

As a surgeon, I know that timely organ transplants can make the difference between life and death, and yet our veterans sit on waiting lists for organs they may never receive. Government bureaucracy should not hurt our Nation's veterans when they are in desperate need of care. The VICTOR Act will give those who fought for our freedom a fighting chance here at home.

FARM BUREAU CENTENNIAL

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the centennial anniversary of the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation, our State's leading and largest farm organization.

Since 1917, Nebraska Farm Bureau has been a grassroots, statewide organization led by farmers and ranchers who work to enhance and strengthen the lives of all Nebraskans. This Federation of 85 county farm bureaus has more than 61,000 member families in all 93 Nebraska counties.

For 100 years, Nebraska Farm Bureau has united our State's farm and ranch families under a common banner, doing together what they cannot do alone. Through the power of their grassroots policy development process, Nebraska Farm Bureau remains the trusted voice for Nebraska farm and ranch families.

This year marks the 100th anniversary of the Farm Bureau's existence, and we congratulate the organization and all of its members on reaching this important milestone. We are excited for what the next 100 years have in store.

REMEMBERING KEVIN MAINHART

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Lieutenant Deputy Kevin Mainhart. A Yell County Sheriff's deputy, Kevin was killed during a traffic stop on May 11, 2017.

Lieutenant Mainhart had served as a police officer for 20 years in West Memphis, Arkansas, before returning to Yell County 5 years ago to protect and serve his hometown. He lived a life of service that his wife, Pam, and two sons, Lucas and Cody, can be proud of.

While words will never be able to console the pain and grief his family, community, and the State of Arkansas feel, we can take solace in the words of Christ, who said: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

Yell County has lost a true friend and a servant. I thank Lieutenant Mainhart for his service and sacrifice and send my most sincere condolences to his friends, family, and all those affected by this senseless act of violence.

CHEMICAL ATTACK IN SYRIA

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, stories from the survivors of Assad's bombings and chemical attacks are almost impossible to read due to the grotesque de-

scriptions of innocent people and children suffocating, foaming at the mouth, and suffering from seizures.

If, in 2013, the Obama administration had taken decisive leadership against the use of chemical weapons, insisted on a U.N. strategy to isolate Assad and Russia, verified the elimination of Syria's chemical weapons stockpile, and created no-fly zones, we might have avoided 500,000 innocent deaths and millions of refugees.

Through his appropriate and proportionate bombing, President Trump told Assad that America will no longer ignore the unspeakable acts of violence against innocent people. We also learned that the U.S.-led coalition aircraft bombed, last week, pro-regime forces after they breached a deconfliction zone and advanced on a base occupied by U.S. special forces.

I call on the United Nations to follow America's lead by pursuing a ceasefire in Syria, creating safe zones, and holding Assad accountable for his war crimes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1603

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GUTHRIE) at 4 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

ADAM WALSH REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1188) to reauthorize certain programs established by the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1188

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 "Adam Walsh Reauthorization Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE (SOMA) PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 126(d) of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16926(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General \$20,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2018 through 2022, to be available only for the SOMA program."

SEC. 3. REAUTHORIZATION OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE WITH RESPECT TO VIOLATIONS OF REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS.

Section 142(b) of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16941(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022, of amounts made available to the United States Marshals Service, not less than \$60,000,000 shall be available to carry out this section."

SEC. 4. DURATION OF SEX OFFENDER REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN JUVENILES.

Subparagraph (B) of section 115(b)(2) of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16915(b)(2)) is amended by striking "25 years" and inserting "15 years".

SEC. 5. PUBLIC ACCESS TO JUVENILE SEX OFFENDER INFORMATION.

Section 118(c) of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16918(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" after the semicolon in paragraph (3);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

"(4) any information about a sex offender for whom the offense giving rise to the duty to register was an offense for which the offender was adjudicated delinquent; and"

SEC. 6. PROTECTION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FROM STATE NONCOMPLIANCE PENALTY UNDER SORNA.

Section 125 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16925(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "jurisdiction" each place it appears and inserting "State";

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "subpart 1 of part E" and inserting "section 505(c)"; and

(B) by striking "(42 U.S.C. 3750 et seq.)" and inserting "(42 U.S.C. 3755(c))"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(e) CALCULATION OF ALLOCATION TO UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—Notwithstanding the formula under section 505(c) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755(c)), a State which is subject to a reduction in funding under subsection (a) shall—

"(1) calculate the amount to be made available to units of local government by the State pursuant to the formula under section 505(c) using the amount that would otherwise be allocated to that State for that fiscal year under section 505(c) of that Act, and make such amount available to such units of local government; and

"(2) retain for the purposes described in section 501 any amount remaining after the allocation required by paragraph (1)."

SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED IN ANNUAL REPORT ON ENFORCEMENT OF REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS.

Section 635 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16991) is amended—

(1) by striking "Not later than July 1 of each year" and inserting "On January 1 of each year,";

(2) in paragraph (3), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ", and an

analysis of any common reasons for noncompliance with such Act”;

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking “and” at the end;

(4) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(5) by adding after paragraph (5) the following:

“(6) the number of sex offenders registered in the National Sex Offender Registry;

“(7) the number of sex offenders registered in the National Sex Offender Registry who—

“(A) are adults;

“(B) are juveniles; and

“(C) are adults, but who are required to register as a result of conduct committed as a juvenile; and

“(8) to the extent such information is obtainable, of the number of sex offenders registered in the National Sex Offender Registry who are juveniles—

“(A) the percentage of such offenders who were adjudicated delinquent; and

“(B) the percentage of such offenders who were prosecuted as adults.”.

SEC. 8. ENSURING SUPERVISION OF RELEASED SEXUALLY DANGEROUS PERSONS.

(a) **PROBATION OFFICERS.**—Section 3603 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in paragraph (8)(A) by striking “or 4246” and inserting “, 4246, or 4248”.

(b) **PRETRIAL SERVICES OFFICERS.**—Section 3154 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in paragraph (12)(A) by striking “or 4246” and inserting “, 4246, or 4248”.

SEC. 9. CIVIL REMEDY FOR SURVIVORS OF CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

Section 2255(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “three years” and inserting “10 years”; and

(2) by inserting “ends” before the period at the end.

SEC. 10. TRIBAL ACCESS PROGRAM.

The Attorney General is authorized to provide technical assistance, including equipment, to tribal governments for the purpose of enabling such governments to access, enter information into, and obtain information from, Federal criminal information databases, as authorized under section 534(d) of title 28, United States Code. The Department of Justice Working Capital Fund (established under section 527 of title 28, United States Code) may be reimbursed by federally recognized tribes for technical assistance provided pursuant to this section.

SEC. 11. ALTERNATIVE MECHANISMS FOR IN-PERSON VERIFICATION.

Section 116 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16916) is amended—

(1) by striking “A sex offender shall” and inserting the following:

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), a sex offender shall”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **ALTERNATIVE VERIFICATION METHOD.**—A jurisdiction may allow a sex offender to comply with the requirements under subsection (a) by an alternative verification method approved by the Attorney General, except that each offender shall appear in person not less than one time per year. The Attorney General shall approve an alternative verification method described in this subsection prior to its implementation by a jurisdiction in order to ensure that such method provides for verification that is sufficient to ensure the public safety.”.

SEC. 12. CLARIFICATION OF AGGRAVATED SEXUAL ABUSE.

Section 111(8) of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16911(8)) is amended by inserting “subsection (a) or (b) of” before “section 2241 of title 18, United States Code”.

SEC. 13. COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION OF SEX OFFENDER ISSUES.

Section 634(c) of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **ADDITIONAL REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of the Adam Walsh Reauthorization Act of 2017, the National Institute of Justice shall submit to Congress a report on the public safety impact, recidivism, and collateral consequences of long-term registration of juvenile sex offenders, based on the information collected for the study under subsection (a) and any other information the National Institute of Justice determines necessary for such report.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 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 in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1188, currently under consideration.

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.

In preventing child victimization, Congress, working in tandem with law enforcement, has long recognized the importance of monitoring sex offenders.

In 1994, Congress passed the Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Offender Registration Act. This legislation mandated that States track violent sex offenders and establish guidelines for tracking those offenders.

Over the years, Congress continued its vigilance in monitoring sex offenders, which ultimately culminated in a comprehensive piece of legislation titled the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006. Among other things, the Adam Walsh Act established a national sex offender registry, provided for post-conviction civil commitment of certain sex offenders, eliminated the statute of limitations for certain sex offenses against children, and created an office at the Justice Department specifically designed to monitor sex offenders.

Today I am proud to be here on the floor to champion the reauthorization of this landmark legislation.

H.R. 1188, the Adam Walsh Reauthorization Act of 2017, authorizes funds for the Department of Justice's Sex Offender Management Assistance program and for the great work the United States Marshals do in locating and apprehending fugitive sex offenders who do not comply with the law's requirements.

H.R. 1188 also contains numerous measures to encourage more States and Tribal jurisdictions to comply with

the requirements of the Federal system, in part by making changes to the law to address concerns some States have expressed.

For instance, the bill lowers the duration of sex offender registration requirements for certain juveniles and allows States to register juveniles adjudicated delinquent on a nonpublic system. It also clarifies that only juveniles who commit violent sexual assaults should be placed on a State registry.

The bill also permits alternative methods for in-person verification so that rural jurisdictions can verify location of offenders remotely, in most instances only requiring in-person verification once per year.

H.R. 1188 requires parole officers and pretrial services officers to stay informed of the conduct and provide supervision of sexually dangerous persons. Moreover, the bill strengthens civil remedies for survivors of exploitation and trafficking by allowing individuals who were victims of exploitation or trafficking as juveniles to have 10 years after becoming an adult to file suit for a civil remedy.

Mr. Speaker, we must not forget why we are here. In 1981, Adam Walsh, a 7-year-old boy, was abducted and brutally murdered in Hollywood, Florida. His death was devastating. And for many families, that kind of insupportable pain would be incapacitating. As a father and grandfather, I cannot even imagine it.

We are thankful for the work of the Walsh family, who have dedicated their lives to child advocacy and whose work is responsible for saving the lives of countless children. I am also grateful to our colleague, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, the author of the original Adam Walsh Act, for introducing this reauthorization bill and for his own tireless advocacy on behalf of our Nation's children.

Mr. Speaker, scripture reminds us that “children are a heritage from the Lord.” I urge my colleagues to support this strong, bipartisan legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1188, the Adam Walsh Reauthorization Act of 2017.

For those of us who have met John Walsh and know of his family, it is both unspeakable and unimaginable the feeling that families have faced when a beautiful young child has gone missing and ultimately brutalized and killed. That is what happened to John, his wife, and his family's beautiful child in 1981.

So out of that came a lifelong commitment to ending this kind of violence against children, but, more importantly, finding the Nation's worst criminals who would brutalize families and fail to be apprehended.

The Adam Walsh Act, in particular, established the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act—often referred to as SORNA—as a national system for the registration of sex offenders.

This bill is an important bill, and I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) again for his energized and effective effort reauthorizing this legislation and his commitment to fighting for the needs of protecting children. We join him in that. I am reminded of the great work of the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children and how they have continued their work for years. As they came into fruition, it seemed that children were missing every day. Violence was perpetrated, but laws were brought about to make a difference.

So I support this bill and I raise some reflective thoughts. I am glad that this bill reflects changes to SORNA that were agreed to by the Judiciary Committee when it last reauthorized the Adam Walsh Act in 2012 to improve the requirements for States to register sex offenders, for that was a very difficult system, and some States were complying and others were not.

Whatever one's belief may be about the wisdom of sex offender registries, prior to SORNA, many States had already developed sex offender registries on their own and devoted substantial resources to identify the most effective methods to manage sex offenders.

In the legislation, there was a certain way that SORNA wanted to handle that, therefore, States were made to disregard those efforts in favor of a one-size-fits-all. One of the principal concerns with SORNA is that it deprives States of flexibility in dealing with juvenile sex offender registration. I am glad that there is at least a recognition that States have put in good programs, so I am delighted that that flexibility can be addressed.

I also think that it is important to note that the bill has to address long-standing implementation issues. As we noted in 2012, although the legislation made some useful reforms, it failed to address fundamental concerns with SORNA, and we are still working to achieve that accomplishment.

Commendably, H.R. 1188, however, would allow States discretion in determining whether juvenile sex offender information would be accessible to the public via the internet. Of course, it continues to be a steadfast legal prohibition and structure to diminishing—or hopefully diminishing—the sex violence against children.

It will reduce the time that certain, but not all, juvenile sex offenders adjudicated as a delinquent are required to register from 25 to 15 years.

The bill has many merits, and I think the changes that have been made are extremely positive, one, in dealing with flexibility, and, two, with recognizing some flexibility as it relates to juvenile offenders.

This is legislation that many have poured their heart into because they

believe that there should be a day when this kind of violence ends, and I hope my colleagues will support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss H.R. 1188, the “Adam Walsh Reauthorization Act of 2017.” While it is an improvement over current law dealing with a very important subject, it should do more.

This bill is a step forward in our effort to address concerns about the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act, commonly known as SORNA.

There is no doubt that child sexual exploitation is a plague on our country.

The mistreatment of children should not be tolerated in any form.

Congress has a duty to carefully craft solutions to this problem without creating confusion or new problems.

The creation of a uniform, nationwide standard for sex offender registries in the Adam Walsh Act of 2006 was motivated by laudable goals—prevention and protection.

Congress soon found, however, that state implementation of SORNA would not occur quickly or easily.

Many states were unable to comply, and some would not comply because of disagreements about who should be subject to mandatory registration.

Problems with SORNA were still evident in 2012 when we last considered, but did not complete, reauthorization of the Adam Walsh Act.

Now, ten years after enactment, problems with SORNA remain.

According to the Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs (OJP), only 17 states, 3 territories, and 103 Indian tribes, have substantially implemented SORNA.

States continue to incur penalties imposed on Byrne Justice Assistance Grants funding for noncompliance, monies that fund essential state and local programs.

Juvenile registration is still the most significant barrier to state implementation of SORNA.

Research has shown that treatment of juvenile sex offenders can and does work through therapy that involves community-based intervention, adapted to the needs of juveniles, working within multiple systems—individual, family, and school—to address the various causes of childhood delinquency.

Researchers have also found that adolescents who completed sexual offender treatment had significantly lower recidivism rates than untreated adolescents, whereas registration serves only to marginalize and label youth, causing more harm than good.

In order to implement the approaches to the treatment of juvenile offenders that have proven successful, states must have flexibility in the manner in which they handle juvenile sex offenders—flexibility that is all but denied to states by SORNA.

Although I believe juveniles should be completely removed from registration requirements, I am glad that this bill includes a provision that allows states to exempt juveniles adjudicated delinquent for sex offenses from the public website and reduces the time some juveniles will be potentially required to register from 25 to 15 years.

Under this bill, the Attorney General's annual report to Congress on sex offender registration will now include an analysis of com-

mon reasons for state noncompliance, including more detailed information on offenders, particularly juveniles, including a breakdown of the number of registered offenders who are juveniles and adults who are required to register because of statutory rape convictions or other conduct committed as juveniles.

Hopefully, this information will inform future efforts to amend SORNA.

While this bill includes provisions that address some of the concerns raised when the Adam Walsh Act was considered by this Committee in 2012, it is clear that work remains to be done if the Act is to ever achieve its purpose.

I thank Mr. SENSENBRENNER for his dedication to this issue.

I support this bill—as far as it goes—and hope my colleagues will support efforts to improve it.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, as the chief sponsor of this legislation, as well as the chief sponsor of the original Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, I rise in support of this legislation and hope that it is swiftly enacted.

The Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act, enacted in 2006, is landmark legislation intended to keep our communities, and, most importantly, our children safe from sex offenders and other dangerous predators.

This bipartisan bill strengthened the sex offender registry requirements and enforcement, extended Federal registry requirements to Indian Tribes, and authorized funding for Federal programs intended to address and deter child exploitation.

□ 1615

The centerpiece of the Adam Walsh Act is the national Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act, or SORNA for short. SORNA's goal is to create a seamless national sex offender registry to assist law enforcement efforts to detect and track offenders. SORNA provides minimum standards for State sex offender registries and created the Dru Sjodin National Sex Offender Public Website, which allows law enforcement officials and the general public to search for sex offenders nationwide from just one website.

H.R. 1188, the Adam Walsh Reauthorization Act of 2017, reauthorizes two key programs from the original Adam Walsh Act: grants to the States and other jurisdictions to implement the Adam Walsh Act's sex offender registry requirements and funding for the U.S. marshals to locate and apprehend sex offenders who violate registration requirements. These programs are crucial to efforts to complete and enforce the national network of sex offender registries, particularly in light of the already passed deadline for States to come into compliance with SORNA.

Based on feedback from the States, H.R. 1188 makes targeted changes to the SORNA sex offender registry requirements. The bill changes the period of time after which juveniles adjudicated delinquent can petition to be removed from the sex offender registry for a clean record from 25 to 15 years, and provides that juveniles do not need to be included on publicly viewed sex offender registries. Instead, it is sufficient for juveniles to be included on registries that are only viewed by law enforcement entities. I believe these provisions strike an appropriate balance between being tough on juveniles who commit serious sex crimes and understanding that there can be differences between adult and juvenile offenders.

The bill also recognizes the unique challenges that tribes face in implementing SORNA. H.R. 1188 provides technical assistance to tribes so they can access, and enter information into, the Federal criminal information databases.

Finally, H.R. 1188 amends the statute of limitations to allow individuals who were victims of exploitation or trafficking as juveniles to have 10 years after becoming an adult to file suit for a civil remedy. It is my hope that, with these commonsense changes, more States will come into compliance.

With the passage of this legislation, Congress can send a strong message to all Americans about our continued commitment to keeping our Nation's children safe. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

First of all, we will be doing a series of bills that are extremely important, and I will make note of my interest in protecting children, but as well to broaden our work as we work in the Committee on the Judiciary on matters dealing with criminal justice reform and specifically dealing with the issue of solitary confinement, alternative sentencing for young people, and Ban the Box. I also hope that we will work on issues dealing with criminal justice reform sentencing reduction that are crucial and prison reform. There is a lot of work for us to do as we do the work on the floor today. People are waiting, and in some instances languishing, in the Nation's juvenile detention centers and various juvenile justice courts for a statement to be made by the Federal Government on seeking a second chance for those who are in the juvenile justice system.

As relates to the Adam Walsh legislation, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the other cosponsors of H.R. 1188 for their steadfast work on these issues. Nevertheless, as I indicated, let's do more with respect to dealing with the registration of juvenile offenders in terms of attempting to ensure that they will have an opportunity for rehabilitation.

While I hope we may still work to make additional improvements to this

legislation, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to again consider the importance of our duty to protect children from sexual predators in as efficient and broad-based manner as we possibly can.

I want to thank the continued service of John Walsh and offer again, as we all do, our deepest expression of remorse for the loss that he and so many families tragically have experienced at the hands of horrific sexual predators and those who would attack our children.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important bipartisan legislation. I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY), and the chief sponsor, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), for working with me and my staff on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1188, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLOBAL CHILD PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1862) to amend title 18, United States Code, to expand the scope of certain definitions pertaining to unlawful sexual conduct, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1862

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 "Global Child Protection Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. EXPANDING THE DEFINITION OF ILLICIT SEXUAL CONDUCT.

Section 2423(f)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "a sexual act (as defined in section 2246) with" and inserting "any conduct involving"; and

(2) by striking "if the sexual act" and inserting "if the conduct".

SEC. 3. EXPANDING THE DEFINITION OF FEDERAL SEX OFFENSE.

