

or shopping center. Moreover, community-based organizations that are known and trusted also have more incentive and opportunity to reach and engage low-propensity voters than government officials and politicians. Hindering their efforts may significantly reduce the likelihood that eligible, unregistered Latinos will be asked by anyone to take part in an election.

Imposition of Strict Voter ID Requirements:

The strict voter ID laws implemented in a number of jurisdictions around the country since 2012 inhibit qualified members of the electorate from casting ballots, because millions of American adults do not possess any of the personal identification documents that strict ID laws require. Individuals who do not already hold a valid form of voter ID face numerous potential barriers to obtaining a qualifying document, including inability to pay application fees, difficulty arranging transportation to identification-issuing locations during business hours, and lack of access to documents like birth certificates that are mandatory precursors to obtaining ID. Eligible Latino voters account for disproportionate shares of both those without ID and those who confront significant or insurmountable barriers to obtaining ID. In addition, studies indicate that Latinos are disproportionately likely to mistakenly presume they lack the ID required to vote, and to decline to attempt to vote as a result of apprehension about the scrutiny they will face at the polls.

Shortened In-Person Early Voting Periods:

In recognition of the increasing demands on Americans' time, many jurisdictions have extended voting days and hours in the past fifteen years, and many voters have taken advantage of early voting periods. Against this backdrop, jurisdictions that have moved in the opposite direction to limit the voting options available to their citizens stand out for their recalcitrance. Latino voters are more likely than others to lack workplace flexibility, and also to shoulder childcare responsibilities, both factors that leave potential Latino voters with less ability to vote where polling places are open on fewer days and for fewer hours. Unsurprisingly, the states with the highest early voting rates are disproportionately Latino: the nine jurisdictions whose citizens were most likely to vote early in 2008 and 2012 are home to less than 26% of all of the nation's voters, but 36% of all Latino voters in the country. Where early voting is constrained, Latinos are disproportionately likely to be negatively affected.

Restrictions on Absentee Voting:

Provisions that have made it more difficult to vote by mail also stand out as a contrast to the wider voting opportunities that improved technology generally has made possible. Several states implemented new laws between November 2012 and Election Day 2016 that impose tighter deadlines on mail ballots, restrict assistors' ability to deliver ballots for people with limited mobility, and make it more likely that mail ballots will be rejected. These and other measures that have made it more difficult to vote by mail are likely to have a disproportionate impact on Latino voters, because their demanding schedules and heightened likelihood of lacking access to personal transportation may force many to rely on mail balloting as the only logistically feasible voting option.

Heightened Qualifications to Vote and Restrictions on Counting Ballots:

Restrictions on registration and voting mechanisms have gained currency among legislators from many different states in the years following the contentious Presidential election of 2000. Voter advocates have begun

to win high-profile victories in legal challenges to voter ID laws, proof of citizenship requirements, and shortened early voting periods. However, simultaneously, jurisdictions have successfully pursued alternative legislative provisions that have not yet been the subject of successful anti-discrimination enforcement actions. Examples of other voting restrictions likely to disproportionately impair Latino voters in November 2016 include felon disfranchisement in Kentucky; refusal to count any votes cast outside the correct precinct in North Carolina; and heightened barriers to the counting of provisional ballots in Ohio.

Redistricting and Other Laws That Diminish Latino Voters' Influence:

Underrepresented voters' influence can be limited not only by laws that create barriers to registration and voting, but also by laws that diminish the weight of their votes. Between the 2012 and 2016 Presidential elections, a number of jurisdictions have adopted new measures concerning redistricting and methods of election that impair the ability of underrepresented communities to elect the candidates of their choice. For example, some redistricting plans have included districts in which Latinos constitute a slight majority of the population, but are unlikely to constitute a majority of voters because so many of the individuals assigned to the district cannot or are not likely to vote. When Latinos have preferences for the candidates of their choice that are consistently different from those of the majority white population, whites and Latinos may vote in blocs and in opposition to one another, and the deliberate manipulation of district boundaries can ensure that Latino voter-preferred candidates are consistently defeated.

Barriers Imposed by Administrative Policy-making:

As widespread as restrictive election law-making has been in state legislatures around the country between 2012 and 2016, discretionary decisions made by unelected administrators—particularly those serving at municipal or other local levels—now pose at least an equal threat to underrepresented voters' ability to participate in elections. With the exception of noncompliance with language assistance obligations, voting rights laws have rarely been used successfully to challenge executive policymaking that has discriminatory effects. Thus, Latino voters are particularly vulnerable to negative consequences of discriminatory or unsound election administration. Among the administrative issues over which election administrators have discretionary control, those that may have the most deleterious effect on Latinos' ability to vote in 2016 include decisions about registration list maintenance and the processing of new registration applications, the closing and consolidation of polling places, the allocation of resources among polling places, and the degree of effort invested in providing language assistance to voters not yet fully fluent in English.

CONCLUSION—CONGRESS MUST RESTORE THE VRA TO FULL STRENGTH

Laws and policies that make it harder for Latinos to register and vote have a clear negative impact on the individuals who are individually prevented from taking part in elections by their inability to satisfy heightened requirements. What may be less obvious is that restrictive measures inhibit even those who are not directly affected by them. The kinds of restrictive laws and policies that jurisdictions around the country have adopted since Election Day 2012 signal to members of the electorate that their voices and input as voters are not welcomed, but

only grudgingly accepted when voters are willing to put in the effort to clear the hurdles in their way. Because they discourage a broad group of potential voters at a time when voter participation has been in dangerous decline, policies that create barriers to the ballot box are the wrong policy choices for 2016. It is imperative that we instead encourage Latinos and all Americans to become more active participants in the political process by making the registration and voting process more accessible.

