

Australian nationals have never used all of the 10,500 authorized visas in a given year, nor have they even come close to doing so. In fact, the highest number used was during the last fiscal year when 5,807 were issued.

H.R. 2877 provides that nationals of Ireland can utilize the visas not used by Australians in a given calendar year. For operational purposes, the visa can be issued for the following year but will be counted against the previous year's cap. So the bill does not increase the number of visas authorized and allows Australia, for whose nationals the program was originally created, to have first access to those numbers.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2877 is a simple bill that reflects the continued friendship between Ireland and the United States. I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2877, to make Irish nationals eligible for temporary admission to the United States through the existing E-3 visa program.

And I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for his offering today and his support. I worked last year with Chairman SENSENBRENNER on this as well.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has broad support, and last session it passed the Congress unanimously.

Created in 2005 as a result of the U.S.-Australian Trade Agreement—which I voted for, supported, and spoke in support of—the agreement said, essentially, that the E-3 visa program, as constructed, would make 10,500 visas annually available to skilled Australian nationals for temporary work.

This program has been a successful pathway for qualified Australian citizens to gain valuable professional experience in the United States. However, our Australian friends have only used roughly half of the available visas during the past decade.

E-3 visas are limited to professionals visiting the United States to perform services in specialty occupations in a confirmed job from a United States employer.

E-3 visa applicants also must have a university degree, or its equivalent, as a minimum for entry into the United States. The E-3 visa allows the holder to stay in America for 2 years with the option to renew.

This legislation—and I want to make sure that we emphasize this—this legislation does not change the requirements of the current E-3 visa program recipients or increase the number of visas made available. In broad strokes, my bill will simply enable qualified Irish workers to annually access unused Australian E-3 visas from the previous fiscal year. Once passed, the Irish

Government has pledged to adopt a reciprocal arrangement that would allow Americans to work in Ireland under the same guidelines.

The E-3 visas, combined with these reciprocal arrangements, would provide a welcome and long overdue movement of citizens between Ireland and the United States in both directions, which is so important to Irish America, the United States, and, indeed, Ireland.

As many of you in this Chamber already know, legal migration between the United States and Ireland has been extremely limited now for many, many years.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I note the support that we have across the United States and unanimously in the Congress. It has the backing of both the White House and the Irish Government, whose prime minister, Leo Varadkar, the Taoiseach, will be welcomed to the Capitol on Thursday for the annual St. Patrick's Day luncheon.

In my opinion, this bill is a win-win opportunity for the United States and for Ireland, and for the citizens of both countries who will benefit from this very innovative and beneficial exchange program.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Committee on the Judiciary chairman, JERRY NADLER, and Judiciary's Subcommittee on Immigration and Citizenship chairwoman, ZOE LOFGREN, for swiftly moving this legislation to the floor. And I do take special note of JIM SENSENBRENNER's contribution for helping us get to this moment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2877.

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill is pretty simple. The opening is the closing. This is one of those times where I think common sense prevails. We are not increasing visas. We are continuing a strong relationship between Ireland and the United States.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, once again, I would urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2877.

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.

#### MAKING TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO GUAM WORLD WAR II LOYALTY RECOGNITION ACT

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill

(H.R. 1365) to make technical corrections to the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

#### SECTION 1. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO GUAM WORLD WAR II LOYALTY RECOGNITION ACT.

Title XVII of division A of Public Law 114-328 is amended—

(1) in section 1703(e)—

(A) by striking “equal to” and inserting “not to exceed”; and

(B) by striking “covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts” and inserting “used to reimburse the applicable appropriations”;

(2) in section 1704(a) by striking “, subject to the availability of appropriations,” and inserting “from the Claims Fund”; and

(3) by striking section 1707(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. SAN NICOLAS) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Guam.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. 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 the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, at the risk of sounding melodramatic, today is a very historic day, particularly in the relationship between the United States and the people of Guam; more specifically, the Chamorro people of Guam, a generation, in particular, that endured the sufferings of World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I was here about 8 months ago when I first brought H.R. 1365 to the floor of this House after securing unanimous consent in the Committee on Natural Resources. And after bringing this measure to this floor 8 months ago and also securing unanimous consent, H.R. 1365 made its way to the Senate. And in going through the Senate, it was able to also receive the necessary unanimous support and receive a very minor change that brings us to the floor today.

H.R. 1365 technically is making what would appear to be a minor change to language that was already enacted in the 2010 NDAA.

□ 1615

In my short time as a freshman Member of this House, I have learned that there is no such thing as a simple technicality. I have learned that the mere addition of a few words, or the subtraction of a few words, can make all the difference between the gravity of the

hurdles that you need to overcome in order to be able to enact legislation.

I have learned that the language contained in H.R. 1365, while technical in nature, is incredibly significant with respect to what it means for the Members of this House to consider.

In our process, Mr. Speaker, legislation that has certain language triggers certain events. H.R. 1365 is intended to allow for money that has been set aside to actually be paid out to the Chamorros, who suffered under the brutality of Imperial Japan during World War II.

This was a process that was initiated over many decades and has finally come to a place where we now just await the ability to cut the checks. But it is in the ability to cut those checks that language actually gets very, very complicated, and it causes certain things to be reconsidered.

