

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 refinement, 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 yeas 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