

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

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

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

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

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

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

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

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

Appointments:  
Board of Visitors of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.  
Western Hemisphere Drug Policy Commission.  
Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy.  
With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS

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

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 415

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1230

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

□ 1245

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

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

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

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

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

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

By painstakingly piecing together all of the available fragmented data in

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1300

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1315

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

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

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

Current policy enables criminals to roam American streets—no matter

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

That is within only 142 characters, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And that is just the way it is.

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1330

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 339]

YEAS—235

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

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

NAYS—190

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



Rice (NY)	Serrano	Tonko	Love	Poe (TX)	Smith (TX)	Vargas	Walz	Welch
Richmond	Sewell (AL)	Torres	Lucas	Poliquin	Smucker	Veasey	Wasserman	Wilson (FL)
Rosen	Shea-Porter	Tsongas	Luetkemeyer	Posey	Stefanik	Vela	Schultz	Yarmuth
Roybal-Allard	Sherman	Vargas	MacArthur	Ratcliffe	Stewart	Velázquez	Waters, Maxine	
Ruiz	Sinema	Veasey	Marchant	Reed	Taylor	Visclosky	Watson Coleman	
Ruppersberger	Sires	Vela	Marino	Reichert	Tenney			
Rush	Slaughter	Velázquez	Marshall	Renacci	Thompson (PA)			
Ryan (OH)	Smith (WA)	Visclosky	Massie	Rice (SC)	Thornberry			
Sánchez	Soto	Walz	Mast	Roby	Tiberi	Cummings	Long	Scalise
Sarbanes	Speier	Wasserman	McCarthy	Roe (TN)	Tipton	Franks (AZ)	Napolitano	Stivers
Schakowsky	Suozzi	Schultz	McCaul	Rogers (AL)	Trott			
Schiff	Swalwell (CA)	Waters, Maxine	McClintock	Rogers (KY)	Turner			
Schneider	Takano	Watson Coleman	McHenry	Rohrabacher	Upton			
Schrader	Thompson (CA)	Welch	McKinley	Rokita	Valadao			
Scott (VA)	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (FL)	McMorris	Rooney, Francis	Wagner			
Scott, David	Titus	Yarmuth	Rodgers	Rooney, Thomas J.	Walberg			
			McSally	J.	Walden			
			Meadows	Ros-Lehtinen	Walker			
			Meehan	Roskam	Walorski			
			Messer	Ross	Walters, Mimi			
			Mitchell	Rothfus	Weber (TX)			
			Moolenaar	Rouzer	Webster (FL)			
			Mooney (WV)	Royce (CA)	Wenstrup			
			Mullin	Russell	Westerman			
			Murphy (PA)	Rutherford	Williams			
			Newhouse	Sanford	Wilson (SC)			
			Noem	Schweikert	Wittman			
			Norman	Scott, Austin	Womack			
			Nunes	Sensenbrenner	Woodall			
			Olson	Sessions	Yoder			
			Palazzo	Shimkus	Yoho			
			Palmer	Shuster	Young (AK)			
			Paulsen	Simpson	Young (IA)			
			Pearce	Smith (MO)	Zeldin			
			Perry	Smith (NE)				
			Pittenger	Smith (NJ)				