Section 3559 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)(2)(A)—

(A) by inserting after "2244(a)(1)" the following "or 2244(a)(5)";

(B) by striking the "or" before "2423(a)"; (C) by striking "into prostitution"; and (D) by inserting "or 2423(c) (relating to illicit sexual conduct)" before the semicolon at the end; and

(2) in subsection (e)(3), by striking "or 2423(a)" and inserting "2423(a), or 2423(c)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1862, currently under consideration.

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.

Children are the most vulnerable and innocent members of our society, and we have a duty to make sure our laws protect them to the fullest extent possible. H.R. 1862, the Global Child Protection Act of 2017, closes regrettable loopholes in existing child exploitation statutes to do just that.

Currently, dangerous sexual predators who violate children overseas can avoid culpability simply by engaging in what the United States Code defines as sexual contact rather than what the law defines as illicit sexual conduct. That is, they can go abroad, cause a child to sexually touch them, and return, without exposure to the criminal liability they would face had they engaged in what the law defines as illicit sexual conduct.

I am sure my colleagues would agree that it should not matter whether the offender engages in sexual conduct or contact with a child. Either way, he is a child predator. This is the very definition of a loophole, and it is putting children at risk. That is because these predators are aware of this loophole, and they are able to share this information quickly in chat groups on the internet. They plot their foreign sex tourism accordingly, to circumvent criminal liability.

H.R. 1862 closes this loophole by expanding the definition of illicit sexual conduct to include sexual contact. No longer will these predators be able to escape justice and continue to offend with impunity.

This bill also closes a loophole for recidivist offenders. It is estimated that only between 8 and 20 percent of victims of childhood sexual abuse report they have been abused. That is why it is vitally important that, when we do become aware of these offenses and secure convictions, our justice system imposes penalties to adequately punish and deter this evil.

Current law provides that an offender convicted of committing a Federal sex offense against a minor shall be sentenced to life imprisonment if that offender has a prior conviction for a sex offense against a minor. In defining sex offense, however, this provision inexplicably excludes two serious offenses. It is missing offenses covering abusive sexual contact with a minor under 12 and also does not apply to offenders who commit their sex crimes against children overseas. H.R. 1862 fixes these oversights—and they were clearly oversights—by adding these provisions into the definition of Federal sex offense.

When an offender has previously harmed a child, been punished for that offense, and goes on to harm another child, the risk that he will go on to abuse again is extremely high, and we must ensure our children are safe from such a dangerous predator. That dynamic of deterrence, ensuring repeat offenders face harsher penalties, is at the core of our system of justice. It is even more important here where the victims are our children. Children are one-third of our population and all of our future. We must prioritize their protection.

I commend the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) for introducing this important legislation. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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 rise reluctantly in opposition to H.R. 1862, and I regret this opposition because it would add a new offense—well, new offenses—to the current provision in the criminal code providing for mandatory life imprisonment for certain repeat sex offenders.

Now, under section 3559(e) of title 18 of the U.S. Code, a defendant who has been previously convicted of a Federal felony or State sex offense committed against a child, and who is guilty of a predicate Federal sex offense against a child, must be sentenced to life in prison. H.R. 1862 amends section 3559 to add more Federal predicate offenses on which to base imposition of a life sentence; namely, sexual contact with a minor under the age of 12, aggravated sexual contact with minors between the ages of 12 and 15, and illicit sexual conduct with a minor abroad by a U.S. citizen. The bill would also provide the requirement that a Federal predicate offense relating to coercion or enticement of a minor be related to prostitution.

Instead, H.R. 1862 would allow coercion or enticement of a minor into any criminal sexual activity to serve as a basis for imposition of a mandatory life sentence. Repeat offenders should, of course, be subject to increased penalties, and, for some offenses, life imprisonment is appropriate. Yet Congress should not mandate that life imprisonment be the only sentencing option.

For far too long, the Federal criminal justice system has relied on an unsustainable system of mass incarceration that is largely driven by inflexible mandatory minimum sentencing. Mandatory minimums are not necessary to impose appropriate sentences. The judge at sentencing has all the information he or she needs to impose a sentence commensurate with the crime committed and the culpability of the offender. Arrived at this way, sentences may still be quite lengthy—perhaps, in some cases, life in prison—but these penalties must be determined on a case-by-case basis. Accordingly, I encourage my colleagues to join with me and others in opposing this legislation.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chief sponsor of this legislation.

□ 1630

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for making our efforts to combat child exploitation and human trafficking a priority on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons I was eager to join the Judiciary Committee was to play a role in combating crimes against children. I am proud to serve on the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, where, under the leadership of Chairman TREY GOWDY, we are working to protect innocent children, and make sure that those that would do them harm are brought to justice.

Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to talk about crimes against children, particularly those that are sexual in nature. Just speaking the term “global sex tourism” is enough to send chills up almost anyone’s spine. Because this subject is so ugly and uncomfortable, most Americans probably have no idea the extent to which children around the globe are at risk of exploitation. That is what makes it so important that we do talk about it and address the problem head-on.

Earlier this year, I met with experts from the Department of Justice to discuss how loopholes in current law are allowing child predators to evade punishment for their abuse of children in the United States overseas. Certain types of sexual contact with children are not explicitly covered under the criminal definition of “illicit sexual conduct.” This allows child predators engaged in global sex tourism to evade punishment for acts that are clearly abusive.

Also, current sentencing code does not treat contact offenses against child victims under the age of 12 the same as it does against those victims between the ages of 12 and 18.

Mr. Speaker, these loopholes were, of course, never intended. Nonetheless,

these technical flaws in the law are making it harder for authorities to put serial child abusers away where they belong.

H.R. 1862, the Global Child Protection Act, aims to close these loopholes and better equip law enforcement to protect people and punish abusers. Specifically, this bill would expand the definition of “illicit sexual conduct” to include “sexual contact,” thus allowing authorities to crack down on global sex tourism and punish these criminals.

This bill also seeks to protect the youngest child victims by broadening the sentencing code to ensure that all types of contact offenses against children of all ages are treated with the same level of seriousness.

To be clear, the current statute criminalizes the act of traveling abroad to do terrible things to children, but it does not criminalize the people who force children to perform sexual acts on them. This bill very simply closes the loophole when it comes to sex tourism and soliciting sexual acts from a minor, to include not just what someone would do to a child, but what they would force a child to do to them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our strong partners in the White House and the Department of Justice for their commitment to combating exploitation and abuse here in our country and abroad.

Last week I went with the chairman and others to the White House to participate in a bipartisan listening session on human trafficking and exploitation hosted by Ivanka Trump. I appreciate Ivanka for inviting me and my fellow lawmakers to be a part of this very important exchange. I believe that her involvement and leadership on this issue can be instrumental to achieving results.

Also, it certainly wasn’t lost on me that in his first official act after being sworn in, Attorney General Jeff Sessions presented the President with an executive order strengthening the enforcement of Federal law on international trafficking, including human trafficking. We have dedicated law enforcement professionals working hard every day to protect children and punish abusers, and we need to make sure that they have every tool at their disposal to do their job.

Mr. Speaker, it is our enduring responsibility to protect those among us who cannot protect themselves. We have an opportunity to do that today by passing the Global Child Protection Act and getting one step closer to closing these loopholes.

Of course, my bill is just part of a slate of Judiciary Committee bills aimed to combat child exploitation and human trafficking. I urge my colleagues to approve all of these bills and to take action toward stopping this growing problem in this country and abroad.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), a

distinguished former member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1862.

While I support the underlying goal of punishing sex offenders, the existing Federal statutes already severely punish these offenses. This legislation, unfortunately, will impose a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment.

This expansion of mandatory minimum sentences of life without parole comes on the heels of Attorney General Sessions' memorandum of May 12, 2017, which has been roundly criticized for rescinding the Holder memo. The Sessions memo directs all Federal prosecutors to pursue the most serious charges and the maximum sentence to include mandatory minimum sentences. This directive takes away from Federal prosecutors and judges the ability to individually assess unique circumstances of each case, including any factors that may mitigate against imposing a life sentence in every case.

A life sentence is a most severe form of punishment, second only to the death penalty. Careful consideration should be given when our society imposes a life sentence, and judges should have the discretion in determining when this severe punishment should be imposed.

Now, I point out that this punishment would be imposed not only on the ringleader, but on anyone involved in a conspiracy. We have seen how that works in drug conspiracies where a girlfriend who takes a phone message or drives her boyfriend to a deal would be included in the boyfriend's conspiracy and subject to the same draconian mandatory minimum the boyfriend is subjected to.

In this case, the defendant would have to have a prior conviction. But life without parole would be the penalty upon a conviction, with no consideration being given to how long ago the conviction occurred or how serious a conviction was or what role the defendant played in the instant case.

For decades now, extensive research and evidence has demonstrated that mandatory minimums fail to reduce crime, they waste the taxpayers' money, they discriminate against minorities, and often require a judge to impose a sentence so bizarre as to violate common sense. Unfortunately, there are already too many mandatory minimums in the Federal code. If we ever expect to do anything about that problem and address this major driver of mass incarceration, the first step we have to take is to stop passing new mandatory minimums or bills that expand mandatory minimums.

Mandatory minimums did not get in the Federal code all at once—they got there one at a time, each one part of a larger bill, which, on balance, might have been a good idea. The only way to stop passing new mandatory minimums is to stop passing bills that contain mandatory minimums.

Giving lip service to a suggestion that you would have preferred that the

mandatory minimum not have been in the bill and then voting for it anyway, just creates another mandatory minimum, and guarantees that those who support mandatory minimums will include them in the next bill. That is how we became number one in the world on incarceration.

Recent studies have shown that we lock up so many people that our incarceration rate is actually counterproductive. There are so many people in jail, so many people being raised with parents in prison, so many people with felony records, and so much of the Justice Department budget being used on prisons that aren't doing any good, that could have been used for constructive activities. We lock up so many people that the incarceration rate is actually counterproductive.

Mr. Speaker, I support the underlying goals of H.R. 1862 to punish sex offenders against children, but I do not support expanding mandatory minimums, in this case, life without parole.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would not be controversial if it had not included mandatory minimums, but, unfortunately, it does. So I, therefore, urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1862.

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

First, let me make it very clear that there are no new mandatory minimums in this bill. The mandatory minimum that is already in the law is appropriate for those who are a danger to children, particularly where these enhancements apply when they have abused a minor, not once, but twice.

We are closing a loophole in the current law and we are adding to this provision the sexual abuse of children under 12 years old. Having already harmed two children, an offender poses too great a risk to our vulnerable citizens. There are victims here and potential victims to protect.

As I mentioned before, child victims report abuse at a shockingly low level. It is important that this conduct is adequately deterred for someone who has already abused a child. Clearly, one conviction was not adequate.

Prosecutorial discretion in these cases act as an appropriate buffer to ensure these provisions are being used reasonably. There are no new mandatory minimums in this bill. We simply close a loophole to make sure that people do not sexually abuse children under 12 years of age, not once, not twice, but more than twice. That is why this mandatory minimum should have a loophole closed to include it, but there is not a new mandatory minimum sentence in this bill.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I agree with my good friend from Virginia, the chairman of the committee,

that the acts are heinous. It appears that there is no addition to the underlying aspect of section 3559(e) of title 18 that says, a defendant who has been previously convicted of a felony Federal or State sex offense committed against a child and who is guilty of a predicate Federal sex offense against a child must be sentenced to life imprisonment.

But, again, the bill is not written that way. I agree with everything my good friend, the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. ROBY) said. I want to congratulate her for her commitment, as so many of us, as women who have come to the United States Congress who are mothers, have a special interest in children, and, in particular, to avoid the horrific abuse of children, and sexual abuse. That is an important cause, and the underlying bill is important and crucial.

But I maintain that there is a lack of clarity into whether or not, in fact, there are additional mandatory minimums because it is broken down in these elements. The imposition of a life sentence, namely, sexual contact with a minor under the age of 12, aggravated sexual contact with a minor between the ages of 12 and 15, and illicit sexual conduct with a minor abroad by a U.S. citizen.

The question is: Is the discretion of the court and the prosecutor there?

I am not in the court. I don't know what the facts are, except for the heinousness of tainting and violating a child. I want that criminal brought to justice, but I want that prosecutor and that judge and the defense under this existing statute to be able to address that question and to be able to address the vileness or the mitigating factors in that instance.

I don't want repeat offenders. Some have alleged that there should be a variety of responses to sex offenders. I am aware of international sex trafficking and men that travel to international places to have sex with a child. I can't imagine that that would not fall on deaf ears in a courtroom under the existing statute of 3559(e). And that is the imposition of life imprisonment.

But there is merit to the question of discretion and the assessment of the court. Now, I might say, with a little aside, that there are some populations that don't get fair treatment, no matter what the case is, yet I am yielding to the court because I do think there is merit to this idea of one mandatory sentence after another, and that that is the only response that one must get the mandatory minimum.

In the backdrop of this Attorney General, who has expressed no interest in rehabilitation, in treatment, or in real criminal justice reform, I am frightened. I am frightened about what will happen in the Nation's U.S. attorneys and Federal courts across America.

Will we again reinstitute the wave of incarcerated persons marching in under mandatory minimums?

□ 1645

Will the epidemic begin again?

It is a difficult posture to stand on the floor of the House when you are discussing a baby, a child, a 12-year-old. There is no divide between my belief and Congresswoman ROBY's belief. It is heinous. They should be punished.

We may have a disagreement of what may be a process that reenacts and restores our pathway on mass incarceration. It is not clear in the bill, plain and simple.

I heard the response of the chairman: There is nothing new. Then it should have been tied to 3559(c) and just say, "must be sentenced to life in prison, as it is." But it seems that there is a re-finement, so more and more opportunities for mandatory minimums and no discretion for the judge.

In a courtroom, the judge, at sentencing, has all the information he or she needs to impose a sentence commensurate with the crime committed and the culpability of the offender. At that time, lock them up, throw the key away.

I am not sure what the Department of Justice is speaking about in terms of loopholes. There are some very fine men and women who have headed up U.S. Attorneys Offices over the years and decades, and they have gotten their man or woman.

So the question is: With an Attorney General that we have, who stood in the way of criminal justice reform in the last Congress as we were on the precipice of doing great things, now I am supposed to be convinced that he is in any way sympathetic to the mass incarceration which disproportionately impacts African Americans.

No, this is not a case that is a bill that points or focuses on African Americans. I am very clear about that. I don't suggest that at all. But I know the ultimate result of mandatory minimums has a disproportionate impact on African Americans, as evidenced by the census population in the Federal Prison Bureau, in the Federal criminal justice system, and in State prisons across America.

I want to work with my colleagues. I want to save children. All of us are brought to tears when some heinous, vile human being wants to taint a child. But if a judge can't understand that, shame on them. If a prosecutor doesn't understand that, shame on them.

And they have got 3559(e) that expresses that, which would include the illicit sexual conduct with a minor abroad by a U.S. citizen and, if not, that could be stated in there, and the language "must be sentenced to life in prison."

I am not sure where we are going, but I would hope that we could clarify that 3559(e) answers all the questions and that we don't find added mandatory minimums which impact communities disproportionately as the only solution to getting a dastardly person off the streets.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would like everyone to think about this in a very general way, that expanding the scope of offenses subject to mandatory minimums is just as harmful as enacting new ones. It is the same thing. And so, accordingly, I oppose this legislation.

Those who commit crimes against children deserve to be punished, and repeat offenders most certainly deserve to face increased penalties. There is no one that, I don't think, in this House, disagrees with that.

But nevertheless, I oppose mandatory minimum sentencing and, therefore, I must oppose this legislation. I believe that judges are the best suited to determine the just and appropriate punishment in each case.

So for the foregoing reasons, I urge each and every one of my colleagues here to oppose H.R. 1862.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, the ranking member, asked that we look at this in a broad and general way, but that is not what this bill is all about. I ask my colleagues to look at this in the very specific way that this bill is designed: to address a loophole in current law that allows sexual predators of children under 12 years old to avoid the sentencing consequences of their actions.

We are about protecting children. This law is about protecting children. But predators know this loophole in the law, and it needs to be closed, so that is what this is about.

This is about making sure that sexual predators are taken off the streets and prevented from not abusing children once or twice, but many more times. This will stop that. This will close that loophole.

This is not the place—sexual predators for children under 12 years old. This is not the place to have a general, broad discussion about mandatory minimum sentences.

Let's fix this problem. And we can and will as we address criminal justice reform, look at our overall sentencing, but this problem needs to be addressed. It needs to be addressed now for the sake of protecting our children. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1862.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

STRENGTHENING CHILDREN'S SAFETY ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1842) to amend title 18, United States Code, to include State crimes of violence as grounds for an enhanced penalty when sex offenders fail to register or report certain information as required by Federal law, to include prior military offenses for purposes of recidivist sentencing provisions, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1842

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 "Strengthening Children's Safety Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. FAILURE OF SEX OFFENDERS TO REGISTER.

Section 2250(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting after "Federal law (including the Uniform Code of Military Justice)," the following: "State law,"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'crime of violence' has the meaning given such term in section 16."

SEC. 3. PRIOR MILITARY OFFENSES INCLUDED FOR PURPOSES OF RECIDIVIST SENTENCING PROVISIONS.

(a) AGGRAVATED SEXUAL ABUSE.—Section 2241(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "State offense" the following: "or an offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice".

(b) SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN.—Section 2251(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "section 920 of title 10 (article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or under" each place it appears and inserting "the Uniform Code of Military Justice or".

(c) CERTAIN ACTIVITIES RELATING TO MATERIAL INVOLVING THE SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF MINORS.—Section 2252 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by striking "section 920 of title 10 (article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or under" and inserting "the Uniform Code of Military Justice or"; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking "section 920 of title 10 (article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or under" and inserting "the Uniform Code of Military Justice or".

(d) CERTAIN ACTIVITIES RELATING TO MATERIAL CONSTITUTING OR CONTAINING CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.—Section 2252A of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by striking "section 920 of title 10 (article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or under" and inserting "the Uniform Code of Military Justice or"; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking "section 920 of title 10 (article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or under" and inserting "the Uniform Code of Military Justice or".

(e) REPEAT OFFENDERS.—Section 2426(b)(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "State law" the

following: “or the Uniform Code of Military Justice”.

(f) SENTENCING CLASSIFICATION.—Section 3559 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)(2)(B)—

(A) by striking “State sex offense” and inserting “State or Military sex offense”; and
(B) by inserting after “under State law” the following: “or the Uniform Code of Military Justice”; and

(2) in subsection (e)(2)(C), by inserting after “State” the following: “or Military”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1842, currently under consideration.

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.

For victims, the effects of child sexual abuse are devastating. It disrupts the victim's development and increases the likelihood that he or she will experience other sexual assaults in the future, and it is, likely, one of the most underreported crimes in the United States. That is why we have to do all we can to prevent these crimes. We promote prevention by closely monitoring sex offenders and by imposing recidivist enhancements on those who have shown a proclivity to abuse children.

H.R. 1842, the Strengthening Children's Safety Act of 2017, closes two significant loopholes to help accomplish these goals.

First, the bill closes a loophole in the statute that criminalizes a sex offender's failure to register. Under current law, a sex offender who fails to comply with registration requirements is guilty of a crime. An enhanced penalty applies to offenders who, while in non-compliant status, commit a Federal crime of violence, a crime of violence under the D.C. Code, a military code crime of violence, a Tribal crime of violence, or a crime of violence in any territory or possession of the United States. This is logical since offenders who have been convicted of both crimes against children and crimes of violence are deserving of more severe punishment.

However, significantly, this provision fails to include offenders who have been convicted of crimes of violence under State laws. It makes no sense that a person convicted of a crime of violence under the D.C. Code is subject to an enhanced penalty, while a person who committed the same offense in

Virginia would not be. Given their propensity for violence, these offenders, regardless of what U.S. jurisdiction convicts them, must be held accountable when they fall off the radar.

