

I believe that H.R. 4100 will help the FBA to flourish for many decades to come. I strongly support this bill. I look forward to the FBA's continued positive involvement in our Nation's legal system, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), chairman of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of a bill that I introduced, H.R. 4100, which, put simply, helps support those Federal attorneys who prosecute major drug traffickers, white collar criminals, and other Federal crimes, and the judges who preside over those cases in our Federal courts.

The Federal Bar Association was founded back in 1920 and chartered by Congress in 1954. However, in the nearly 64 years of its existence, its charter has never been amended.

As a former educator, attorney, and current senior member of the Judiciary Committee, I would note the important work that the Federal Bar Association does to bring civics education to classrooms in my State of Ohio, and they bring that same expertise to other areas all across the country.

Without legislation like H.R. 4100, it takes an act of Congress to even allow the Federal Bar Association to make simple changes to their bylaws. More specifically, this legislation gives the association the authority to choose the location of its principal office, restricts its officers from engaging in political activity, and makes other technical changes to conform to commonly used language and other things.

This legislation provides the Federal Bar Association the continued ability to support legal research, pro bono, and community projects; continue to educate grade schoolchildren on the Federal judiciary system; and improve the practice of Federal law in our Federal courtrooms all across America.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank the chairman, Chairman GOODLATTE, for his leadership in helping to bring this very important legislation to the floor for consideration, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about H.R. 4100.

The Federal Bar Association is the Nation's premier association for practitioners in Federal courts and, as such, should, of course, be open to all, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity.

Currently, the FBA recognizes the importance of nondiscrimination and

has adopted a diversity statement that includes race, gender, ethnicity, national origin, religion, age, disability, sexual orientation, and gender identity.

Diversity statements are valuable, but they do not carry the weight of law. The addition of a nondiscrimination provision to the FBA charter is an important action, but it is really unfortunate that my Republican colleagues have excluded gender identity as an enumerated protected characteristic in the law. I am not sure if they are pandering to the most extremes in their party or to their political base, but it is wrong.

Gender identity is an individual's personal and internal identification as a man, a woman, neither, or both. For transgender people, their gender identity may not match their biological or legal sex. Despite the efforts to exclude gender identity from H.R. 4100, transgender people will be protected from discrimination under Federal law.

Discrimination on the basis of gender identity is a form of sex discrimination. Laws prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex protect transgender people.

Numerous Federal circuit and district court opinions have held that our Nation's nondiscrimination laws that prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex protect transgender people from discrimination. That includes title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, and title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission determined in *Macy v. Holder* that title VII's prohibitions on sex discrimination also prohibit discrimination on the basis of gender identity. This decision is binding on the Federal Government with respect to employment practices.

While gender identity will be covered by the sex nondiscrimination provision, it is better to enumerate gender identity. Our laws work best when there are clear expectations.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Listing out protected characteristics helps those making determinations about membership understand their obligations, and helps those seeking membership understand their rights. There is no reason to refuse to include gender identity as a protected characteristic.

While I do not oppose H.R. 4100, I hope that we can continue to discuss and take into account the issues that impact the lives of LGBTI individuals and will work toward a charter that protects everyone from discrimination.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, given that the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals has determined that title VII sex discrimi-

nation includes discrimination against people based on their gender identity, it seems somewhat petty and churlish to exclude those words from the language of this charter. I hope that this will be corrected when the legislation goes through. Otherwise, I consider this a very fine bill.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4100.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KNOWLEDGEABLE INNOVATORS AND WORTHY INVESTORS ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2245) to include New Zealand in the list of foreign states whose nationals are eligible for admission into the United States as E-1 and E-2 nonimmigrants if United States nationals are treated similarly by the Government of New Zealand.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2245

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 "Knowledgeable Innovators and Worthy Investors Act" or the "KIWI Act".

SEC. 2. NONIMMIGRANT TRADERS AND INVESTORS.

For purposes of clauses (i) and (ii) of section 101(a)(15)(E) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(E)), New Zealand shall be considered to be a foreign state described in such section if the Government of New Zealand provides similar nonimmigrant status to nationals of the United States.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 2245, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, E-1 visas are non-immigrant visas available for treaty traders, and E-2 visas are available for treaty investors.

Pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, these visas are available to aliens who are “entitled to enter the United States under and in pursuance of the provisions of a treaty of commerce and navigation between the United States and the foreign state of which he is a national, and their spouse and children . . . solely to either carry on substantial trade, including trade in services or trade in technology, principally between the United States and the foreign state of which he is a national, or to develop and direct the operations of an enterprise in which he has invested . . . a substantial amount of capital. . . .”