## NOT VOTING—8

Cummings	Gutiérrez	Scalise
Engel	Long	Stivers
Franks (AZ)	Napolitano	

□ 1357

Mr. RUSH changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

## RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 340]

AYES—236

Abraham	Conaway	Grothman
Aderholt	Cook	Guthrie
Allen	Costello (PA)	Handel
Amash	Cramer	Harper
Amodei	Crawford	Harris
Arrington	Culberson	Hartzler
Babin	Curbelo (FL)	Hensarling
Bacon	Davidson	Herrera Beutler
Banks (IN)	Davis, Rodney	Hice, Jody B.
Barletta	Denham	Higgins (LA)
Barr	Dent	Hill
Barton	DeSantis	Holding
Bergman	DesJarlais	Hollingsworth
Biggs	Diaz-Balart	Hudson
Bilirakis	Donovan	Huizenga
Bishop (MI)	Duffy	Hultgren
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Hunter
Black	Duncan (TN)	Hurd
Blackburn	Dunn	Issa
Blum	Emmer	Jenkins (KS)
Bost	Estes (KS)	Jenkins (WV)
Brady (TX)	Farenthold	Johnson (LA)
Brat	Faso	Johnson (OH)
Bridenstine	Ferguson	Johnson, Sam
Brooks (AL)	Fitzpatrick	Jones
Brooks (IN)	Fleischmann	Jordan
Buchanan	Flores	Joyce (OH)
Buck	Fortenberry	Katko
Bucshon	Fox	Kelly (MS)
Budd	Frelinghuysen	Kelly (PA)
Burgess	Gaetz	King (IA)
Byrne	Gallagher	King (NY)
Calvert	Garrett	Kinzinger
Carter (GA)	Gianforte	Knight
Carter (TX)	Gibbs	Kustoff (TN)
Chabot	Gohmert	Labrador
Chaffetz	Goodlatte	LaHood
Cheney	Gosar	LaMalfa
Coffman	Gowdy	Lamborn
Cole	Granger	Lance
Collins (GA)	Graves (GA)	Latta
Collins (NY)	Graves (LA)	Lewis (MN)
Comer	Graves (MO)	LoBiondo
Comstock	Griffith	Loudermilk

Adams	Evans	McNerney
Aguilar	Foster	Meeks
Barragán	Frankel (FL)	Meng
Bass	Fudge	Moore
Beatty	Gabbard	Moulton
Bera	Gallego	Murphy (FL)
Beyer	Garamendi	Nadler
Bishop (GA)	Gonzalez (TX)	Neal
Blumenauer	Gottheimer	Nolan
Blunt Rochester	Green, Al	Norcross
Bonomici	Green, Gene	O'Halleran
Boyle, Brendan F.	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Brady (PA)	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Brown (MD)	Hanabusa	Panetta
Brownley (CA)	Hastings	Pascrell
Bustos	Heck	Payne
Butterfield	Higgins (NY)	Pelosi
Capuano	Himes	Perlmutter
Carbajal	Hoyer	Peters
Cárdenas	Huffman	Peterson
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Cartwright	Jayapal	Pocan
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Polis
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Chu, Judy	Johnson, E. B.	Quigley
Cicilline	Kaptur	Raskin
Clark (MA)	Keating	Rice (NY)
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Richmond
Clay	Kennedy	Rosen
Cleaver	Khanna	Roybal-Allard
Clyburn	Kihuen	Ruiz
Cohen	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Connolly	Kilmer	Rush
Conyers	Kind	Ryan (OH)
Cooper	Krishnamoorthi	Sánchez
Correa	Kuster (NH)	Sarbanes
Costa	Langevin	Schakowsky
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Crist	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Crowley	Lawrence	Schrader
Cuellar	Lawson (FL)	Scott (VA)
Davis (CA)	Lee	Scott, David
Davis, Danny	Levin	Serrano
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Sewell (AL)
DeGette	Lieu, Ted	Shea-Porter
DeLaney	Lipinski	Sherman
DeLauro	Loeb sack	Sinema
DelBene	Lofgren	Sires
Demings	Lowenthal	Slaughter
DeSaulnier	Lowe y	Smith (WA)
Deutsch	Lujan Grisham,	Soto
Dingell	M.	Speier
Doggett	Luján, Ben Ray	Suozzi
Doyle, Michael F.	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
Ellison	Maloney,	Takano
Engel	Carolyn B.	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)
Españillat	Matsui	Titus
Esty (CT)	McCollum	Tonko
	McEachin	Torres
	McGovern	Tsongas

## NOT VOTING—6

Cummings	Long	Scalise
Franks (AZ)	Napolitano	Stivers

□ 1404

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

## NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3003

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

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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