The bill further ensures that those offenders who have been previously convicted of sex crimes under the Uniform Code of Military Justice are exposed to the same recidivist enhancements as those convicted of the same crimes in Federal, State, and Tribal courts. The way the U.S. Code is currently written, many of these Federal recidivist statutes unintentionally fail to cover significant sex crimes committed under military law, including certain child pornography offenses. Again, it is important that repeat offenders are subject to the same sentencing enhancements, no matter where they were convicted, in order to protect our children.

H.R. 1842 is commonsense legislation that closes loopholes in Federal law, promotes uniformity, and will help keep our children safe.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE), a member of the Judiciary Committee, for introducing this important bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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 rise in opposition to H.R. 1842, a bill that is intended to address gaps in our child protection laws.

Now, this bill makes a number of changes to the Federal criminal code that, unfortunately, makes the same error that was previously made. It results in the expanded imposition of mandatory minimum sentences. I don't know where we get this notion that mandatory minimum sentences are a solution.

H.R. 1842 amends section 2250(d) of the criminal code, which provides for an enhanced penalty for sex offenders who commit a crime of violence while in noncompliance of sex offender registration and reporting requirements.

In addition to the Federal crimes of violence already included in that statute, this bill would add State crimes of violence as predicate offenses that, in turn, would require the imposition of a mandatory 5-year prison sentence to be served consecutively to any sentence imposed for failing to register or comply with sex offender registration and reporting requirements.

H.R. 1842 would also add prior military child sex offenses to several recidivist sentencing provisions, most of which carry mandatory minimum penalties of at least 15 years or life, itself.

Perhaps we should expand coverage of enhanced sentences for the offenses added by this bill, but we should do so without expanding the number of mandatory minimums. The judges, not the Congress—not us—are in the best position to impose sentences for even the most offensive criminal violations because they know the facts and circumstances of each case.

□ 1700

There is an increasing bipartisan, national recognition that mandatory minimum sentences are not only unfair, but they are also counterproductive. Instead of expanding the coverage of mandatory minimums, we should be eliminating them. Individuals convicted of serious offenses will still receive appropriately lengthy sentences, but they will not be set on a one-size-fits-all basis.

We want to examine the facts, the circumstances in each case, and the judge is in the best position to do that. We should not be assuming that we can sit here and pass these national laws that will not help and will make it difficult for judges to do their work.

Unfortunately, this bill takes the opposite course, and that is why I must oppose it. I encourage my colleagues to think about what we are doing here and oppose H.R. 1842. I urge your support against this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE), the chief author of this legislation.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1842, the Strengthening Children's Safety Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, there are few things more shocking to the conscience or sickening to the soul than crimes against children—the most innocent, the most vulnerable members of our society.

In my time as a Federal prosecutor, the child exploitation images that I was forced to review as part of the evidence were, by far, the most disturbing and difficult part of that job. All of these years later, I still can't erase those depraved images from my mind, and I doubt that I will ever be able to do that.

But crimes against children should stick with us, they should haunt us, and then they should spur us to take action. If we do anything here in Congress, it should be working to protect children. We talk all day long in this Chamber about the future of this country. Well, Mr. Speaker, the children are the future of this country. We need to put our words into action.

So today I am introducing H.R. 1842, the Strengthening Children's Safety Act of 2017, a bill which closes two sets of loopholes in Federal child exploitation laws to make sure that all dangerous sex offenders are treated the same and are subject to the same enhanced penalties under the law.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, current law establishes minimum national standards for sex offender registration and notification in all 50 States, in the District of Columbia, in U.S. territories, and Tribal jurisdictions. If a sex offender knowingly fails to register or update a registration, that individual faces a fine and imprisonment of up to 10 years.

There is also an enhanced penalty of 5 to 30 years imprisonment if the offender, while in that noncompliance status, also commits a crime of violence under Federal law, under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, the law of the District of Columbia, Indian Tribal law, or the law of any territory or possession of the United States.

But here is the problem, Mr. Speaker: Right now, only individuals committing crimes of violence under these Federal, military, and Tribal laws are subject to the enhanced penalty, while individuals committing the same crimes of violence under State law are not.

Mr. Speaker, hopefully, we can all agree that child predators committing crimes of violence should be subject to the same enhanced penalties, regardless of whether these crimes are being charged in Federal court or at the State level. So this bill adds similar State crimes of violence to that list to ensure that the enhanced penalty applies equally to all dangerous offenders.

Mr. Speaker, the second portion of H.R. 1842 addresses enhanced sentences for individuals with prior sex offenses. Fortunately, our child exploitation laws consistently do call for higher sentences any time a defendant has a prior conviction for Federal or State sex offenses. But currently, these sentencing provisions do not consistently include all similar sex offense convictions that arise under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

H.R. 1842 amends those Federal child exploitation laws to include all child sexual exploitation offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice in the recidivist provisions, as appropriate. Again, I think it is critical, Mr. Speaker, that we close this loophole to ensure that all prior child exploitation convictions are penalized for repeat offenders.

Many issues in Congress these days are partisan, but it is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that Members on both sides of the aisle today will be able to come together to support stronger protections for children who are sexually abused. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, as usual, we are indebted to the gentleman from Virginia, who, for years, was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations in the Judiciary Committee and still carries with him the understanding and the experience that leads him to be on the floor with us today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) in support of his position.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1842.

While I support the underlying goal of punishing sex offenders, the existing sentencing laws already provide serious punishment for this conduct. Unfortu-

nately, this legislation expands non-mandatory minimums to additional offenders.

This expansion of mandatory of minimums comes at the heels of Attorney General Sessions' memo, which has been roundly criticized for rescinding the Holder memo and directing all Federal prosecutors to pursue the most serious charges and the maximum sentence, to include mandatory minimum sentences.

The Sessions memo takes away, from Federal prosecutors, the ability to individually assess the unique circumstances of their cases and any factors which would mitigate against seeking the harshest sentence in every case. Once that offense triggers a mandatory minimum and once that is charged, the sentencing judge loses any discretion to assess the unique circumstances of the case and, upon conviction, must impose the mandatory minimum provided in the code.

This legislation is remarkable in that it extends a number of exceptionally high mandatory minimums to most defendants. The mandatory sentence of life without parole is expanded to apply to more cases. The mandatory sentence of 35 years is expanded. In other cases, the mandatory minimum would triple from 5 years to 15 years.

These are grave sentences, and the judge should have discretion in determining when they should be imposed. And these sentences would apply not only to the ring leader, but to everyone who may be involved in the activity and subject to a conspiracy conviction. The mandatory minimum eliminates the ability of the judge to consider the individual circumstances of the case or the culpability or the role of the defendant in that case.

For decades now, extensive research has been done on mandatory minimums, and the conclusions are: they do not reduce crime; they do not protect anybody; they waste the taxpayers' money; they discriminate against minorities; and they often require judges to impose sentences so bizarre that they violate common sense.

When you see how these are worked in drug cases, you can be reminded of President Obama's policy to consider full commutation. Those who are, essentially, first offenders who have been convicted of nonviolent, low-level activity in a drug case would be considered for commutation after 10 years.

Now, that seems reasonable, but what you ought to ask is the question: How did a low-level, nonviolent first offender get so much time that, after 10 years, they still need help from the President? The answer is: mandatory minimums. The judge had no choice but to impose that bizarre sentence.

Unfortunately, there are already too many mandatory minimums in the Federal code. If we ever expect to do anything about the problem and address that driver of mass incarceration, the first step we have to take is to stop passing new mandatory minimums or

bills that expand existing mandatory minimums.

Mandatory minimums in the code did not get there all at once; they got there one at a time, each, part of a larger bill which, on balance, seemed like a good idea. Therefore, the first step we have to take in reducing mandatory minimums is to stop passing new ones or to stop passing bills that expand mandatory minimums.

For these reasons, while I support the underlying goals of H.R. 1842, to punish sex offenses against children, I oppose expanding the application of severe mandatory minimum sentences such as the 15 and 35 and life imprisonment.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would not be controversial without the mandatory minimums; but, unfortunately, they are in the bill, and I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose the legislation.

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

Once again, this bill has no new mandatory minimum sentences. These are not low-level offenders. These are not nonviolent offenders. They are violent sexual predators, and these added offenders—which this bill does to close, again, a loophole—these added offenders have committed the exact same crimes with the exact same conduct as those already covered in existing law. This bill aims to apply the mandatory minimums equitably, and that, I think, should be an important goal for all of us.

Again, there are no new mandatory minimums in this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations in the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan for his leadership and, as well, the gentleman who is a proponent of this legislation which, on its face, provides for an enhanced penalty for sex offenders who commit a crime of violence while in noncompliance of sex offender registration and reporting requirements. That offense can apply to that in the Military Code of Justice, Tribal law, State law, and Federal law.

It also adds State crimes of violence as a predicate offense that, in turn, would require the imposition of a mandatory or an enhanced sentencing to be served consecutively to any sentence imposed for failing to register or comply with the sex offender registration reporting requirements.

I believe, as my colleagues have said, that the underlying premise of this bill will join us together in linking arms, there is no doubt. It should be the rule of this Congress and the rule of elected

officials from State to local government, the U.S. Military Code of Justice, and Tribal law to protect our children; and certainly, the idea of non-compliance with sex registration should be addressed in any court proceeding dealing with these offenders.

The issue, I believe, is the question, again, of: What do we gain by the implementing of a mandatory minimum? In this instance, it is an enhanced 5-year sentence. But there may be a number of reasons in terms of an individual moving from State to State where the person is not registered.

Again, I have to turn my attention to where we are and where we stand on this day, May 22, 2017. It makes a difference. It makes a difference if we have an Attorney General that does not seem to have any interest in rehabilitation, any interest in ensuring that the mass incarceration ends, the disparate treatment of different races and ethnic groups in the criminal justice system ends.

As has been noted already, the previous policies of Attorney General Holder that were fair and did not add to the enhancement of crime, which allowed discretion by prosecutors of not adding up on the particular defendant any number of offenses that would create 200- and 300-year sentencing and, therefore, having people languish in prisons across this country, building up the record of private prisons, and seeing teeming numbers in our Federal prison system, that is what we are facing now.

□ 1715

There is no doubt that the present law, I believe, does, in fact, cover the efforts of the proponent of this legislation. Obviously, there will be a difference of opinion, but I believe that there is sufficient coverage in the underlying legislation without adding this particular enhancement.

I would hope that our colleagues who are in support of this bill, just as I respect their commitment to fighting against sexual violence, sexual contact, and sexual criminal acts against children, would recognize that a discussion about mandatory minimums does not, in any way, diminish one's commitment to the underlying premise of this legislation.

There are too many unknown variables with the leadership of the Attorney General and his indication as to what kind of treatment there should be for underlying crimes and his wish to have newly appointed U.S. Attorneys, many of whom are not appointed, not confirmed, so that we can, again, overcriminalize America, overcriminalize the acts of individuals, and create another siege of mass incarceration.

We will have a number of other bills that will be on the floor with the same concerns that will be expressed. Again, let me say that I support the idea of fighting against child sex trafficking and violent sexual crimes perpetrated against children. I support the opposi-

tion to such and the incarceration of those and bringing those individuals to justice. I do believe, however, that there are many ways of dealing with this, including incarceration without a continuous either enhancement or continued increase of the number of mandatory minimums that are continuing to be added to individuals who are recidivists and who are convicted of Federal, State, or military crimes, in this instance.

Mr. CONYERS. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I commend the gentlewoman for her consistent understanding and explaining why mass incarceration is at the base of all of the debate that is going on.

I am hoping that more and more people who listen to these discussions that we have here in the House of Representatives will begin to understand that mass incarceration is not the answer to our problems. As a matter of fact, they compound the problems.

I salute the gentlewoman for her tenacity and understanding and explaining this situation to everyone who can listen to our discussions here.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for that very thoughtful addition and his kind words.

I think what I want to say to Mr. CONYERS, in concluding, is that mass incarceration is real. We have lived with this for decades. We finally have gotten to the point that judges recognize that there are many different ways to deal with individuals who are recidivists at sentencing, regardless of whether or not the previous conviction, as I said earlier, was Federal, State, or military court, and now Tribal. That is the only point that we are making here.

Next week, we will have 10 more bills with mandatory minimums. We will all agree with the underlying premise, which is to lock the bad guys up, but we do believe that there is some value to the discretion of judges and courts. I don't believe anyone on this floor—none of us, Republicans or Democrats—would have any argument—none—on the underlying premise of our absolute responsibility, without question, of defending and protecting children from these vile individuals. But I don't have the facts inside the courtroom, and there is not a one-size-fits-all answer. That is what mandatory minimums are. All it does is load our prison systems with bodies, one after another.

I conclude with this. The courts have asked for discretion. I would hope that in the Federal system those who are appointed have, in fact, both the wherewithal, the knowledge, the sense of justice, and the right to make the decision based upon the laws and based upon the vileness of what has been engaged in.

This is not an opposition. This is a plea for collaboration.

If I may say one thing personally. There are neighbors that I know in my

community who have been accused of certain things. They are dignified citizens—not with regard to this particular underlying act—but dignified citizens, former military persons, and they are languishing under a mandatory minimum. It is disgraceful. Let me be very clear: It is not a sex offense, not an offense of violence. It is minimal, at best. But they are operating under a mandatory. It literally is disgraceful how this has destroyed their lives.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1842 is a well-intentioned bill meant to ensure that repeat sex offenders are punished for their crimes, whether their prior offenses are State, Federal, or military.

While I believe that repeat sex offenders of any kind should receive appropriately lengthy sentences, I disagree with the imposition of mandatory minimums. We are not the court. We are not the judge. We do not hear the facts and circumstances in each case.

I appeal to good common sense and good legal analysis that we oppose this legislation that would amplify the difficulties that we already know exist. I hope that we will oppose this measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Texas cited a personal experience she had with someone she knows who has been convicted of a crime and given a mandatory minimum sentence. It was not a violent crime, not a sex crime, and not relevant to this bill, which does not add any new mandatory minimum sentences. It simply makes sure that the sentences already imposed under the law are equitably applied, regardless of where their prior offenses took place.

These are sexual crimes. These are violent crimes. These offenders should receive the exact same sentences for the exact same conduct as others already covered under the current law.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation to protect our children and get sexual predators off the street.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1842.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

TARGETING CHILD PREDATORS ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 883) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a certification process for the issuance of nondisclosure requirements accompanying certain administrative subpoenas, to provide for judicial review of such nondisclosure requirements, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 883

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 “Targeting Child Predators Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. NONDISCLOSURE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SUBPOENAS.

Section 3486(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “the Secretary of the Treasury” each place it appears and inserting “the Secretary of Homeland Security”;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking “ordered by a court”;

(3) by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

“(6)(A) If a subpoena issued under this section is accompanied by a certification under clause (ii) and notice of the right to judicial review under subparagraph (C), no recipient of a subpoena under this section shall disclose to any person that the Federal official who issued the subpoena has sought or obtained access to information or records under this section, for a period of 180 days.

“(ii) The requirements of clause (i) shall apply if the Federal official who issued the subpoena certifies that the absence of a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection may result in—

“(I) endangering the life or physical safety of an individual;

“(II) flight from prosecution;

“(III) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

“(IV) intimidation of potential witnesses; or

“(V) otherwise seriously jeopardizing an investigation or unduly delaying a trial.

“(B)(i) A recipient of a subpoena under this section may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

“(I) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary in order to comply with the request;

“(II) an attorney in order to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the request; or

“(III) other persons as permitted by the Federal official who issued the subpoena.

“(ii) A person to whom disclosure is made under clause (i) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom a subpoena is issued under this section in the same manner as the person to whom the subpoena was issued.

“(iii) Any recipient that discloses to a person described in clause (i) information otherwise subject to a nondisclosure requirement shall notify the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

“(iv) At the request of the Federal official who issued the subpoena, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under subclause (I) or (III) of clause (i) shall identify to the individual making the request under this clause the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request.

“(C)(i) A nondisclosure requirement imposed under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to judicial review under section 3486A.

“(ii) A subpoena issued under this section, in connection with which a nondisclosure requirement under subparagraph (A) is imposed, shall include notice of the availability of judicial review described in clause (i).

“(D) A nondisclosure requirement imposed under subparagraph (A) may be extended in accordance with section 3486A(a)(4).”

SEC. 3. JUDICIAL REVIEW OF NONDISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3486 the following:

“§ 3486A. Judicial review of nondisclosure requirements

“(a) NONDISCLOSURE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) NOTICE.—If a recipient of a subpoena under section 3486 wishes to have a court review a nondisclosure requirement imposed in connection with the subpoena, the recipient may notify the Government or file a petition for judicial review in any court described in subsection (a)(5) of section 3486.

“(B) APPLICATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of a notification under subparagraph (A), the Government shall apply for an order prohibiting the disclosure of the existence or contents of the relevant subpoena. An application under this subparagraph may be filed in the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the recipient of the subpoena is doing business or in the district court of the United States for any judicial district within which the authorized investigation that is the basis for the subpoena is being conducted. The applicable nondisclosure requirement shall remain in effect during the pendency of proceedings relating to the requirement.

“(C) CONSIDERATION.—A district court of the United States that receives a petition under subparagraph (A) or an application under subparagraph (B) should rule expeditiously, and shall, subject to paragraph (3), issue a nondisclosure order that includes conditions appropriate to the circumstances.

“(2) APPLICATION CONTENTS.—An application for a nondisclosure order or extension thereof or a response to a petition filed under paragraph (1) shall include a certification from the Federal official who issued the subpoena indicating that the absence of a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection may result in—

“(A) endangering the life or physical safety of an individual;

“(B) flight from prosecution;

“(C) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

“(D) intimidation of potential witnesses; or

“(E) otherwise seriously jeopardizing an investigation or unduly delaying a trial.

“(3) STANDARD.—A district court of the United States shall issue a nondisclosure order or extension thereof under this subsection if the court determines that there is reason to believe that disclosure of the information subject to the nondisclosure requirement during the applicable time period may result in—

“(A) endangering the life or physical safety of an individual;

“(B) flight from prosecution;

“(C) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

“(D) intimidation of potential witnesses; or

“(E) otherwise seriously jeopardizing an investigation or unduly delaying a trial.

“(4) EXTENSION.—Upon a showing that the circumstances described in subparagraphs

(A) through (E) of paragraph (3) continue to exist, a district court of the United States may issue an ex parte order extending a nondisclosure order imposed under this subsection or under section 3486(a)(6)(A) for additional periods of 180 days, or, if the court determines that the circumstances necessitate a longer period of nondisclosure, for additional periods which are longer than 180 days.

“(b) CLOSED HEARINGS.—In all proceedings under this section, subject to any right to an open hearing in a contempt proceeding, the court must close any hearing to the extent necessary to prevent an unauthorized disclosure of a request for records, a report, or other information made to any person or entity under section 3486. Petitions, filings, records, orders, certifications, and subpoenas must also be kept under seal to the extent and as long as necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of a subpoena under section 3486.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3486 the following:

“3486A. Judicial review of nondisclosure requirements.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 883, currently under consideration.

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, over the years, we as a society have made great strides in combating crimes against children. As with many crimes, however, law enforcement often struggles to keep pace with modern technology. That is why H.R. 883, the Targeting Child Predators Act, is both an important and a timely piece of legislation.

While many of the bills we have discussed today have been aimed at prevention and punishment, H.R. 883 provides law enforcement with the tools necessary to stop ongoing abuse, occurring in real time, and to locate offenders.

Because of the severity of sex crimes committed against children and the often irreparable harm they cause, we must take steps to ensure that law enforcement has the ability to swiftly locate sexual predators.

In 1998, Congress recognized this urgency by passing the Protection of Children From Sexual Predators Act, which permitted the FBI to use administrative subpoenas in cases of child exploitation. That legislation was intended to enhance the FBI's ability to

investigate online child exploitation offenses in an expeditious manner.