Alien employees of treaty traders and treaty investors may receive visas if they are coming to the United States “to engage in duties of an executive or supervisory character, or, if employed in a lesser capacity, if they have special qualifications that make the services to be rendered essential to the efficient operation of the enterprise.”

There are no numerical caps on E-1 or E-2 visas. Aliens may be admitted initially for a period of 2 years and can apply for extensions in 2-year increments.

The United States has entered into treaties of commerce since at least 1815, when we entered into a Convention to Regulate Commerce with the United Kingdom.

□ 1645

Currently, the nationals of 83 countries are eligible for E-1 or E-2 status. In fiscal year 2017, in total, about 50,000 E-1 and E-2 visas were issued.

In the past, countries became eligible for the E-1 and E-2 programs through treaties signed with the United States. However, in 2003, the Judiciary Committee reached an understanding with the U.S. Trade Representative that no immigration provisions were to be included in future trade agreements. Henceforth, legislation would be required to add countries.

The bill we are considering today, S. 2245, makes New Zealand nationals eligible for E-1 and E-2 visas. I want to thank Mr. ISSA for all of his work on this issue, and for introducing companion legislation in the House. I am also appreciative of the Embassy of New Zealand for seeking E visa status in the right way.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 2245, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

S. 2245, the Knowledgeable Innovators and Worthy Investors Act, or KIWI Act, is bipartisan legislation to allow citizens of New Zealand to participate, along with the people of more than 80 other countries, in the E-1 and E-2 visa programs for treaty traders and treaty investors, so long as

New Zealand provides the same reciprocal treatment to citizens of the United States.

I favor this commonsense bill that will facilitate trade by making it easier for New Zealanders to invest here and will lead to the creation of new jobs in the United States.

The E-1 treaty trader program provides temporary visas to employees of firms engaged in substantial trade with our country. The E-2 treaty investor program provides temporary visas to foreign investors who make substantial investments in American enterprise.

These visas help increase trade with and direct investments in the U.S. More than 80 countries already participate in the programs, including almost all of our democratic allies and trading partners. Yet New Zealand, one our closest and dearest allies, is not on the list.

There are already many New Zealand companies in the U.S., just as there are many of our companies in New Zealand. In 2016, our two countries engaged in approximately \$12 billion of bilateral trade in goods and services; and the U.S. is already the second most popular destination for New Zealand foreign investment, accounting for 17 percent of all foreign investment by New Zealanders in 2016, for a total of \$3.2 billion dollars.

Bringing New Zealand into the E-1 and E-2 programs will increase trade and bilateral investment flows, helping both of our countries accelerate economic growth and job creation.

While so much of our foreign policy is consumed today with dangerous and counterproductive trade wars against our allies, which is harmful to our farmers, especially our soybean, corn, and livestock farmers, I am glad that this bill will actually strengthen ties with one of America’s closest and most steadfast allies.

Congratulations are in order for Senator HIRONO, who championed this bill in the Senate, where it passed last month by unanimous consent. I also congratulate my Judiciary colleague, DARRELL ISSA, who authored the companion bill in the House. They both deserve credit for identifying this deficiency in our immigration laws and working across the aisle to craft a smart solution that has gained broad support in the body for adoption. Our country will be more prosperous and so, presumably, will be New Zealand as a result of their efforts.

I also want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Chairwoman ILEANA ROSLEHTINEN of the Foreign Affairs Committee for their support and work on behalf of this important legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 2245, the KIWI Act.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland and Ranking Member NADLER and others for their work on this legislation, as well as Congressman

ISSA and Senator HIRONO. This is very good legislation and it’s overdue. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2245.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LA PAZ COUNTY LAND CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2630) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to La Paz County, Arizona, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2630

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 “La Paz County Land Conveyance Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COUNTY.—The term “County” means La Paz County, Arizona.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—The term “Federal land” means the approximately 8,800 acres of land managed by the Bureau of Land Management and designated as “Federal land to be conveyed” on the map.

(3) MAP.—The term “map” means the map prepared by the Bureau of Land Management entitled “Proposed La Paz County Land Conveyance” and dated May 24, 2017.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE TO LA PAZ COUNTY, ARIZONA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Secretary receives a request from the County to convey all or a portion of the Federal land, subject to valid existing rights and to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), the Secretary shall convey to the County all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land identified on the map.

(b) PHASED CONVEYANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey the public land described in subsection (a) in parcels over a period of up to 20 years, as is required to carry out the phased development of renewable energy or other economic development.

(2) PAYMENT OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.—A parcel shall be conveyed by the Secretary on payment by La Paz County, Arizona, to the Secretary, of the fair market value of the parcel, as determined under paragraph (3).

(3) APPRAISAL TO DETERMINE FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The Secretary shall determine the fair market value of the Federal land to be conveyed—

(A) in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and