The language in H.R. 1365 would, in effect, create what we know as a scoring here in this Congress, meaning that there may be an expenditure that the body would need to consider. The actual funding source of H.R. 1365 was a set-aside of moneys that was already due to Guam and has been set aside over the past several years, with the money accumulating and being ready to be paid out to these war survivors.

The reason why the United States is assuming this obligation, Mr. Speaker, is because, at the end of World War II, the United States absolved Japan of their obligations in order to be able to move the entire world forward after the conclusion of the war. In so doing, they also just so happened to absolve them of their obligation to make whole the war crimes that were endured by the Chamorro people who suffered because they were inhabiting the United States territory of Guam at the time. The people suffered beheadings, forced marches, rapes, and the loss of their infants in their arms.

It has taken us now going on 76 years to finally come to this point. I say that this is historic, Mr. Speaker, because it, in a large respect, represents almost an original sin, in terms of the inability for us to reconcile our territorial relationships in a manner that really makes for plain and simple justice.

I am deeply moved, Mr. Speaker, to be able to handle these proceedings today and to be able to see H.R. 1365 come before this House once more because, as we all know, in this current political environment, almost any hurdle that legislation faces is a hurdle too much.

As we have gone through this process and have gotten to this point, there were many times when I was deeply concerned about whether or not something technical was going to actually be dead on arrival. But by the grace of God, Mr. Speaker, the small territory of Guam has been able to garner the unanimous support of this House, the unanimous support of the Senate. We are here again today addressing a matter that really triggers certain con-

cerns but has gotten us to a point where we are able to see that there are some things that are bigger than the nuances of language, the semantics of procedure.

So it is with a deep sense of pride that I stand here, as a Member of this House, nonvoting Delegate that I am, because I can stand here in witness to the fact that, at some point in time, justice really does find its way in the United States of America.

I urge my colleagues to please support this measure. We are this close; we are just a hairline away. And in passing this House, this measure will then go before the President for signature, and we can finally make whole a generation that suffered because they were loyal to America.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a problem that has been vexing representatives from our territory of Guam for many years now. I appreciate the gentleman from Guam, who has adequately explained what he is attempting to do and what this bill actually does. I congratulate him on this bill, which is finally going to recognize and compensate a very small group but a significant group of people who literally sacrificed for this country.

This is the right thing to do. This House has done this before. This passed out of our committee on a voice vote. It has passed on the floor on a voice vote. It then went to the Senate, where the Senate felt compelled to make changes, as is their wont to do. And in lightning speed, the Senate, in only 8 months, was able to strike the 22 lines and return this bill to us.

So, lest we vex them even further and ask them to do something else, I would urge everyone in here to give this another "yes" vote and send this on to the President's desk immediately from this floor.

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

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. 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 Guam (Mr. SAN NICOLAS) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 1365.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SUPPORTING PEOPLE OF NICARAGUA IN THEIR PEACEFUL EFFORTS TO PROMOTE DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 754) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that

the United States should continue to support the people of Nicaragua in their peaceful efforts to promote democracy and human rights, and use the tools under United States law to increase political and financial pressure on the government of Daniel Ortega, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 754

Whereas the government of Daniel Ortega has concentrated power and brought about the progressive deterioration of democratic conditions in Nicaragua;

Whereas recent elections in Nicaragua, including the 2016 Presidential elections, have been marred by irregularities and characterized by significant restrictions on the participation of opposition parties and the absence of credible international and local electoral observers;

Whereas Nicaraguan security forces, parapolice, and other actors working under the direction of the Ortega regime committed gross violations of human rights and acts of repression, resulting in more than 325 deaths, over 2,000 injuries, and at least 800 arbitrary detentions during the peaceful protests that took place in 2018, according to the Organization of American States;

Whereas a report by the Interdisciplinary Group of Independent Experts, appointed by the Organization of American States Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, determined that the Ortega regime used deliberate, lethal force against protesters and committed acts of torture that meet the international legal standard of crimes against humanity;

Whereas an estimated 62,000 Nicaraguans fled the country between April 2018 and April 2019, according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees;

Whereas the Ortega government reneged on its commitment in 2019 to release all political prisoners by releasing just 392 people, of which 286 were released to house arrest with charges still pending, while the Blue and White National Unity coalition alleges that there remain at least 56 political prisoners as of February 15, 2020;

Whereas a United States citizen and Navy veteran, 57-year-old Eddy Montes, was shot and killed while in the custody of the Nicaraguan police at La Modelo Prison on May 16, 2019;

Whereas the government of Daniel Ortega has severely restricted freedom of the press by closing five local television stations, attacking independent radio stations, arbitrarily detaining journalists, and illegally restricting print supplies from entering the country;

Whereas the Ortega regime has violated the economic and political rights protections of indigenous communities, rural campesinos, land rights defenders, and those living in the Caribbean Autonomous Regions of Nicaragua;

Whereas, on November 27, 2018, Executive Order 13851 was issued, which blocks the property of certain persons contributing to the situation in Nicaragua, and its application was expanded on September 4, 2019;

Whereas the Departments of State and the Treasury have imposed targeted sanctions on over 20 Nicaraguan individuals and entities, including First Lady and Vice President Rosario Murillo and Daniel Ortega's son, Laureano Ortega, as well as Nicaragua's Banco Corporativo (Bancorp);

Whereas the bipartisan Nicaraguan Investment Conditionality Act (NICA Act), was