Administrative subpoenas are especially useful in child exploitation cases because they are not burdened with grand jury secrecy obligations, so the information may be shared among law enforcement to quickly locate offenders in emergency situations.

Under current law, the FBI is permitted to use an administrative subpoena to obtain non-content information from internet service providers in child exploitation cases.

H.R. 883 allows the government to prohibit the recipient of a subpoena from disclosing the existence of the subpoena, provided the government certifies there is reason to believe that disclosure may result in endangerment to the life or physical safety of any person, flight to avoid prosecution, destruction of or tampering with evidence, or intimidation of potential witnesses.

Presently, if agents want to obtain this information with a nondisclosure provision, it must go through the courts, which, of course, defeats the purpose of a speedy mechanism to obtain non-content information.

Importantly, the bill contains a provision that allows a company in receipt of such a subpoena to insist that the government obtain a court order prohibiting the company from disclosing the subpoena to the target. Alternatively, the company may initiate such proceedings itself in a relevant court to challenge the nondisclosure requirement.

Mr. Speaker, a nondisclosure provision is vitally important in child exploitation cases. If a bad guy who has taken a child knows that law enforcement is on to him, or is looking for him, what might he do to get away? What might he do to that child?

H.R. 883 is an important bill which promotes Congress' original intent to ensure law enforcement has quick access to this information. It is narrowly tailored to ensure that its provisions apply in cases where time is of the essence. It provides a mechanism for companies to challenge the nondisclosure requirements.

□ 1730

I commend Mr. DESANTIS, the gentleman from Florida and a member of the Judiciary Committee, for introducing this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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 reluctantly rise in opposition to H.R. 883, the Targeting Child Predators Act of 2017.

You see, child sexual exploitation and abuse are reprehensible crimes committed against the most vulnerable members of our society. Unfortunately, these offenses have been increasingly facilitated by the use of the internet in recent years. H.R. 883 would change the

administrative subpoena statute to facilitate the prosecution of criminals who commit these terrible crimes against children.

Without question, I support the goal of pursuing these criminals, but, nevertheless, I am concerned that this bill would eliminate judicial oversight of nondisclosure orders currently required prior to the issuance of the administrative subpoenas.

Section 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code authorizes investigators to request a 90-day order of nondisclosure from a district court judge. The order of nondisclosure forbids the recipient, such as an internet service provider, from alerting the target of the investigation of the law enforcement's inquiry. H.R. 883 would extend the nondisclosure period from 90 days to 180 days to allow investigators more time to complete their investigations before the target is informed of the inquiry.

Although I would like to have more information about why it is necessary to extend this time period, it is particularly problematic combined with the other significant change to the law made by this very legislation. H.R. 883 would allow investigators to require nondisclosure of internet service providers without the approval of a judge, thereby eliminating any judicial oversight prior to issuance of the subpoena.

The administrative subpoena authority is an extraordinary power given to certain agencies by Congress under its limited circumstances. While the legislation would allow a recipient to challenge a nondisclosure order in court, I am concerned about the bill's elimination of judicial approval on the front end.

I understand the desire to do more to facilitate the investigation of these crimes and that the online context for them has raised issues that we should continue to examine, but I do not believe we have been given enough information justifying this bill, at least in its current form.

Elimination of prior judicial approval of nondisclosure orders is a step we should undertake only based on evidence and careful deliberation. A bill such as the one before us warrants at least a legislative hearing to consider its potential ramifications. I don't think that is asking too much that we have a hearing on this matter before we decide what to do with the proposal rather than not have one at all. Our committee has not had the benefit of any such hearing on this legislation, and I think this is not the proper way the members of the House Judiciary Committee, who are mostly lawyers, should proceed.

Mr. Speaker, accordingly, I oppose H.R. 883, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), who is the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, every year, thousands of children are victims

of cyber exploitation. As a former prosecutor who has handled child exploitation cases, I know just how important it is to preserve evidence that can bring predators to justice.

After speaking with Florida law enforcement officials about the challenges they face when tracking suspects online, I introduced the Targeting Child Predators Act. This is a sensible reform that will better protect our children by preventing suspected child predators from destroying evidence and covering their tracks.

When tracking a suspected child predator online, law enforcement far too often hits roadblocks that can critically threaten their investigation. Internet service providers who have been issued a duly issued, lawful subpoena from law enforcement will often inform the suspect that police investigators have requested their information. Once notified that they are the target of an investigation, child predators can wipe their systems clean and go into hiding, leaving law enforcement empty-handed and potentially putting their victims at further risk.

The Targeting Child Predators Act is a simple and necessary amendment to our criminal code requiring that ISPs wait 180 days before disclosing to suspected child predators that their information has been requested by law enforcement. The bill is narrowly targeted to child exploitation cases where the destruction of valuable evidence could endanger the safety of a child or seriously jeopardize an ongoing investigation. Additionally, the Targeting Child Predators Act provides judicial review of subpoenas and affords both ISPs and suspects due process as required by law.

The Targeting Child Predators Act will protect our children from those who wish to exploit them while maintaining the constitutional rights of suspected criminals. This is an issue that should garner wide bipartisan support from the House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to step up. Let's support our vulnerable children. Let's target child predators, and let's vote "yes" on this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who is one of the consistent leaders for a good criminal justice system.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member very much, and I thank him for his work.

I think the work that we are doing in Judiciary certainly has far-reaching impact. It is important to try to make more efficient the way that we address these very heinous acts against our children.

As a strong advocate for children throughout my career, I agree that we in Congress must do everything within our power and authority to prevent child sexual exploitation and abuse. The Targeting Child Predators Act of 2017 is intended to assist investigators in their pursuit of online predators.

I fully support efforts to locate and prosecute individuals who commit such heinous crimes. However, I believe we should discuss the proposal before us with more information from all who would be impacted prior to approving the changes to the law this bill proposes.

This has a lot of moving parts and participants, particularly in relation to online internet and the variety of providers that are stakeholders in all of this.

This bill would modify a powerful yet historically controversial investigatory tool: the administrative subpoena. Administrative subpoenas allow certain investigators investigating specified crimes to obtain private records without judicial approval. I can account for the fact, Mr. Speaker, that there are many instances where this may be a vital approach.

We know that we live in a very difficult time, and a number of incidents dealing with national security and others may certainly be impacted by such; but, obviously, there are other subpoenas that are attendant to those particular acts. But the administrative subpoenas, as indicated, allow Federal investigators investigating specified crimes to obtain private records, as indicated, without judicial approval.

Although investigators do not need sign-off from a judge before issuing such a subpoena, there is one layer of judicial review that prevents them from abusing their subpoena power. That is the judicial consideration of nondisclosure orders prior to the issuance of subpoenas.

At present, a district court judge must determine if circumstances exist to justify issuance of a 90-day nondisclosure order in connection with administrative subpoenas. Under the terms that I understand are in this proposed bill, investigators could require nondisclosure by subpoena recipients for a longer period—180 days—and without first receiving the approval of a district judge, effectively eliminating judicial consideration of nondisclosure orders prior to the issuance of subpoenas. Subpoena recipients would have the ability to seek judicial review of the nondisclosure requirement only after receiving the subpoena. I believe that this provision raises concerns that remove the wisdom of district judges from this process at the time the gag orders are imposed.

Congress authorized the use of these subpoenas to allow investigators to obtain information quickly and expeditiously, and I think they work that way. The intervention of judicial review has not proven to be an obstruction so much so that you might remove it and the wisdom of the court. Congress also expressly required that investigators seek the approval of a district judge for nondisclosure orders connected to these subpoenas.

I share my colleagues' desire to locate and prosecute those who commit child exploitation and abuse crimes,

and, in essence, let's get them, but I do think that the willingness to remove judicial review is one of question.

Those individuals who hide behind computer screens committing abhorrent acts against children on the internet must be apprehended and made to answer for their crimes. I would think that the judge would be well aware of how sensitive this is and use their best impression to get moving and to allow the process to proceed.

I think this Nation is a land of laws. We abide by the rule of law, and Congress has a right to draft laws. But I do think, in this instance, the rule of law, abiding by the rule of law, allowing for the active participation of the court and the wisdom of the court is not too much to ask in a nation that believes in democracy, believes in the rights of the offenders and, as well, the victims.

So I am very concerned about this bill, and I would hope that we would have the opportunity to have this addressed or the issues addressed, or addressed in the Senate; and I look forward to those issues being addressed in the Senate so that we can, together, handle the concerns that are being expressed and have a bill that does not remove judicial oversight and the wisdom of the court.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss H.R. 883, the "Targeting Child Predators Act of 2017." As a strong advocate for children throughout my career, I agree that we in Congress must do everything within our power and authority to prevent child sexual exploitation and abuse.

The "Targeting Child Predators Act of 2017" is intended to assist investigators in their pursuit of online child predators.

I fully support efforts to locate and prosecute individuals who commit such heinous crimes. However, I believe we should discuss the proposal before us—with more information from all who would be impacted—prior to approving the changes to the law this bill proposes.

This bill would modify a powerful, yet historically controversial, investigatory tool—the administrative subpoena.

Administrative subpoenas allow certain Federal investigators, investigating specified crimes, to obtain private records without judicial approval.

Although investigators do not need sign-off from a judge before issuing such a subpoena, there is one layer of judicial review that prevents them from abusing their subpoena power.

That is the judicial consideration of nondisclosure orders prior to the issuance of subpoenas.

At present, a district court judge must determine if circumstances exist to justify issuance of a 90-day nondisclosure order in connection with administrative subpoenas.

Under the terms proposed in this bill, investigators could require nondisclosure by subpoena recipients for a longer period—180 days—and without first receiving the approval of a district judge, effectively eliminating judicial consideration of nondisclosure orders prior to the issuance of subpoenas.

Subpoena recipients would have the ability to seek judicial review of the nondisclosure requirement only after receiving the subpoena.

I am deeply concerned with the provision that would remove the wisdom of district judges from this process at the time the gag orders are imposed.

Congress authorized the use of these subpoenas to allow investigators to obtain information quickly and expeditiously.

But, Congress also expressly required that investigators seek the approval of a district judge for nondisclosure orders connected to these subpoenas.

I share my colleagues' desire to locate and prosecute those who commit child exploitation and abuse crimes.

Those individuals, who hide behind computer screens, committing abhorrent acts against children on the internet, must be apprehended and made to answer for their crimes.

I am not convinced that this bill is the best way to go about doing so.

I hope we can find a way to address this issue, with more information from all concerned.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the most problematic aspect of H.R. 883 is that it would eliminate prior judicial approval of nondisclosure orders. I am firmly opposed to that. And while I fully support efforts to investigate crime, particularly those perpetrated against children, I cannot support this bill without knowing more about how it will affect an already extraordinary investigative power.

Let's have a hearing. That is what our committee is for. The Judiciary Committee should inquire into this very carefully, and, in the absence of such evidence, I must urge, at this time, our colleagues join me in opposing H.R. 883.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to urge my colleagues to support this very important, very targeted legislation.

This is not some broad authority. This is very targeted under circumstances where the sexual predator has the child and the authorities need to get information from third parties now so they can find that child and they need those third parties to not disclose information that they are yielding to the government about their whereabouts and other information about them because of the emergency circumstances that are at play here, or you are dealing with someone who has a child and needs to be found so that child can be saved. That is the purpose of this legislation.

□ 1745

It is a good purpose. This legislation should be supported by all the Members of the House. I urge them to do so.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 883.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHILD PROTECTION IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 695) to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 695

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 “Child Protection Improvements Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECK AND CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW PROGRAM.

The National Child Protection Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 5119 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3—

(A) by amending subsection (a)(3) to read as follows:

“(3)(A) The Attorney General shall establish a program, in accordance with this section, to provide qualified entities located in States which do not have in effect procedures described in paragraph (1), or qualified entities located in States which do not prohibit the use of the program established under this paragraph, with access to national criminal history background checks on, and criminal history reviews of, covered individuals.

“(B) A qualified entity described in subparagraph (A) may submit to the appropriate designated entity a request for a national criminal history background check on, and a criminal history review of, a covered individual. Qualified entities making a request under this paragraph shall comply with the guidelines set forth in subsection (b), and with any additional applicable procedures set forth by the Attorney General or by the State in which the entity is located.”;

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(E), by striking “unsupervised”;

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) by redesignating subparagraph (A) as clause (i);

(II) in subparagraph (B)—

(aa) by adding “and” at the end; and

(bb) by redesignating such subparagraph as clause (ii);

(III) by striking “that each provider who is the subject of a background check” and inserting “(A) that each covered individual who is the subject of a background check conducted pursuant to the procedures established pursuant to subsection (a)(1)”;

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) that each covered individual who is the subject of a national criminal history background check and criminal history review conducted pursuant to the procedures established

pursuant to subsection (a)(3) is entitled to challenge the accuracy and completeness of any information in the criminal history record of the individual by contacting the Federal Bureau of Investigation under the procedure set forth in section 16.34 of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto.”;

(iii) in paragraph (3), by inserting after “authorized agency” the following: “or designated entity, as applicable”; and

(iv) in paragraph (4), by inserting after “authorized agency” the following: “or designated entity, as applicable.”;

(C) in subsection (d), by inserting after “officer or employee thereof,” the following: “nor shall any designated entity nor any officer or employee thereof.”;

(D) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

“(e) FEES.—

“(1) STATE PROGRAM.—In the case of a background check conducted pursuant to a State requirement adopted after December 20, 1993, conducted with fingerprints on a covered individual, the fees collected by authorized State agencies and the Federal Bureau of Investigation may not exceed eighteen dollars, respectively, or the actual cost, whichever is less, of the background check conducted with fingerprints.

“(2) FEDERAL PROGRAM.—In the case of a national criminal history background check and criminal history review conducted pursuant to the procedures established pursuant to subsection (a)(3), the fees collected by a designated entity shall be set at a level that will ensure the recovery of the full costs of providing all such services. The designated entity shall remit the appropriate portion of such fee to the Attorney General, which amount is in accordance with the amount published in the Federal Register to be collected for the provision of a criminal history background check by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(3) ENSURING FEES DO NOT DISCOURAGE VOLUNTEERS.—A fee system under this subsection shall be established in a manner that ensures that fees to qualified entities for background checks do not discourage volunteers from participating in programs to care for children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities.”;

(E) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) NATIONAL CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECK AND CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW PROGRAM.—

“(1) NATIONAL CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECK.—Upon a designated entity receiving notice of a request submitted by a qualified entity pursuant to subsection (a)(3), the designated entity shall forward the request to the Attorney General, who shall, acting through the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, complete a fingerprint-based check of the national criminal history background check system, and provide the information received in response to such national criminal history background check to the appropriate designated entity. The designated entity may, upon request from a qualified entity, complete a check of a State criminal history database.

“(2) CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW.—

“(A) DESIGNATED ENTITIES.—The Attorney General shall designate, and enter into an agreement with, one or more entities to make determinations described in paragraph (2). The Attorney General may not designate and enter into an agreement with a Federal agency under this subparagraph.

“(B) DETERMINATIONS.—A designated entity shall, upon the receipt of the information described in paragraph (1), make a determination of fitness described in subsection (b)(4), using the criteria described in subparagraph (C).

“(C) CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW CRITERIA.—The Attorney General shall, by rule, establish the criteria for use by designated entities in making a determination of fitness described in

subsection (b)(4). Such criteria shall be based on the criteria established pursuant to section 108(a)(3)(G)(i) of the Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to end the Exploitation of Children Today Act of 2003 (42 U.S.C. 5119a note).”; and

(F) by striking—

(i) “provider” each place it appears, and inserting “covered individual”; and

(ii) “provider’s” each place it appears, and inserting “covered individual’s”; and

(2) in section 5—

(A) by amending paragraph (9) to read as follows:

“(9) the term ‘covered individual’ means an individual—

“(A) who has, seeks to have, or may have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, served by a qualified entity; and

“(B) who—

“(i) is employed by or volunteers with, or seeks to be employed by or volunteer with, a qualified entity; or

“(ii) owns or operates, or seeks to own or operate, a qualified entity.”;

(B) in paragraph (10), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in paragraph (11), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (11) the following:

“(12) the term ‘designated entity’ means an entity designated by the Attorney General under section 3(f)(2)(A).”.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall be fully implemented by not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 695, currently under consideration.

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, we have spent a great deal of time this afternoon discussing legislation designed to detect and punish sexual predators. These bills are all strong, well crafted, and laudable. I urge my colleagues to support them.

However, there is another facet to this problem, which is prevention. This may be the most important action we as Congress can take in the realm of child exploitation laws. We must do all we can to prevent child exploitation from happening in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am pleased to bring H.R. 695, the Child Protection Improvements Act, before the House today. This legislation is extremely important in that it makes permanent a successful pilot program that allowed youth-serving organizations access to FBI fingerprint database searches.

In 2003, the PROTECT Act created the Child Safety Pilot Program, which ran from 2003 until 2011, and provided access to FBI fingerprint background checks for a variety of child-serving nonprofits.

The pilot conducted over 105,000 background checks during its existence. 6.2 percent of potential volunteers were found to have criminal records of concern. While that may seem like a small percentage, Mr. Speaker, it works out to over 6,500 individuals.

In addition, over 40 percent of individuals with criminal records of concern had crimes in States other than where they were applying to volunteer, meaning that only a nationwide check would have flagged these individuals' criminal records.

The criminal offenses detected among some of these checks included convictions for criminal sexual conduct with a child, child endangerment, and manslaughter. Twenty-six percent of these individuals showed a different name on their record than the one they used on their job application.

H.R. 695 allows organizations such as the YMCA to submit fingerprints to a designated entity which, in turn, submits them to the FBI for processing. The system protects privacy rights by ensuring that the specifics of a criminal record are never disclosed without explicit consent by the applicant, and it provides opportunity for individuals to correct errors in their records directly with the FBI.

Importantly, the bill does not mandate that youth-serving organizations use this process. It merely makes the process more accessible and more affordable for organizations that wish to use it.

Mr. Speaker, the harsh reality is that there are individuals who will put themselves in positions where they are entrusted with children so they can then betray that trust in the worst way imaginable. That is why bills like H.R. 695, and other bills we have discussed today, are so important.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) for introducing this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this strong bipartisan 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 rise in strong support of H.R. 695, the Child Protection Improvements Act, and tip my hat to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the author of the bill, who we will hear from shortly.

We have a special responsibility to protect our young people and vulnerable adults. For that reason, I am pleased that we are considering this measure which would provide a robust, easily accessible, cost-effective background check system for organizations that work with youth and vulnerable

adults. I support it for a number of reasons.

To begin with, it will facilitate more comprehensive criminal background checks which provide a critical layer of protection. These checks help identify individuals who could potentially harm participants in programs for children, young people, and vulnerable adults as well.

Background checks also serve to ensure the integrity and accountability of the organizations that sponsor these programs by reducing potential threats. Results from background checks that search criminal histories nationwide are more reliable than background checks that only search criminal histories in a few States. I think that is obvious.

Secondly, the State background checks are no substitute whatsoever for the FBI's fingerprint-based system, which is the only nationwide database that allows a search of criminal histories in every single State.

Currently, this database can only be accessed through the State law enforcement agencies, and many States limit the ability of organizations to access the system, with some States completely even forbidding access—no access whatsoever. As a result, organizations must navigate a labyrinth of State laws or rely on private companies to perform background checks of employees and volunteers.

H.R. 695, on the other hand, would provide organizations with the ability to access the FBI's superior system without impacting the autonomy of States or the organizations. States would be able to continue or establish their own background check systems, and organizations would not be required to perform FBI background checks of potential applicants or volunteers.

Finally, the need for this legislation is clearly justified by the Child Safety Pilot Program, which we implemented over a decade ago. This program documented the effectiveness of nationwide background checks for youth-serving organizations. Based on a comprehensive review of thousands of criminal history records spanning an 8-year period, the program demonstrated that people who might pose a risk to the safety of children, nevertheless, attempted to work with children.

For example, the program identified applicants who, to avoid detection, used aliases, incorrect dates of birth, or wrong Social Security numbers. Some of these applicants had serious criminal histories, including even homicides, sexual assaults, child endangerment, and even rape.

More than a third of criminal history hits were from out-of-state, and more than half of the people with criminal history hits failed to disclose them on their application.

H.R. 695 would give organizations access to the FBI's comprehensive background check system and thereby help ensure the safety of our youth and others.

Accordingly, I hope that all of my colleagues will join me in supporting this important measure.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP), one of the two chief sponsors of this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for his great work in bringing this matter forward.

Mr. Speaker, protection of children is not a partisan matter, and I am grateful to the committee, committee staff, and Chairman GOODLATTE for his leadership in this matter and bringing this forward.

With school ending and summer camp starting, this is the time to bring awareness to and pass the Child Protection Improvements Act.

Every year, millions of people work with or volunteer to help our children wherever they are as camp counselors, local youth sports coaches, mentors. You name it. All across America, there are organizations where people can make a difference in the lives of our Nation's youth, and our children can absolutely benefit from these programs. Take the Boys and Girls Clubs, MENTOR, or the YMCA, just to name a few. These groups and dozens of others, which exist virtually in all of our districts, have come to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and to me asking for help.

Just like any parent, they too want to ensure that people working with our kids are decent, with clean backgrounds and good intentions. Mr. Speaker, that is where Congress comes in. We have a duty to ensure every youth-serving organization in America can afford and access the best background checks on staff and volunteers so they can properly vet people who might have traveled across State lines. This means utilizing the FBI's gold-standard database.

Shockingly enough, not every organization has the option today, but we have the ability to change that. The Child Protection Improvements Act would allow all youth-serving organizations to utilize the FBI fingerprint-based background checks. We are simply eliminating the red tape that prevents the access in some of these States so every organization can adequately look out for our children, no matter where they live.

For those who are justifiably concerned about the cost, it should also be noted that the CPIA is fiscally responsible, as it does not authorize any new spending. The program will be supported by fees assessed for background checks by the requesting nonprofit organizations.

Mr. Speaker, every kid deserves a childhood where they can explore, grow, and do fun things beyond the

walls of their home and school. As a father of three myself, I ask my colleagues to support this commonsense measure to catch potential threats and keep our kids safe.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) for his contribution.

I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee and the author of the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Child Protection Improvements Act. I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) who has been an excellent partner working with me on this bill, the first version of which was introduced in 2007.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS for their work on the bill as well.

I volunteered with Big Brothers Big Sisters many years ago. I was paired with an extraordinary young man named David who is now himself a Big Brother. I have always said that I have learned as much or more from David and the program as he ever learned from me.

The experience also helped me understand the huge amount of trust that we put in volunteers at organizations all around the country. In the vast majority of cases, that trust is well placed. But, unfortunately, there are exceptions.

For that reason, in 2003, Congress created the Child Safety Pilot Program to demonstrate the feasibility of allowing youth-serving nonprofits to access FBI background checks.

□ 1800

The FBI maintains the database of criminal histories from every State in the Nation, searchable by fingerprint. An FBI search is really the gold standard when it comes to background checks, as it cannot be evaded by using a fake name, and it will find convictions from every State. I believe that the gold standard is what we should strive for when it comes to protecting children, seniors, and individuals with disabilities who are put in a potentially vulnerable situation.

Between 2003 and 2011, youth-serving organizations were able to run over 100,000 background checks through this pilot program, and about 6 percent of the potential volunteers were revealed to have criminal records of concern. Applicants were found with convictions for everything from murder to child abuse, to sexual assault; and frequently those convictions were from out of State, so only a national background check would have found them.

H.R. 695 ensures that every child-serving organization in America will have access to the most comprehensive and effective background check pos-

sible. H.R. 695 will also protect the applicant's privacy and does not allow for the individual's specific criminal record to be disclosed without explicit consent by the potential volunteer.

We have demonstrated that background checks for nonprofits working with children can be conducted quickly, affordably, and accurately. It is time to create a system that is permanent and that will protect children and other vulnerable populations while ensuring the privacy of volunteers.

I urge the passage of this bipartisan bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me also congratulate Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. BISHOP. And as was indicated on the floor, thank you very much, Mr. CONYERS.

This is the kind of bill that is corrective and effective. This bill would allow a more effective and comprehensive criminal background check, which will help identify the integrity and accountability of the organizations that sponsor these programs.

Many of us have worked with the Boys and Girls Clubs, Boys and Girls Scouts, and many other organizations that really work to help children. These nationwide criminal background checks are more reliable than background checks that only search criminal histories in a few States.

Many States currently limit the ability of organizations to access their database and, thus, force organizations to depend on private companies to perform background checks of employees and volunteers. If anybody has been on the board of a nonprofit dealing with children, you realize that you want to put most of your resources investing in the programs to help these children. H.R. 695, however, would alleviate this burden of expense and allow organizations to access the FBI's more robust system.

In the Child Safety Pilot Program, which we implemented over 10 years ago, it demonstrates the effectiveness of nationwide background checks for youth-serving organizations. The program has effectively exposed applicants who use aliases, incorrect dates of birth, and other identifiers, some of whom have serious criminal backgrounds. That is the preventative way to protect our children, by ensuring a very healthy, robust vetting of individuals who want to engage with our children.

H.R. 695 would allow organizations to access the FBI's comprehensive background check system and to create a more accurate determination of individuals who want to work with children. Volunteers we welcome, but we want to ensure that those volunteers are there to take care of our children,

to help our children, and improve the lives of our children. H.R. 695 is a very important contributor to that effort.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I am pleased to make my closing remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the Child Protection Improvements Act is a reasonable, bipartisan piece of legislation intended to protect our children and vulnerable adults from harm and give those who love them peace of mind.

Although we still have work to do to address the accuracy and reliability of some criminal history records and give individuals an opportunity to challenge incomplete or inaccurate records, this is a good bill. For those reasons, I urge everyone in this Chamber to support the bill.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP). I thank the ranking member of the full committee and the ranking member of the subcommittee and the chairman of the subcommittee for working on this important legislation with me and the committee staff.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 695, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TARGETED REWARDS FOR THE GLOBAL ERADICATION OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1625) to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to include severe forms of trafficking in persons within the definition of transnational organized crime for purposes of the rewards program of the Department of State, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1625

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 "Targeted Rewards for the Global Eradication of Human Trafficking" or the "TARGET Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Trafficking in persons is a major transnational crime that threatens United States national security and humanitarian interests.

(2) Trafficking in persons is increasingly perpetrated by organized, sophisticated criminal enterprises.

(3) Combating trafficking in persons requires a global approach to identifying and apprehending the world's worst human trafficking rings.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Department of State's rewards program is a powerful tool in combating sophisticated international crime and that the Department of State and Federal law enforcement should work in concert to offer rewards that target human traffickers who threaten United States national security and humanitarian interests by preying on the most vulnerable people around the world.

SEC. 3. REWARDS FOR JUSTICE.

Paragraph (5) of section 36(k) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2708(k)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “means”;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and moving such clauses, as so redesignated, two ems to the right;

(3) by inserting before clause (i), as so redesignated, the following:

“(A) means—”;

(4) in clause (ii), as so redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(5) by adding at the end following new subparagraph:

“(B) includes severe forms of trafficking in persons, as such term is defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1625 is the human trafficking TARGET Act. It authorizes the State Department and Federal law enforcement to target international human traffickers, and they can do that by offering rewards for their arrest or conviction anywhere around the globe.

Mr. Speaker, I think for all of us, with some of the cases we have had in our districts, some of our constituents, some of the victims, this is pretty close to all of us. It has touched many of our communities, because trafficking in persons here in the U.S. and worldwide is a major global crime that destroys countless lives at home and abroad, and the most vulnerable are destroyed by this.

Many of these persons—and they are primarily women and children—are

trafficked into international sex trade by force or by fraud or by coercion. And I will remind everyone, out in southern California, in L.A., the average age of a girl being trafficked is 14. In Orange County, the average age is 14.

So when I say “by force,” we are talking about abduction. When I say “by fraud,” that is a situation where they get one of these gigolos, one of those Romeos—they call them—to go out, convince some girl to run off with him, get her out of State, and then he sells her to a criminal gang. The gang sells her to the crime syndicate. Now her fate is sealed. Or through coercion, and we have heard these cases. At 14, young people are pretty gullible, what this criminal organization is going to do to her sister or to her parents if she does not go along.

So this transnational crime also includes forced labor. It involves significant violations of public health, human rights standards worldwide, and every other kind of moral standard you could think of. And that is why, as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and as Representative for the 39th District in California, I have, over the last few years, made working on this issue and moving legislation on this horrific crime a top priority for the committee, and we have had bipartisan support throughout for this legislation. We have enacted many bills in recent years, including the International Megan's Law last February. We have held committee hearings in Washington, in L.A., and in Orange County to hear firsthand from victims.

For example, at a field hearing in Fullerton, we heard from Angela Guanzon, who was trafficked from the Philippines into coerced servitude in Los Angeles where she worked for 18 hours a day every day without a weekend off, without a holiday off, was forced to sleep on the hallway floor until a sharp-eyed neighbor finally alerted law enforcement.

I helped establish a Human Trafficking Congressional Advisory Committee. I established that in the 39th District for L.A., Orange County, and San Bernardino. We have local law enforcement involved in that as well as the Federal authorities, victims rights groups, and community advocates in California to address these concerns, to try to come up with solutions.

Mr. Speaker, we have made progress, but there is still so much work to be done. If we are going to end human trafficking, it will take all of us working together, so I want to thank Ranking Member ENGEL, of course, Congressman CONNOLLY, and the coauthor of my legislation here, LOIS FRANKEL, for their outstanding work on this measure.

As has been discussed today, trafficking in persons is increasingly perpetuated and perpetrated by sophisticated transnational criminal enterprises. The traffickers themselves operate outside sometimes of our borders.

Other times they are inside our borders, but the profits from the trafficking industry contribute to the expansion of organized crime and terrorism here and worldwide.

That is why combating human trafficking requires a global approach to identify and apprehend the world's worst offenders. This TARGET Act for traffickers does that. It targets human trafficking globally through the Department of State's very successful Rewards Programs.

Rewards issued under these programs have led to the capture of major terrorists and international criminals, including—I will remind Members—Ramzi Yousef, who was convicted in the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center, several members of the Abu Sayyaf terrorist group who kidnapped and killed American citizens, and over 60 major international drug traffickers. All of them were convicted with the help of this particular program that we want to expand now, that we want to apply here.

A reward on one's head creates real fear for terrorists and criminals. At one committee hearing, a State Department official testified that one captured narcotics trafficker told DEA agents he would no longer trust anyone in his organization after the U.S. put a \$5 million reward for his capture.

I remember the quote. He said he felt like a hunted man.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we want human traffickers to know the fear of being hunted.

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

□ 1815

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

Mr. Speaker, I laud the leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and my good friend, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), for taking a particular lead in our committee on this terribly important topic.

I rise in support of H.R. 1625, the Targeted Rewards for the Global Eradication of Human Trafficking Act. Let me start by again thanking both of my colleagues for their leadership. I am also proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill to help bring human traffickers to justice.

Human trafficking is an abhorrent practice, increasingly perpetrated by organized criminal enterprises, that deprives people of their most precious gift: human autonomy. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness presume autonomy. Without autonomy, identity is lost, and the ability to pursue those inalienable rights Thomas Jefferson wrote about in our Declaration of Independence do not exist. They are nullified. This major transnational crime threatens United States security and humanitarian interests all over the world.

This bill would allow the State Department to pay cash through the Rewards for Justice program for information leading to the arrest and conviction of human traffickers worldwide. These cash rewards are a proven method for cracking open international criminal networks.

Congress originally established the program to gain more information in terrorism cases. We have since expanded it to include other crimes as well. With this legislation, we will give law enforcement the ability to use this valuable tool in the fight against human trafficking.

Over the last two decades, the United States has actively fought human trafficking through provisions laid out in the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act, which established the annual Trafficking in Persons Report and subsequent reauthorizations.

Human trafficking is nothing short of modern-day slavery. As the TIP Report demonstrates, human trafficking affects, unfortunately, every country in the world, including, of course, the United States, as the distinguished chairman described.

As ranking member of the House Oversight Subcommittee on Government Operations, I joined with the then-subcommittee chairman, JAMES LANKFORD, now Senator from Oklahoma, to investigate the abuse of foreign nationals employed by government contractors. Together, we introduced the End Trafficking in Government Contracting Act, which was enacted as part of the fiscal 2013 National Defense Authorization Act.

Whether it takes the form of forced labor or sexual exploitation, every case of human trafficking deprives an individual of their basic human rights. More than 20 million people fall victim to this heinous crime every year. A disproportionate share of the victims are women and children, and only a very small fraction will ever see their traffickers held accountable. We must and can do more to bring the perpetrators of this heinous crime to justice.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It will give law enforcement a proven method to help finally bring an end to this modern-day slave trafficking.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), my good friend and coauthor of this important piece of legislation.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CONNOLLY and, of course, the chair of our committee for his fine work and our ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, as we have heard already, human trafficking is a global crisis of epic proportions. An estimated 12 to 20 million men and women around

the world are being subjected to slavery of some sort. In fact, it is the number two criminal enterprise on Earth.

I have seen the effects of this human trafficking up close. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about a couple visits I made.

When I went to Peru, I went to a couple shelters there, which were now the homes of young girls who had been trafficked. The first one I went to, there were girls in their mid-teens who had been raised in families that were very, very poor. Their families were approached by these traffickers, who told them they would take their children, take their daughters to “the promised land.” They were going to take them to an area in Peru where they would be educated, well fed, and well nourished.

What they really ended up doing was taking these young girls and basically enslaving them. They found themselves in people’s homes where they would be locked up, literally, for years. From the time the Sun came up to the time the Sun went down, these children told their stories of having to, for example, peel potatoes, peel potatoes day and night. No education, no mingling with their peers, just deprived of the joy of childhood.

At another shelter we went to, we visited young girls, again, who had been saved from their slavery. They had been kidnapped off the streets—they were now teenagers—when they were 9 and 10 and 11. I mean, it was just hard for me to hear these stories. I am sure it will be hard for you to hear these stories. When they were preteens, they were kidnapped off the streets. Some of them were locked in trunks. They were beaten. They were forced in submission to become sex slaves to miners. Again, children deprived of their education, deprived of their innocence.

I am not only haunted when I think back on them, I am haunted because I remember looking in their eyes—looking in their eyes—and saying to myself: How could this happen? How in our civilization do we let this happen to innocent children?

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when I returned home to the United States, I heard a story from a young woman named Shandra, who had a work visa to come over here from Indonesia to work in a hotel. On her way over, she was kidnapped by traffickers and forced into commercial sex slavery for 2 to 3 years on the I-95 corridor. The way she escaped was through a bathroom window.

I thank Mr. ROYCE for letting me have an opportunity to join him in this legislation, which is going to target these sex and labor traffickers, give a powerful tool to stop what we call modern-day slavery. I am very proud to support the TARGET Act.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) especially for the trips that she has made overseas—not just here in the United States—to do this investigative work to expose trafficking and for being the original lead Democratic coauthor with me on this bill. I also want to again thank GERRY CONNOLLY for his work.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade. He has done a great deal of work over the years on this issue as well.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent piece of legislation.

Like Ms. FRANKEL mentioned during her comments on the floor, we had the opportunity to go to Peru together to visit children who were way up in the mountains being protected from those deviants who wanted to traffic them not only in Peru, but other parts of South America.

I had, also, the opportunity to go to Costa Rica and meet some young girls who were being trafficked in Costa Rica and into other foreign countries. I remember one girl named Lilli. She was 7 years of age when I met her. She did not talk at all, even though she had the physical ability to talk, but she did not talk because of the trauma that she had been through before she had been rescued and put in that shelter in Costa Rica.

There are a lot of little girls like Lilli throughout the world, including in the United States. Societies must make the decision now that we will not tolerate the stolen innocence of young children by those who sell them on the marketplace of slavery for money, whether that is the trafficker, the slave master, or the buyer, the consumer. We, as a world, cannot tolerate that.

The United States has taken the lead on international trafficking and, I believe, on trafficking here in the U.S. This legislation, the TARGET Act, makes it clear that we are not going to tolerate this conduct and that those people who act this way in the slave trade are going to be held accountable for their conduct, and the consequences for what they do are not going to be pleasant. Plus, we are going to rescue those young children.

I support this legislation, Mr. Speaker.

And that is just the way it is.

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

Let every Member of Congress who is a parent, let every American who is a parent ask himself or herself: How would you feel if your loved one, your child were made prey by human traffickers? Imagine the heartache. Imagine the terrible grief, the trauma and tragedy of such a situation—and now remember 20 million fellow human beings go through that experience every year.

This is a crime that is repugnant to all human value. This is a crime we can

stop. This is a subject matter that can bring us together, irrespective of whether we are Democrats or Republicans, for the sake of our fellow human beings, for the sake of that human autonomy that is celebrated in the Declaration of Independence and enshrined in the Constitution of the United States and the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Let us take this step today. Let us rededicate ourselves to the idea that all human autonomy is sacred and that that is what we, too, are dedicated to support and uphold. I urge passage of the legislation.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me say that, for republics in Europe and our United States, we credit our civilizations with having eradicated slavery some 150 years or more ago, but clearly Judge POE uses the right word here: Slavery is, in fact, what is committed in these acts.

I can tell you, my chief of staff, having worked in relief efforts in south Asia and in Cambodia with underaged girls as young as the ones described by Judge POE—7, 8, 9 years old—the most vulnerable people on this planet are being sold into slavery. As long as force and fraud, coercion is used to prey upon the most vulnerable, as long as profits from these victims suffering from the ill-gotten gains are used to build out criminal networks to snare more and more of these children, as long as trafficking in persons is a global crime that extends beyond the capacity of certain governments, then it requires a global response and, again, as my colleagues have said, requires that the United States, therefore, lead.

□ 1830

So this bill targets human traffickers around the world through the Department of State's successful reward programs by offering rewards for their capture anywhere on Earth, it lets the victims of human trafficking know we will not stop until they are free, and it tells the predators that we will not stop until they are behind bars.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1625.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 953, REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS ACT OF 2017

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-145) on the resolution (H. Res. 348) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 953) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1862, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1842, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

GLOBAL CHILD PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1862) to amend title 18, United States Code, to expand the scope of certain definitions pertaining to unlawful sexual conduct, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 372, nays 30, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 269]
YEAS—372

| | | | | | |
|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Abraham | Blumenauer | Carter (GA) | Crawford | Keating | Posey |
| Adams | Blunt Rochester | Cartwright | Crist | Kelly (IL) | Price (NC) |
| Aderholt | Bonamici | Castor (FL) | Crowley | Kelly (MS) | Quigley |
| Aguilar | Bost | Castro (TX) | Cuellar | Kelly (PA) | Raskin |
| Allen | Boyle, Brendan | Chabot | Culberson | Kennedy | Ratcliffe |
| Amodei | F. | Cheney | Curbelo (FL) | Kihuen | Reed |
| Arrington | Brady (PA) | Clark (MA) | Davidson | Kildee | Reichert |
| Babin | Brady (TX) | Clay | Davis (CA) | Kilmer | Renacci |
| Bacon | Brat | Cleaver | Davis, Danny | King (IA) | Rice (NY) |
| Banks (IN) | Bridenstine | Coffman | Davis, Rodney | King (NY) | Rice (SC) |
| Barletta | Brooks (IN) | Cohen | DeFazio | Kinzinger | Roby |
| Barr | Brown (MD) | Cole | DeGette | Knight | Roe (TN) |
| Barragán | Brownley (CA) | Collins (GA) | Delaney | Krishnamoorthi | Rogers (AL) |
| Barton | Buck | Comer | DeLauro | Kuster (NH) | Rogers (KY) |
| Beatty | Bucshon | Comstock | DelBene | Kustoff (TN) | Rokita |
| Bera | Budd | Conaway | Demings | LaHood | Rooney, Francis |
| Bergman | Burgess | Connolly | Denham | LaMalfa | Rooney, Thomas |
| Biggs | Bustos | Cook | Dent | Lamborn | J. |
| Billrakis | Butterfield | Cooper | DeSantis | Lance | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Bishop (GA) | Byrne | Correa | DesJarlais | Langevin | Rosen |
| Bishop (MI) | Calvert | Costa | Diaz-Balart | Larsen (WA) | Roskam |
| Bishop (UT) | Carbajal | Costello (PA) | Dingell | Larson (CT) | Ross |
| Blackburn | Cárdenas | Courtney | Doggett | Latta | Rothfus |
| Blum | Carson (IN) | Cramer | Donovan | Lawrence | Rouzer |
| | | | Doyle, Michael | Lawson (FL) | Roybal-Allard |
| | | | F. | Levin | Royce (CA) |
| | | | Duffy | Lewis (MN) | Ruiz |
| | | | Duncan (SC) | Lieu, Ted | Ruppersberger |
| | | | Duncan (TN) | Lipinski | Rush |
| | | | Dunn | LoBiondo | Russell |
| | | | Emmer | Loeb sack | Rutherford |
| | | | Engel | Lofgren | Ryan (OH) |
| | | | Eshoo | Long | Sánchez |
| | | | Espallat | Loudermilk | Sanford |
| | | | Estes (KS) | Love | Sarbanes |
| | | | Farenthold | Lowenthal | Scallise |
| | | | Faso | Lowe | Schiff |
| | | | Ferguson | Lucas | Schneider |
| | | | Fitzpatrick | Luetkemeyer | Schrader |
| | | | Fleischmann | Lujan Grisham, | Schweikert |
| | | | Flores | M. | Scott, Austin |
| | | | Fortenberry | Lujan, Ben Ray | Scott, David |
| | | | Foster | MacArthur | Sensenbrenner |
| | | | Fox | Maloney, | Serrano |
| | | | Frankel (FL) | Carolyn B. | Sessions |
| | | | Franks (AZ) | Maloney, Sean | Sewell (AL) |
| | | | Frelinghuysen | Marchant | Shea-Porter |
| | | | Gabbard | Marino | Sherman |
| | | | Gaetz | Marshall | Shimkus |
| | | | Gallagher | Mast | Shuster |
| | | | Gallego | Matsui | Simpson |
| | | | Garamendi | McCarthy | Sinema |
| | | | Garrett | McCaul | Sires |
| | | | Gibbs | McClintock | Slaughter |
| | | | Gohmert | McCollum | Smith (MO) |
| | | | Gonzalez (TX) | McHenry | Smith (NE) |
| | | | Goodlatte | McKinley | Smith (NJ) |
| | | | Gosar | McMorris | Smucker |
| | | | Gottheimer | Rodgers | Soto |
| | | | Gowdy | McNerney | Speier |
| | | | Graves (GA) | McSally | Stefanik |
| | | | Graves (LA) | Meadows | Stewart |
| | | | Green, Al | Meehan | Stivers |
| | | | Green, Gene | Meeks | Suozi |
| | | | Griffith | Meng | Taylor |
| | | | Grijalva | Messer | Tenney |
| | | | Grothman | Mitchell | Thompson (CA) |
| | | | Guthrie | Moolenaar | Thompson (MS) |
| | | | Hanabusa | Mooney (WV) | Thompson (PA) |
| | | | Harper | Moore | Thornberry |
| | | | Harris | Moulton | Tipton |
| | | | Hartzler | Mullin | Titus |
| | | | Heck | Murphy (FL) | Tonko |
| | | | Hensarling | Murphy (PA) | Torres |
| | | | Herrera Beutler | Napolitano | Trott |
| | | | Hice, Jody B. | Neal | Tsongas |
| | | | Higgins (LA) | Noem | Turner |
| | | | Higgins (NY) | Nolan | Upton |
| | | | Hill | Norcross | Vargas |
| | | | Himes | Nunes | Veasey |
| | | | Holding | O'Halleran | Vela |
| | | | Hollingsworth | O'Rourke | Velázquez |
| | | | Hoyer | Olson | Visclosky |
| | | | Hudson | Palazzo | Wagner |
| | | | Hultgren | Pallone | Walberg |
| | | | Hunter | Palmer | Walden |
| | | | Hurd | Panetta | Walker |
| | | | Issa | Paulsen | Walorski |
| | | | Jeffries | Pearce | Walters, Mimi |
| | | | Jenkins (KS) | Pelosi | Walz |
| | | | Jenkins (WV) | Perlmutter | Wasserman |
| | | | Johnson (LA) | Perry | Schultz |
| | | | Johnson (OH) | Peters | Weber (TX) |
| | | | Johnson, E. B. | Peterson | Webster (FL) |
| | | | Jones | Pingree | Welch |
| | | | Jordan | Pittenger | Wenstrup |
| | | | Joyce (OH) | Pocan | Westerman |
| | | | Kaptur | Poe (TX) | Williams |
| | | | Katko | Poliquin | Wilson (FL) |

| | | |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| Wilson (SC) | Yarmuth | Young (IA) |
| Wittman | Yoder | Zeldin |
| Womack | Yoho | |
| Woodall | Young (AK) | |

NAYS—30

| | | |
|-------------|--------------|----------------|
| Amash | Evans | McEachin |
| Bass | Fudge | McGovern |
| Beyer | Hastings | Nadler |
| Capuano | Huffman | Richmond |
| Chu, Judy | Jackson Lee | Schakowsky |
| Clarke (NY) | Jayapal | Scott (VA) |
| Clyburn | Johnson (GA) | Smith (WA) |
| Conyers | Khanna | Takano |
| DeSaulnier | Lee | Waters, Maxine |
| Ellison | Massie | Watson Coleman |

NOT VOTING—28

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Black | Granger | Pascarell |
| Brooks (AL) | Graves (MO) | Payne |
| Buchanan | Gutiérrez | Polis |
| Carter (TX) | Huizenga | Rohrabacher |
| Chaffetz | Johnson, Sam | Smith (TX) |
| Cicilline | Kind | Swalwell (CA) |
| Collins (NY) | Labrador | Tiberi |
| Cummings | Lewis (GA) | Valadao |
| Deutch | Lynch | |
| Esty (CT) | Newhouse | |

□ 1857

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Mr. HASTINGS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. CARSON of Indiana, JEFFRIES, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ALLEN, and Ms. ADAMS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRENGTHENING CHILDREN'S SAFETY ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CHENEY). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1842) to amend title 18, United States Code, to include State crimes of violence as grounds for an enhanced penalty when sex offenders fail to register or report certain information as required by Federal law, to include prior military offenses for purposes of recidivist sentencing provisions, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 371, nays 30, answered “present” 1, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 270]

YEAS—371

| | | |
|-----------|------------|-------------|
| Abraham | Bacon | Bergman |
| Adams | Banks (IN) | Beyer |
| Aderholt | Barletta | Biggs |
| Aguilar | Barr | Bilirakis |
| Allen | Barragán | Bishop (GA) |
| Amodi | Barton | Bishop (UT) |
| Arrington | Beatty | Blackburn |
| Babin | Bera | Blum |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| Blumenauer | Garrett | McCarthy | Sires | Titus | Wasserman |
| Blunt Rochester | Gibbs | McCaul | Slaughter | Tonko | Schultz |
| Bonamici | Gohmert | McClintock | Smith (MO) | Torres | Weber (TX) |
| Bost | Gonzalez (TX) | McCollum | Smith (NE) | Trott | Webster (FL) |
| Boyle, Brendan F. | Goodlatte | McHenry | Smith (NJ) | Tsongas | Welch |
| Brady (PA) | Gosar | McKinley | Smucker | Turner | Wenstrup |
| Brady (TX) | Gottheimer | McMorris | Soto | Upton | Westerman |
| Brat | Gowdy | Rodgers | Speier | Vargas | Williams |
| Bridenstine | Graves (GA) | McNerney | Stefanik | Veasey | Wilson (FL) |
| Brooks (IN) | Graves (LA) | McSally | Stewart | Vela | Wilson (SC) |
| Brown (MD) | Green, Al | Meadows | Stivers | Velázquez | Wittman |
| Brownley (CA) | Green, Gene | Meehan | Suozzi | Visclosky | Womack |
| Buck | Griffith | Meeks | Taylor | Wagner | Woodall |
| Bucshon | Grijalva | Meng | Tenney | Walberg | Yarmuth |
| Budd | Grothman | Messer | Thompson (CA) | Walden | Yoder |
| Burgess | Guthrie | Mitchell | Thompson (MS) | Walker | Yoho |
| Bustos | Hanabusa | Moolenaar | Thompson (PA) | Walorski | Young (AK) |
| Butterfield | Harper | Mooney (WV) | Thornberry | Walters, Mimi | Young (IA) |
| Byrne | Harris | Moulton | Tipton | Walz | Zeldin |
| Calvert | Hartzler | Mullin | | | |
| Carbajal | Hastings | Murphy (FL) | | | |
| Cárdenas | Heck | Murphy (PA) | | | |
| Carson (IN) | Hensarling | Napolitano | | | |
| Carter (GA) | Herrera Beutler | Neal | | | |
| Cartwright | Hice, Jody B. | Noem | | | |
| Castor (FL) | Higgins (LA) | Nolan | | | |
| Castro (TX) | Higgins (NY) | Norcross | | | |
| Chabot | Hill | Nunes | | | |
| Cheney | Himes | O'Halleran | | | |
| Clark (MA) | Holding | O'Rourke | | | |
| Cleaver | Hollingsworth | Olson | | | |
| Coffman | Hoyer | Palazzo | | | |
| Cohen | Hudson | Pallone | | | |
| Cole | Hultgren | Palmer | | | |
| Collins (GA) | Hunter | Panetta | | | |
| Comer | Hurd | Paulsen | | | |
| Comstock | Issa | Pearce | | | |
| Conaway | Jeffries | Pelosi | | | |
| Connolly | Jenkins (KS) | Perlmutter | | | |
| Cook | Jenkins (WV) | Perry | | | |
| Cooper | Johnson (LA) | Peters | | | |
| Correa | Johnson (OH) | Peterson | | | |
| Costa | Jones | Pingree | | | |
| Costello (PA) | Jordan | Pittenger | | | |
| Courtney | Joyce (OH) | Pocan | | | |
| Cramer | Kaptur | Poe (TX) | | | |
| Crawford | Katko | Poliquin | | | |
| Crist | Keating | Posey | | | |
| Crowley | Kelly (IL) | Price (NC) | | | |
| Cuellar | Kelly (MS) | Quigley | | | |
| Culberson | Kelly (PA) | Raskin | | | |
| Curbelo (FL) | Kennedy | Ratcliffe | | | |
| Davidson | Kihuen | Reed | | | |
| Davis (CA) | Kildee | Reichert | | | |
| Davis, Danny | Kilmer | Renacci | | | |
| Davis, Rodney | King (IA) | Rice (NY) | | | |
| DeFazio | King (NY) | Rice (SC) | | | |
| DeGette | Kinzinger | Roby | | | |
| Delaney | Knight | Roe (TN) | | | |
| DeLauro | Krishnamoorthi | Rogers (AL) | | | |
| DelBene | Kuster (NH) | Rogers (KY) | | | |
| Demings | Kustoff (TN) | Rokita | | | |
| Denham | LaHood | Rooney, Francis | | | |
| Dent | LaMalfa | Rooney, Thomas J. | | | |
| DeSantis | Lamborn | Ros-Lehtinen | | | |
| DesJarlais | Lance | Rosen | | | |
| Diaz-Balart | Langevin | Roskam | | | |
| Dingell | Larsen (WA) | Ross | | | |
| Doggett | Larson (CT) | Rothfus | | | |
| Donovan | Latta | Rouzer | | | |
| Doyle, Michael F. | Lawrence | Roybal-Allard | | | |
| Duffy | Lawson (FL) | Royce (CA) | | | |
| Duncan (SC) | Levin | Ruiz | | | |
| Duncan (TN) | Lewis (MN) | Ruppersberger | | | |
| Dunn | Lieu, Ted | Rush | | | |
| Emmer | Lipinski | Russell | | | |
| Engel | LoBiondo | Rutherford | | | |
| Eshoo | Loeb sack | Ryan (OH) | | | |
| Estes (KS) | Lofgren | Sánchez | | | |
| Farenthold | Long | Sanford | | | |
| Faso | Loudermilk | Sarbanes | | | |
| Ferguson | Love | Scalise | | | |
| Fitzpatrick | Lowenthal | Schiff | | | |
| Fleischmann | Lucas | Schneider | | | |
| Flores | Luetkemeyer | Schrader | | | |
| Fortenberry | Lujan Grisham, M. | Schweikert | | | |
| Foster | Luján, Ben Ray | Scott, Austin | | | |
| Fox | Lynch | Scott, David | | | |
| Frankel (FL) | MacArthur | Sensenbrenner | | | |
| Franks (AZ) | Maloney | Serrano | | | |
| Frelinghuysen | Carolyn B. | Sessions | | | |
| Gabbard | Maloney, Sean | Sewell (AL) | | | |
| Gaetz | Marchant | Shea-Porter | | | |
| Gallagher | Marino | Sherman | | | |
| Gallego | Marshall | Shimkus | | | |
| Garamendi | Mast | Shuster | | | |
| | Matsui | Simpson | | | |
| | | Sinema | | | |

| | | |
|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| Amash | Evans | McGovern |
| Bass | Fudge | Moore |
| Capuano | Huffman | Nadler |
| Chu, Judy | Jayapal | Richmond |
| Clarke (NY) | Johnson (GA) | Schakowsky |
| Clyburn | Johnson, E. B. | Scott (VA) |
| Conyers | Khanna | Smith (WA) |
| DeSaulnier | Lee | Takano |
| Ellison | Massie | Waters, Maxine |
| Espallat | McEachin | Watson Coleman |

NAYS—30

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Jackson Lee

NOT VOTING—28

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Bishop (MI) | Esty (CT) | Pascarell |
| Black | Granger | Payne |
| Brooks (AL) | Graves (MO) | Polis |
| Buchanan | Gutiérrez | Rohrabacher |
| Carter (TX) | Huizenga | Smith (TX) |
| Chaffetz | Johnson, Sam | Swalwell (CA) |
| Cicilline | Kind | Tiberi |
| Collins (NY) | Labrador | Valadao |
| Cummings | Lewis (GA) | |
| Deutch | Newhouse | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1904

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 269 and “yea” on rollcall No. 270.

REAPPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO LIBRARY OF CONGRESS TRUST FUND BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to section 1 of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board Act (2 U.S.C. 154), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board for a 5-year term:

Ambassador Richard Fredericks, San Francisco, California

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 2(a) of

the National Cultural Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76h(a)), amended by Public Law 107-117, and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts:

Mr. MACARTHUR, New Jersey

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 4003(e) of the 21st Century Cures Act (Pub. L. 114-255), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Health Information Technology Advisory Committee:

Mr. Patrick Soon-Shiong, Culver City, California

HONORING BRIAN C. COOPER

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate Brian Cooper, who is retiring from the Office of the Parliamentarian after 35 years on Capitol Hill. Brian's first job came in 1982, when he was hired in the stock room of the Longworth Building working in Publication and Distribution Services.

Since then, Brian held a variety of positions in Congress, where he learned the intricacies of the legislative process, and the inner workings of House operations—skills that earned him a job at the House Parliamentarian Office, where he currently serves as Chief Clerk. A consummate professional, Brian has spent his career committed to assisting with an orderly and accurate legislative process, observed in a fair and nonpartisan manner.

Madam Speaker, I ask my congressional colleagues to join me in congratulating Brian Cooper on his long-deserved retirement and wish him all the best as he pursues his passions, including his artistic endeavors, traveling, spending more time with his family, and cheering on his favorite Baltimore sports teams.

Bon voyage and Godspeed to Brian Cooper.

FUND CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Madam Speaker, in our increasingly competitive world, the importance of education beyond our K-12 system has only grown. As we address this reality, it is vital that we recognize the importance of career and technical education, in addition to colleges and universities.

That is why I am proud to be the lead Democrat on the bipartisan Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act. This bill, which passed the Education and the Workforce Committee last week unanimously, will increase funding for career and technical education by 9 percent over the next 6 years to modernize these initiatives and to ensure students have the skills employers are looking for.

Through investing in our citizens and our economy, this bill will help hard-working families across the country join and stay in the middle class. I am proud to work with my colleagues from both parties, including Congressman THOMPSON from Pennsylvania, to build a more promising future for millions of Americans, and I hope this bill will soon receive consideration on the House floor.

CONGRATULATIONS TO COREY BULMAN AS MINNESOTA TEACHER OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate Corey Bulman, an English and literature teacher at Mound Westonka High School, on being named Minnesota's Teacher of the Year. This is an extraordinary achievement and a tribute to his enthusiasm both inside and outside of the classroom.

Mr. Bulman began teaching at Mound Westonka 17 years ago, where he devoted his entire tenure as an educator to enriching students in the classroom through his creative, imaginative, and insightful curriculums. What sets him apart is the meaningful and empowering connections he develops with his students.

As one of his former students said: "Corey was an adult, who showed me he believed I was smart, and cared about my ideas. He was honest, funny, and made me believe in myself."

Madam Speaker, there is no doubt that Mr. Bulman has touched so many of his students' lives. He understands how forming these bonds can inspire students for future success.

Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate Corey and thank him for dedicating himself on educating, inspiring, and empowering our young students.

HONORING NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH AND KENNATH FORSYTH-SEARS

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, as co-chair of the Congressional Foster Youth Caucus, I rise in recognition of National Foster Care Month and in honor of the remarkable foster youth

alumnus that I am fortunate to host this week: Kennath Forsyth-Sears.

Kennath hails from the Ocean State, where he attends my alma mater, Rhode Island College, and aspires to work with children with disabilities.

Kennath is a reminder of why we must ensure every child has the opportunity to reach their full potential. Madam Speaker, all children need the support and love of a family, yet finding "forever families" for foster youth is one of our biggest challenges.

Madam Speaker, it is our moral duty to care for these children as we would our own, including by supporting permanency for foster youth.

I thank my co-chair of the Congressional Foster Youth Caucus and the leader of our Caucus, Congresswoman KAREN BASS of California, for bringing young people like Kennath to Capitol Hill for Foster Youth Shadow Day, and I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring National Foster Care Month.

□ 1915

ERDOGAN: THE VIOLATOR OF DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, it looks like Turkish President Erdogan has brought his brutal crackdown on human rights to Washington, D.C.

For years, Erdogan has attacked Turkey's democratic institutions, undermined the rule of law, and violated Turkish civil liberties. On Tuesday, several bullies violently assaulted protesters outside the Turkish Embassy here in Washington. These Gestapo-type body guards beat peaceful demonstrators, in one case kicking a woman lying on the ground. This type of behavior is unacceptable.

Erdogan is becoming a Turkish dictator. One of the traits of a dictator is to violently quash opposition. He is showing he doesn't believe in the democratic principles of free speech and peaceful assembly. But, Madam Speaker, we will have no foreign tyrant violating these sacred rights on American soil without consequences.

And that is just the way it is.

5000 ROLE MODELS OF EXCELLENCE PROJECT

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, tomorrow 50 Miami-Dade County ninth grade boys from various chapters of the 5000 Role Models of Excellence Project will visit Washington, D.C. They are all college-bound and have earned the promise of a 4-year scholarship from the program.

5000 Role Models is an in-school dropout prevention program that will turn 25 years old in January 2018. There are

6,000 participants in Miami-Dade County, 3,000 in St. Petersburg, and 2,000 in Jacksonville school districts.

The program's goal is to mentor minority boys beginning in elementary school, middle school, and high school, all the while guiding them along a carefully charted path to manhood and sending them to college.

Madam Speaker, in this season of youth violence, during which boys get entangled in the school-to-prison pipeline, we are proud of the project and the tens of thousands of boys it has helped to become successful, contributing men in society. For example, Barry Jenkins, director of the Oscar-winning film "Moonlight," is a 1998 graduate of the program.

I look forward to welcoming these young men here tomorrow and hope you will get a chance to meet them, also. If you do, give them a hug and tell them that you love them.

ALS AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, May is ALS Awareness Month. It is a time many lend their voices to the fight against ALS and help raise awareness about this devastating disease.

ALS is often referred to as Lou Gehrig's disease, after the baseball great was diagnosed with the progressive neurodegenerative disease that affects the nerve cells in the brain and spinal cord.

Recently, I had the honor of meeting with people from Pennsylvania to talk about ALS, including Michael Bond, who has ALS, and his wife and caretaker, Karen Bond, both of Edinboro, Pennsylvania; and Jayne Cawthorne of Centre County, Pennsylvania, who is a long-time advocate for the ALS Association. Jayne and her daughter have been visiting with me since I was first elected to Congress, and their advocacy continues to build hope while their association aggressively searches for new treatments and cures.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1361, which would ensure access to complex rehabilitation technology such as power wheelchairs and their components and accessories. When you have lost the ability to walk, move your hands, or hold your head up, these technologies are critical.

NATIONAL MARITIME DAY

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Maritime Day.

Since America's founding, our men and women who serve as mariners have dedicated themselves to protecting our

economy and our interests at home and abroad. Whether it be through ensuring the delivery of goods, supporting us during times of peace, or standing up during times of war, the maritime industry has held strong.

The Port of Los Angeles, which I am proud to represent, has made countless contributions not only to California but to every other congressional district.

As a member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I work to ensure the safety and security of the Port of Los Angeles so that it can continue to serve as America's port. Along with the Port of Long Beach, the ports employ twice as many men and women as the Hollywood entertainment industry.

Today, I am proud to honor those men and women who serve and have served as U.S. merchant mariners. I ask that we continue to support the maritime industry today, and every day.

SUPPORT OUR VETERANS

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

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2288, the Veterans Appeals Improvement and Modernization Act of 2017, a bill that addresses the Department of Veterans Affairs' broken appeals process.

As of April 1, 2017, the number of pending appeals for disability compensation with the VA has reached 470,000. That is more than a 20 percent increase since fiscal year 2015. At current funding levels and using its current operational structure, the Department of Veterans Affairs estimates that it will take at least 5 years to address the backlog of appeals claims.

That is unsatisfactory. We can do better. We must do better. Our veterans deserve better. They have risked their lives to protect the freedoms we hold so dear, and it is up to us to make sure they receive the benefits they have earned and deserve.

H.R. 2288 modernizes the appeals process to efficiently and effectively resolve backlogged claims and prevent this kind of backlog from happening in the future. This bipartisan piece of legislation takes a giant leap toward a more efficient Department of Veterans Affairs, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

SABOTAGE X 2

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

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, sabotage.

A plot is afoot in Washington. It is time to sound the alarms. It is time to let the people know. It is time to ride like Paul Revere across our Nation and awaken Americans to this sinister scheme.

President Trump is sabotaging the Affordable Care Act. Trump has threat-

ened to cut subsidies to millions of Americans, creating more uncertainty today by stalling in court. He has refused to fund the high-risk corridors, causing insurance companies to flee States like Iowa and Kentucky. He has cut the public notices to keep those in need of healthcare in the dark. He has cut the signup period in half to prevent more Americans from signing up.

Is sabotage destroying the healthcare market worth it? Is robbing millions of Americans of healthcare coverage worth it? Is that the price Trump is willing to pay for repeal? To give tax cuts to billionaires?

Mr. Trump, ObamaCare works. If you break it, you own it. When you sabotage healthcare for millions of Americans, you are responsible. And the people ought to know.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

MILITARY APPRECIATION MONTH

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, if history has taught us anything over the years, it is that freedom is not free. It comes at a great price.

It is easy to take for granted the freedoms we enjoy, but this Military Appreciation Month I pray that we all reflect upon the sacrifices the men and women of our Armed Forces have made for our liberty and our security.

Specifically, I am reminded today of the 5,100 dedicated men and women serving at Dyess Air Force Base, home of the 7th Bomb Wing and the 317th Airlift Group, and the 40,000 veterans in my district in west Texas.

It is with them in mind, Madam Speaker, that I would like to express my gratitude for those who have served, my sorrow for those who did not make it back home, and my condolences to those who have lost someone dear in service to our great country. Let us never forget them. Let us always remind our children and grandchildren of the sacrifices of those who gave up their today so that we can have our tomorrow.

God bless our men and women in uniform. And God bless these United States of America.

WORLD AT A CROSSROADS

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, as I stand here, our world stands at a crossroads. As I stand here, 20 million stand at risk of starvation at the hands of what has the potential to become the worst humanitarian crisis since World War II: famine in South Sudan and impending famine in northeast Nigeria, Somalia, and Yemen. Additional

funding is needed to avert the destabilization of entire regions and to support refugees fleeing into neighboring countries.

Earlier this year, a bipartisan group of Members proposed that the U.S. allocate \$1 billion in emergency funding for famine response. Thanks to those efforts, Congress pledged to provide \$990 million in emergency funding in fiscal year appropriations.

Foreign aid is an investment. It makes our country, and those overseas fighting for us, dramatically safer. With leadership comes responsibility. Providing aid is a moral imperative.

WHAT DO WE HAVE TO LOSE: NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today to anchor this CBC Special Order. For the next 60 minutes, we have a chance to speak directly to the American people on issues of great importance to the Congressional Black Caucus, Congress, the constituents we represent, and all Americans.

Tonight, we will highlight the President's action to undermine our national security, including, but not limited to, abruptly firing FBI Director Comey in order to ease pressure on the Russian investigation just 1 day before sharing classified information with a Russian official.

Madam Speaker, many in this country believe Congress continues to have trouble accomplishing the basic requirements of its job. Up until a few weeks ago, we were still scrambling yet again to complete spending legislation to prevent a government shutdown.

If the only measure of national security success during the President's first 100 days were avoiding catastrophe, okay, President Trump has succeeded: no attacks on the U.S., no new wars, no nuclear Armageddon.

These are good things, and in the moment we can breathe a sigh of relief. However, these outcomes, arguably, owe more to the national security machine built by the President's predecessors than any decision of the 45th President.

President Trump's first major budget proposal will be released tomorrow. It is reported to include massive cuts to Medicaid and will call for drastically

and unprecedented changes to anti-poverty programs.

As for Medicaid, the State Federal programs that provide healthcare to low-income Americans, Trump's draconian budget plan would follow through on a bill passed by House Republicans to cut more than \$800 billion over 10 years.

The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that this would cut off Medicaid benefits for 10 million people over the next decade. That is unacceptable.

The dysfunctional relationship between Congress and the Trump administration has helped to bog down and complicate the fiscal 2017 budget process and has stymied the work of this Congress when it comes to passing legislation that will help our constituents.

A recent survey found that 48 percent of Americans now prefer increased government spending in areas like healthcare, veterans care, education, and infrastructure—things that the people of my district, the Virgin Islands, desperately need, with a 15 percent unemployment rate and 33 percent of our children living in poverty.

□ 1930

It is time for Congress to get back to work for the people that have put us here.

I want to highlight three pieces of legislation that I have introduced that will help my constituents in the Virgin Islands in various ways.

With a special counsel now having been appointed to look into the distractions the White House has created, it is time that Congress focus on our job and proceed to hold hearings on these bills followed by a vote on the House floor, and, hopefully, these commonsense bills will be signed into law by the President.

Healthcare: President Trump and the Republican Congress are planning to cut more than \$800 billion out of Medicaid funding over 10 years while converting the program to a cap block grant to the States and territories and eliminating ACA's Medicaid expansion. These provisions are in the American Health Care Act, the House GOP's ObamaCare repeal bill.

As a Member representing the Virgin Islands, I believe we need to get back to doing the work of the people, and that is working to pass laws that better the lives of our constituents.

I introduced improving the treatment of the U.S. territories under the Federal healthcare program, which would eliminate existing inequities the territories face under Medicaid and Medicare. There are numerous bills that my other colleagues have introduced to assist their constituents and all Americans in areas of healthcare. We need to bring those bills to the floor and vote them up or vote them down.

Veterans: There are few places in the United States with higher per capita rates of military service than the

United States Virgin Islands. As a Member, I am committed to ensuring Virgin Islands veterans have full and equal access to health, housing, education, and employment benefits they have rightfully earned. Our constituents have deployed to Afghanistan and Iraq more than 30,000 times since September 11, and about 120,000 military veterans live in the territories, yet none are allowed to cast a ballot to choose their Commander in Chief.

We need to remember that nearly 4 million Americans call Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa home, a combined population greater than 22 States. We represent those Americans in the U.S. House who cannot vote for their interests on the House floor. Our constituents are denied representation in the U.S. Senate and are barred from the general election for President and Vice President. When the Presidential vote was tabulated in 2016, it was as if 4 million Americans we represent do not exist. There is a time, however, when our people are counted—when the country goes to war.

I have introduced H. Res. 91, which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding Presidential elections, voting rights for residents of all United States territories and commonwealths.

Education: We have to fix the education system. We have to give our young people better choices. We need to allow our children to be able to be educated in a place that is hospitable to learning. That does not occur right now in many places in the United States. The President's budget cut would remove support to schools for infrastructure, for afterschool programs, and for summer reading programs.

We cannot continue with this if we want to have national security. National security is the security of our young people to be educated and to grow safely. That is not happening in the Virgin Islands or anyplace in the United States at this time.

I recently introduced the United States Virgin Islands College Access Act of 2017, which will allow college students who are residents of the Virgin Islands to receive more reasonable tuition rates at participating 4-year institutions of higher education.

It is time for Congress to stop doing business as usual. With budget decisions impacting everything from national security to infrastructure investment, Congress needs to focus on doing its job and doing it with more than the next few months or current fiscal year in mind. Moving forward, we as Members of Congress need to make sure that we deal with our legislative and budgetary responsibilities with more thoughtfulness and foresight.

Congressman DWIGHT EVANS represents the wonderful city of Philadelphia and the people of Pennsylvania. He is a legislator of many years. Although he comes here as a freshman,

none of us consider him as a freshman having served in the legislature in Pennsylvania for more than 20 years. I would ask him to speak on the topic that the Congressional Black Caucus' Special Order hour has introduced: What Do We Have to Lose: National Security.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from the great Virgin Islands, and I really appreciate her leadership.

I would like to thank my colleagues for bringing forward such an important topic for tonight's Special Order hour. National security is an issue of utmost importance to all of us.

The bottom line is this: If the President thinks it is okay to share classified information with our adversaries, we have a big problem. I will be reemphasizing that point: If the President of the United States of America shared classified information with our enemies, then the lives of the American people are at risk.

Regardless of political party, if, in fact, President Trump did willingly share classified information with Russia, then this further proves that the President does not understand the consequences of his actions. It proves that he doesn't understand how much we stand to lose as a result of these actions.

The bigger question now that people are asking is: Do you think the President is in so much trouble?

It is clear from the news that the Russian investigation is the gift that keeps giving. But I want to be really, really clear with you. I did not vote for President Trump. I did not support him when he was running, and I fought hard to stop President Trump from becoming elected.

If you want to know, I think the President is in trouble. I will tell you this. President Trump and his administration are not ready for prime time. The campaign is over. The President needs to focus on governing, and we have not seen him do that yet. He needs to learn how to govern.

We know that the Comey firing has sent a potential signal of the President's collusion with Russia. For this reason, I called for the special prosecutor and the independent commission so that the American people truly can know the Trump-Russia connection.

I am glad to see former FBI Director Bob Mueller named as special counsel to oversee the investigation, but we still need to make sure that Congress is able to conduct an independent investigation into the Trump administration's ties to Russia and interference in the 2016 election. The American people deserve to know the facts. The American people deserve to know the facts.

I was in my district over the weekend in Lower Merion, and all anyone asked to talk about was Comey and Russia.

They want answers, and they want to get to the bottom line of this.

I want to, but what I want to do is to raise the dialogue on the issues that really matter here, the issues that we really have a lot to lose on. For example, last week, I hosted a briefing on middle neighborhoods. Middle neighborhoods are neighborhoods caught between bust and boom. They are communities doing just well enough that our cities aren't focusing our resources or attention on them.

Of course, we need to get to the bottom line of collusion between Russia and the President. I want to, and we will get to the bottom line of this as the American people deserve the facts. At the same time, I want to make sure we are fighting for dialogue on the ways we can make a difference and make an impact on our communities in need.

We need to find ways to tackle food insecurity, help our public schools, and expand access to capital and credit on every corner to build stronger neighborhoods block by block. This will not be easy. We need to work together. It is in our collective interest to ensure national security is not a partisan issue. It should be a bipartisan issue.

So I stand here in the well of this House, Madam Speaker, to indicate that I want to ensure that national security is important. I hope, Madam Speaker, that the President also understands that it is important.

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, I thank the Congressman so much for his comments.

I think it was very interesting that the gentleman was saying that the American people and people that he spoke with over the weekend want the truth. I think that is what we all here in Congress want. We want the facts. We want to hear specifically what has happened so that the people of the United States can make a decision about what happens next.

I am not here to ask for impeachment or ask for any rash decision, but I am asking that the American people be able to see a transparent Congress and a transparent process that allows them to then speak to us as Members of Congress as to what they would like.

Several months ago, almost 2 months now, several colleagues of mine and I wrote a letter to the Department of Justice, to the Acting Attorney General, requesting that he institute a special counsel, a special prosecutor, in this matter. We are grateful that that has happened. But a special counsel cannot replace an independent, outside commission and vigorous congressional investigation.

The appointment of a special counsel speaks to the urgency of investigating the Trump connection to Russia's interference in our election and the gravity of the President's abuse of power in trying to shut down the FBI Director; but the American people need to understand that, while a special counsel could bring charges against those indi-

viduals who were, in fact, if the facts prove to be so, in collusion with the Russians, it cannot do anything to the President except bring a report to this Congress for this Congress to act on.

This Congress needs to remember that we are a separate branch of government than the White House. This Congress seems to be acting as if it is part of the White House, an extension of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, when, in fact, this Congress stands alone.

We have a separate set of rules, a separate power, and a separate responsibility than the President of the United States. As such, Madam Speaker, it is important that we demonstrate to the American people that we are acting that way. A special counsel within the Trump-controlled Justice Department cannot replace a truly independent, outside commission, because it is the commission which would then be able to make a decision about our President.

I say it is our President because we all respect the Office of the President, and we want the world to know that we respect and hold in reverence the individual who holds that and hold him accountable for that position that he holds. An independent, outside commission, as special counsel, Director Muller's actions will still be subject to review and approval by the President Trump-appointed leadership of the Justice Department.

Congress must act to create an independent, outside commission that is completely free of the Trump administration's meddling. A special counsel cannot be used as a pretext for Republicans to shut down investigations by Congress or hide the facts of the President's wrongdoing from the American people.

Now, I have heard the Justice Department and others talk about this being a criminal investigation, that the special counsel is using it as a special criminal investigation. As a lawyer, as someone who has been a prosecutor, I understand that the burden of proof for criminal charges are much different than this Congress would hold for a President if it were to ask for impeachment.

So this Congress must not abdicate its responsibility because the work needs to be done. Jobs need to be created and infrastructure needs to be put in place so that commerce can be done in this country. Healthcare needs to be put in place for Americans. We cannot lose more Americans' healthcare. We need to gain more Americans having healthcare. We need to settle the issues of immigration.

Madam Speaker, never mind criminal justice reform. It seems that this Congress has completely forgotten that, in the last Congress, we agreed, both Republicans and Democrats, to reform criminal justice. We are seeing our young people die not from the Justice Department and not just from what is happening on the streets, and never mind what is happening in our criminal

justice system. I understand that a bill is going to be coming on the floor asking for minimum mandatory sentencing for a slew of charges which will again increase the school-to-prison, cradle-to-death pipeline of prisons in this country.

So these are the things that we as Congress need to be concerned with. The national security issues that our President has are things that we need to continue to look at.

There is an old Washington cliché: personnel is policy. The same reflects the wisdom that any President's agenda depends on his political appointees to refine and implement that vision. Trump's White House has failed first and most spectacularly in this requirement. That failure may not even be the President's failure at this time but the people he has put in place by both building a dysfunctional White House and National Security Council and by failing to staff his national security agencies with the appointees necessary to oversee and direct foreign policy.

For now, the failures of Trump's political favorites with his new establishment professionals likely mean incoherence on the national security front for some time, with the White House lurching from one crisis to the next, its actions and words disconnected from any broader doctrine.

Bad personnel decisions have also dogged the Trump administration during its first 100 days. Michael Flynn and K.T. McFarland hardly did well in leading the NSC during their brief sojourns there. Low-level hires have also continued poor performance.

□ 1945

The most obvious foreign policy failures are that there is no policy, no doctrine, no strategy that knits together Trump's desired ends with the government's ways and means. That should be of concern to my Republican colleagues who want this Republican President to succeed. If you want him to succeed, you need to help him. The help needs to come in terms of the personnel that he has put in place, in terms of the transparency, and as they said, cleaning the swamp, getting rid of the swamp, so that there can be those professionals and those above reproach in the White House carrying out the mission of this President.

At the agency level, the Trump's White House political appointments machine has been incredibly dysfunctional, reportedly because of fights between the White House factions over personnel picks.

This has starved the Pentagon, State Department, Justice Department, and other agencies of under secretaries, assistant secretaries, deputy assistant secretaries, special assistants who actually are carrying out the President's agenda.

In the absence of an entire team, the uniformed military leadership and career civil servants of these agencies have carried on, but with significant

friction given the personal disdain for these people during the campaign and afterwards.

The personnel failures have worsened the second category of the failures, those of process. If there was personnel, we also have process failures going on right now.

The NSC was codified in 1947, along with the modern Defense Department, CIA, and Joint Chiefs of Staff to correct perceived process failures during World War II. The big idea behind the National Security Act was to create a process that could withstand poor personnel by ensuring the institution of the presidency was well served by its national security agencies and could, therefore, make better informed decisions.

Despite its aspirations to run the White House like a fine-tuned machine, the administration has uniformly failed to implement processes to serve its agenda. Indeed, at times—an example being the 63-hour rush to strike Syria with cruise missiles or its announcement of a tax plan before the details were ironed out—the White House seems at war with the very idea of process, as if budgets, planning, and coordination were toxic features of the Washington swamp, to be rejected at all costs.

The biggest process failures have been those that affected the entire government. Trump's failure to develop detailed budgets, let alone to agree with Congress on the funding levels and priorities, nearly led the country to the brink of a government shutdown. All indications point to the impasse being settled, but the outcome will likely be a continuing resolution once again that punts all the major budget decisions and keeps agencies in limbo on major programs, including, if we are talking about national security, major weapons systems, acquisitions, spending on important training and exercises, and outlays for servicemembers and military families. This is something that is going to cause all Americans to suffer, spectacularly in some cases.

One of the President's biggest campaign promises, the pledge to build a wall on America's border with Mexico, has stalled for lack of funding, and proposals will likely remain stuck in the government contracts process for months, if not years.

His immigration orders have been held unconstitutional because of errors that his Justice Department or Department of Homeland Security lawyers would have caught and corrected had they been there or had a chance.

In some cases, the process failures have had deadlier consequences. President Trump ordered a risky special operations raid on Yemen over a dinner meeting with his senior staff with scant process or coordination. The raid went badly, as military operations sometimes do. Instead of taking responsibility, the White House blamed the military, both for the substantive

failure on the ground and the faulty decision process that put the SEALs there. Disconnects between the White House, Department of Defense, and the U.S. Pacific Command resulted in a confusing saga regarding the movements of a U.S. aircraft carrier, resulting in the dilution of any deterrent value that President Trump's words might hold in Moscow or Beijing.

The personnel and process failures contribute to policy failures across the national security chessboard. The most obvious Trump foreign policy failure is that there is no policy, no doctrine at this time. We deserve better in the Middle East, in Afghanistan, in China, in North Korea, but most importantly, here on the home front. We as Americans deserve a coherent, comprehensive process oriented as well as personnel driven with career intelligence individuals at the helm and within the ranks of each one of these agencies because we have a lot to lose.

We have our young people to lose if we go into wars that have not been thought out and have not been process driven. Our young people deserve better. Our world deserves better because the world is looking to America to still be the ones—although we seem to be abdicating our responsibility, whether it be in war or in the other forms of diplomacy that we engage in—to keep this a safe place. Famines that are going on in Sudan, in Yemen, and in other places, it is the American might, the might of our aid and our support to them, that keeps democracy alive, not just on the ground and in fact, but in the hearts and minds of those who yearn for it in other places.

That is the national security that this America needs to be engaged in, and it is that kind of national security that this Congress needs to be concerned with. We need to get back. We have a week of bills that are dysfunctional in themselves that do not serve the best interests of the American people. This Congress needs to stop scuttling legislation, scuttling bills that their colleagues are trying to put forward. Vote them up or vote them down. Let the American people know where you stand on every issue. We need to stop the voice votes that are going on in committees that allow Members to hide behind what their positions are with their constituents. I know it is not easy, but that is why we are all adults here. We want to put on our big girl pants and be the kind of people who can stand for what we believe.

So let's bring those bills forward. Let's support the infrastructure jobs activity, as well as national security and support for the world abroad. That is what we have to lose if we do not hold this President, this White House, and all of his agencies and his Cabinet accountable for the work that they are doing.

Madam Speaker, it appears that I do not have additional Members who would like to speak in this Special Order hour.

Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 35 minutes remaining.

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

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, protecting our national security should be among one of the top concerns of any administration—Republican or Democrat. Yet, President Trump has demonstrated an alarming disregard for the national security interests of the United States.

There have been a number of incidents that I believe warrant additional scrutiny by Congress and the American people. Just last week, it was reported that President Trump revealed highly classified information to the Russian foreign minister and ambassador during a White House meeting. In direct contravention of standing diplomatic agreements with our closest allies, President Trump also reportedly divulged the source of that highly classified information. Not only did this blatant disregard for protocol damage our credibility among the international community, but President Trump may have very well also exposed extremely sensitive information about U.S. and allied intelligence operations abroad.

Earlier this month, President Trump also took a bold step in firing former FBI Director James Comey in the midst of an investigation into his administration and alleged ties to Russian officials. Shortly after Director Comey was fired, an unnamed White House source revealed that President Trump told Russian officials during the same meeting that he did so in order to ease some of the pressure from the Russia investigation. This is deeply alarming, if not simply just ironic.

During the Presidential election, House Speaker PAUL RYAN criticized Hillary Clinton over her mishandling of classified emails on a private email server. He stated, "individuals who are 'extremely careless' with classified information should be denied further access to such info." Today, I have yet to hear Speaker RYAN—or other key House Republicans—speak out against this blatant mishandling of classified information. It is hypocrisy in its purest form.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford the unauthorized divulging of classified information and national security secrets, especially to hostile nations such as Russia. I find it deeply troubling that a sitting president would display such a blatant disregard for the safeguarding of U.S. national security interests. I continue to join my colleagues in calling for an independent commission to investigate any possible collusion between the Trump Campaign and the Kremlin.

ARMED FORCES DAY AND MEMORIAL DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, before I begin, I ask unanimous consent

that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BERGMAN. The topic of today's Special Order is to recognize the importance of Armed Forces Day and Memorial Day.

I am not going to give a history lesson here tonight, but, rather, a series of personal remembrances that started when I was about 5 or 6 years old in the early 1950s.

My father, a World War II veteran, and some of his fellow veterans organized the local VFW in Minnesota where I was born. We would spend Memorial Day in the morning visiting three cemeteries in our local town.

At each cemetery, the color guard would post the colors, the rifles would give their report, and taps would play. Everyone who attended—and when I say everyone who attended, that was really the whole town—came out in a long train of automobiles to go to these three cemeteries to honor the veterans who were no longer of this Earth.

I remember the solemnness of that day. I remember the tears for family members and friends who had passed on, those who had worn the cloth of our Nation both in peace and in war. Those kinds of memories, as I stand here and talk tonight, are very vivid in my mind.

Some years later, in the mid-1960s, we were involved in Vietnam, and I was a sophomore in college. Because of the fact that my parents had both stepped up during World War II, I felt—and with their support—it was the right thing to stand up and take the oath that sent me into the Marine Corps to serve our country.

When you go into harm's way, you don't know what the outcome is going to be, but you do know that those you serve with are going to give it their all and you are going to remember them and honor them for as long as we walk this Earth.

I was very fortunate to have absolutely spectacular commanding officers along the way that taught me what it was like to be a young leader and what it meant to take care of your Marines—most notably my commanding officer in Vietnam, who, thankfully, is still with us. He was the kind of individual that made the tough calls because he understood the sacrifices needed and the outcomes that were required.

One by one, we all pass. Memorial Day is our opportunity to remember, share stories, share tears, share laughter for those who have now gone on into God's hands. The past and the present set the tone for the future.

As David French said:

Sacrifice sustains our Nation far beyond the battlefield. As iron sharpens iron, so one

man sharpens another in times of stress. In times when we are under great duress, that ability to sharpen not each other's bodies but each other's souls carries us on.

We remember on Memorial Day those who have made that effort.

In the Marine Corps, we believe a lot of things, but three words encompass them all: honor, courage, and commitment.

Tonight we honor those who fought for our country, who made the ultimate sacrifice and gave their lives in the service of our country, and those who have passed on since their service. It is our job to make sure that their sacrifice wasn't in vain.

Courage: there is moral courage and there is physical courage. You never know until the time comes whether you have the physical courage, but you do find out. It is the moral courage that we know from the beginning, and it is set by our predecessors that sets our attitude and our mindset in stone that we know that we have that. And when it is tested, we are ready.

□ 2000

Commitment: Our commitment is always to the mission and to one another. We never leave anyone behind. Never. No one is more invested in peace than our men and women in uniform. They take the risks. They make the sacrifices, and they bear the cost of the battle in full force. Those rows of white headstones across the bridge in Arlington remind us of their commitment every day, and for that we owe them more than gratitude. We owe them every effort to keep our world at peace.

On Memorial Day in 1982, President Reagan said:

"War will not come again, other young men will not have to die, if we will speak honestly of the dangers that confront us and remain strong enough to meet those dangers.

"It's not just strength or courage that we need, but understanding and a measure of wisdom as well."

We owe it to our men and women who have fought and died for our country to take a stand, to prepare for peace not by ignoring the dangers we face and placating the enemies of freedom but by facing them head on.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to yield to my fellow Members who will be presenting and speaking tonight. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I, too, am honored to join my colleagues here tonight to recognize the bravery and the sacrifice of those who serve in our military. I also want to thank General Bergman for his years of dedicated service and for his leadership tonight.

While May is Military Appreciation Month, it is important that every month we continue to recognize those who are fighting and still putting their lives on the line each and every day. Since the founding of our country, there have always been brave men and

women who understood what it takes to protect our freedom and our way of life. They are patriots who represent the very best of America.

I am especially grateful to the members of my family who served. My father, James, served in the Army during World War II; and my two brothers, Rick in the Navy and Reg in the Marines, served during Vietnam. Like many of us, I recall seeing my older brothers go off to war in Vietnam, and I vividly remember the difference between the Blue Star and, tragically, Gold Star families during that conflict.

Throughout our Nation's history, we have paid a heavy price for freedom. It has not been easy. One week from today, we will remember those who made the ultimate sacrifice for our country. On Memorial Day, we remember those who gave their lives in the service of these United States. Our fallen soldiers were born in different generations, fought in different wars, faced unique challenges, but they are all part of the fabric and history of this great land, America.

Through their service and selflessness, our Nation's sons and daughters have kept our country strong and free. Thank you to the fallen. Thank you to the veterans and those currently serving here and abroad. God bless America.

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, it is our job not just to remember but to carry the torch of freedom forward so that the sacrifices of our brothers and sisters have not and will not be in vain.

Oliver Wendell Holmes said: "But grief is not the end of all. . . . Our dead brothers still live for us, and bid us think of life, not death—of life to which in their youth they lent the passion and joy of the spring."

I would strongly encourage all, all of our American citizens, next Monday, May 29, the official observance of this year's Memorial Day, to take your families to a local cemetery, walk around, look at those headstones and those gravestones, explain to your children and your grandchildren, and anyone else who may have questions, the meaning and the significance of the many flags that fly next to those headstones.

Those folks, those comrades, sacrificed it all so we can be here today. It is up to us to honor them, to remember them, and to carry on to ensure that the challenges we face as a country will be defended against and protected because of our willingness to sacrifice for the United States of America.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. NEWHOUSE (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and for the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 23, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1398. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing four officers to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); ; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1399. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's 2016 Merger Decisions Report, pursuant to Sec. 18(c)(9) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1400. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — 340B Drug Pricing Program Ceiling Price and Manufacturer Civil Monetary Penalties Regulation (RIN: 0906-AA89) received May 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1401. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; El Paso Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan [EPA-R06-OAR-2016-0550; FRL-9962-20-Region 6] received May 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1402. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Louisiana; Volatile Organic Compounds Rule Revision and Stage II Vapor Recovery [EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0167; FRL-9962-21-Region 6] received May 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1403. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Compliance Date Extension; Formaldehyde Emission Standards for Composite Wood Products [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2017-0244; FRL-9962-86] (RIN: 2070-AK35) received May 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1404. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality Designations for the 2012 Primary Annual Fine Particle

(PM2.5) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for Areas in Tennessee [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0918; FRL-9962-89-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT44) received May 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1405. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pesticides; Certification of Pesticide Applicators Rule; Delay of Effective Date [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0183; FRL-9962-94] received May 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1406. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a periodic report prepared by the Department's Bureau of Industry and Security on the national emergency declared by Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001 and continued, caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979 for August 26, 2016 to February 25, 2017, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627) and 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1407. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination and certification to waive for a period of six months the restrictions of section 1003 of Public Law 100-204; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1408. A letter from the Director, Office of Financial Management, United States Capitol Police, transmitting the Statement of Disbursements for the United States Capitol Police for the period of October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1910(a); Public Law 109-55, Sec. 1005; (119 Stat. 575) (H. Doc. No. 115—43); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

1409. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Advancing Care Coordination Through Episode Payment Models (EPMs); Cardiac Rehabilitation Incentive Payment Model; and Changes to the Comprehensive Care for Joint Replacement Model (CJR); Delay of Effective Date [CMS-5519-F3] (RIN: 0938-AS90) received May 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1973. A bill to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-136, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1761. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to criminalize the knowing consent of the visual depiction, or live transmission, of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 695. A bill to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1862. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to expand the scope of certain definitions pertaining to unlawful sexual conduct, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1842. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to include State crimes of violence as grounds for an enhanced penalty when sex offenders fail to register or report certain information as required by Federal law, to include prior military offenses for purposes of recidivist sentencing provisions, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 883. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a certification process for the issuance of nondisclosure requirements accompanying certain administrative subpoenas, to provide for judicial review of such nondisclosure requirements, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1188. A bill to reauthorize certain programs established by the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1370. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue Department of Homeland Security-wide guidance and develop training programs as part of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-143, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1545. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to disclose certain patient information to State controlled substance monitoring programs, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WOODALL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 348. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 953) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-145). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1370 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Education and the Workforce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1973 referred to the

Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. BARLETTA (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RENACCI, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 2581. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the provision of social security numbers as a condition of receiving the health insurance premium tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 2582. A bill to authorize the State of Utah to select certain lands that are available for disposal under the Pony Express Resource Management Plan to be used for the support and benefit of State institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CRIST, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 2583. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a Community Resilience Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HURD (for himself, Mr. KILMER, Mr. REICHERT, and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 2584. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, 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. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. TONKO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2585. A bill to reduce risks to the financial system by limiting banks' ability to engage in certain risky activities and limiting conflicts of interest, to reinstate certain Glass-Steagall Act protections that were repealed by the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 2586. A bill to require an independent assessment and report of subversive activities of the Russian Federation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 2587. A bill to provide for the coverage of medically necessary food and vitamins for

digestive and inherited metabolic disorders under Federal health programs and private health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2588. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to codify the prohibition on the acquisition of "about" communications under section 702 of such Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. KINZINGER (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. TIPPON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CLAY, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. HECK, Mr. STEWART, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. YODER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. HILL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FLORES, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 2589. A bill to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's disease; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIMALVA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. POLIS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 2590. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to carry out a program to increase access to prekindergarten through grade 12 computer science education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 2591. A bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to modernize the funding of wildlife conservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 2592. A bill to amend the definitions relating to HUBZones in the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. JONES, Mr. COOK, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. HIMES, Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee,

Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COLE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. BOST, Mr. COFFMAN, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. HILL, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CORREA, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. BANKS of Indiana):

H. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H. Res. 349. A resolution calling for the global repeal of blasphemy, heresy, and apostasy laws; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARPER:

H. Res. 350. A resolution permitting official photographs of the House of Representatives to be taken while the House is in actual session on a date designated by the Speaker; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

42. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Florida, relative to Senate Resolution No. 574, opposing United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 and requesting its repeal of fundamental alteration; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

43. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 15, requesting Congress to fully support the National Park Service's recommendations to extend the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail to include additional sites along the Expedition's Eastern Legacy; which was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

44. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 30, memorializing the Congress of the United States to create a reliable, predictable stream of resources to address deferred maintenance needs in the America's National Park System; which was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

45. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 26, urging Congress and NASA to name the NASA IV & V Facility at Fairmont for West Virginia mathematician Katherine Coleman Johnson; which was referred to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

46. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Florida, relative to Senate Resolution No. 1184, condemning the international Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement against the State of Israel and calls upon the governmental institutions of this state to denounce hatred and discrimination whenever they appear; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

47. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 44, recognizing Wednesday, April 26, 2017, as the fifth annual Liquefied Natural Gas Day at the state capitol and express support of the Louisiana Energy Export Association, LNG exports, and the streamlining and expedition of permit approval for pending export facilities; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Foreign Affairs.

tives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2581.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have 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; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 2582.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV Section 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2583.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HURD:

H.R. 2584.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, 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. CAPUANO:

H.R. 2585.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 2586.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 2587.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 2588.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 2589.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 2590.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The Congress shall have power. . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes; . . . 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. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 2591.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 2592.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 36: Mr. BUCK.

H.R. 48: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 52: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 106: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 113: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 179: Ms. MOORE and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 299: Mr. STEWART and Mr. REED.

H.R. 324: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 350: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 358: Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 398: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 457: Mr. PETERS and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 467: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 468: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 484: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 490: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 535: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 566: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 586: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 608: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 620: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 681: Mr. DUNN and Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 695: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 719: Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 721: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 747: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 750: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 754: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 757: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 807: Mr. TROTT, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BLUM, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MESSER, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 820: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. ROSS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SIREN, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 825: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 838: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 839: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 840: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 848: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 850: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 871: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 880: Mr. WALZ and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 883: Ms. TENNEY and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 909: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 919: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 953: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. PITTENGER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 972: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 975: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 982: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 993: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1005: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1017: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1078: Mr. STEWART and Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 1089: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representa-

H.R. 1090: Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 1148: Mr. SOTO and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1155: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 1156: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 1164: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1171: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CRIST, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VELA, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1179: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 1188: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 1200: Mr. FLORES, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. PITTINGER.
H.R. 1223: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 1231: Mr. BARTON and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1247: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. VELA, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. LEE, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1253: Mr. WALZ and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1267: Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 1299: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 1300: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1310: Mr. MAST.
H.R. 1318: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 1339: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 1361: Mr. BACON, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 1370: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. DONOVAN, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 1393: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1405: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 1409: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 1413: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 1421: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 1422: Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 1454: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 1456: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 1485: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1544: Mr. MAST and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1560: Mr. GALLEG0.
H.R. 1563: Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Ms. PIN-GREE.
H.R. 1584: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 1599: Mr. RICE of South Carolina and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1600: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 1615: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 1625: Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 1626: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1639: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 1645: Mr. MASSIE and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 1651: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 1663: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1676: Mr. REICHERT and Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 1681: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1692: Mr. GALLEG0.
H.R. 1697: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 1698: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. YOHO, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. WOMACK, and Ms. CHENEY.
H.R. 1761: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 1762: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1810: Mr. KIHUEN and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 1826: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 1836: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 1042: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 1844: Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 1862: Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 1924: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1926: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1928: Mr. MAST, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. WALZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1940: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1953: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 1955: Mr. GRIFFITH and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 1960: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
H.R. 1968: Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 1969: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1973: Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 1988: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2028: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2038: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2052: Mr. RUSH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. CON-AWAY.
H.R. 2063: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2106: Mr. MULLIN and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2108: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2124: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2141: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 2200: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2206: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2215: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 2244: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2248: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2268: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 2272: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2276: Mr. PITTINGER and Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 2317: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2318: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BACON, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2319: Mr. SIRES and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 2326: Mr. MAST and Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 2353: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania,
H.R. 2354: Mr. MAST.
H.R. 2358: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 2372: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. NUNES, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 2386: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 2392: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2428: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2431: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 2435: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2440: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 2452: Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2466: Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 2475: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2477: Mr. BROWN of Maryland and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2482: Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. COOK, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 2499: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2501: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 2506: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2508: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 2510: Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUM-MINGS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CAPU-ANO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. WILSON of Flor-ida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LAW-RENCE, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2519: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PEARCE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. EMMER, Mr. LATTI, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KATKO, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2539: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2547: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2564: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.J. Res. 48: Ms. KAPTUR.
H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. HECK.
H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. BACON.
H. Con. Res. 43: Mr. EVANS.
H. Con. Res. 47: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KEN-NEDY, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H. Con. Res. 54: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H. Res. 15: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. MARINO.
H. Res. 31: Mr. FASO, Mr. MARINO, Mr. COS-TELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 220: Mr. GARRETT and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H. Res. 256: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H. Res. 276: Mr. KIHUEN, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H. Res. 304: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H. Res. 325: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H. Res. 330: Mr. PALMER.
H. Res. 335: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H. Res. 344: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H. Res. 346: Ms. GABBARD.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIM- ITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIM- ITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Rep-resentative ESTY (CT) or a designee, to H.R. 953 the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017, does not contain any congressional ear-marks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

46. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the town of Buckland, MA, relative to Article 27, calling upon the Massachusetts Legis-lature and the United States Congress to im-plement Carbon Fee and Dividend, placing a steadily rising fee on carbon-based fuels, and returning all fees collected, minus adminis-trative costs, to households; which was re-ferred to the Committee on Energy and Com-merce.