We applaud Members of Congress for introducing bipartisan legislation that would modernize the VRA. The Voting Rights Amendment Act, H.R. 885, and the Voting Rights Advancement Act, H.R. 2867, would ensure that discriminatory policies do not taint our political process, and that elections are instead open to all Americans regardless of their race, ethnicity, or linguistic ability. We look forward to working with Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle to advance legislation that strengthens protection of the fair and equal opportunity to vote, and safeguards the integrity of our democracy for the long term.

FIRST RESPONDER ACCESS TO INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL T. McCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 2016

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following cost estimate from the Congressional Budget Office regarding H.R. 5460.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 28, 2016.

Hon. MICHAEL McCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 5460, the First Responder Access to Innovative Technologies Act.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Jacob Fabian.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL,
Director.

Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

H.R. 5460—FIRST RESPONDER ACCESS TO INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES ACT

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) provides grants to help state, local, and tribal governments develop their capacity to prevent, prepare for, and respond to acts of terrorism. Under current law, equipment purchased using such grants must meet voluntary standards, developed by FEMA in coordination with appropriate federal agencies, the National Advisory Council, and private entities. Requests to use grants to purchase equipment that does not meet such standards, or for which no such standards exist, are subject to further review and approval by FEMA.

H.R. 5460 would require FEMA to implement a uniform process for reviewing applications for grants intended to support purchases of innovative equipment that does not meet or exceed current applicable standards or for which no voluntary standards exist. The bill also would require the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security to assess and report on FEMA's implementation of the new review process.

Based on information from FEMA, CBO estimates that implementing this legislation would not have a significant effect on the federal budget. According to the agency, grant recipients rarely request permission to purchase equipment that does not at least meet current standards or for which standards do not exist. As a result, CBO expects that any administrative costs to establish, implement, assess, and report on the proposed process for reviewing such requests would be insignificant; such spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

Enacting H.R. 5460 would not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply. CBO estimates that enacting the bill would not increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2027.

H.R. 5460 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Jacob Fabian. The estimate was approved by H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

DAANGEROUS SYNTHETIC DRUG CONTROL ACT OF 2016

SPEECH OF

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 2016

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3537, the “Dangerous Synthetic Drug Control Act”. I want to thank Congressman KATKO and Congressman DENT for their work on this important legislation.

Earlier this year, Congress passed S. 524, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, or CARA. That historic legislation was vitally important because, today, the United States faces an epidemic of opioid abuse. More than 120 Americans are dying every day from overdoses.

H.R. 3537 continues Congress’s stated commitment to stem the tide of drug abuse and death, by placing 22 synthetic substances on schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act. These 22 substances represent the “worst of the worst” synthetic drugs, and include three varieties of fentanyl, a powerful opioid which is all too familiar to Members of this body, as well as to our constituents, families, and loved ones. Fentanyl is up to 100 times more powerful than morphine, and has led to a rash of deaths across the country.

The federal agencies charged with battling drug abuse—specifically, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Food and Drug Administration, and the National Institute on Drug Abuse—have all concurred that these substances are the “worst of the worst,” and have no medicinal use. People are overdosing and dying because of them right now. Congress cannot sit on its hands and allow this to continue happening.

I want to address a couple of misconceptions about this legislation. First, some have argued that the bill will prevent these substances from being researched. But that is a specious claim. Federal law permits schedule I controlled substances to be researched, via

FDA-approved “new drug” applications and DEA schedule I research registrations. The application requirements are significant, but that is appropriate since, again, these drugs are the worst of the worst. If you are experimenting with these substances, which have killed people, you should be held to the highest standards of scientific research.

Second, some of my colleagues have argued that this legislation would impose mandatory minimum sentences on people for simple possession of these synthetic substances. Again, this is erroneous. In order to receive a mandatory minimum sentence under the Controlled Substances Act, a defendant has to possess more than a certain amount of a drug that appears on a list in federal law. None of the synthetic substances in H.R. 3537 appear on that list. As a result, even with the passage of this bill the only way a defendant could be subject to a mandatory minimum is if a user suffers death or serious bodily injury after consuming the drug.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3537 is good, timely legislation that will criminalize some extremely dangerous substances that are killing American citizens. It is a stopgap, since a more comprehensive solution is needed down the road, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on comprehensive synthetic drug legislation. But Congress must pass this legislation now to get these substances off the streets now.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

IN HONOR OF KELLY MCMILLIN

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 2016

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable public service career of Chief Kelly McMillin, who is retiring after a 32-year-long career in law enforcement, that last 4 as the Chief of the Salinas, California, Police Department. Kelly has been a remarkable leader who led the Salinas Police Department through a particularly challenging period. I am particularly grateful for his work with my office to help convince the U.S. Department of Justice in 2011 to include the City of Salinas as one of the initial 7 U.S. cities in the pilot National Forum on Youth Violence. I am proud of Kelly’s service and honored to call him a friend.

Kelly began his law enforcement career in 1984 as a Deputy with the San Benito County Sheriff’s Department. In 1986, he transferred to the San Diego County Sheriff’s Department before joining the Salinas Police Department in 1988. As a Salinas Police Officer, Kelly has worked patrol, several anti-gang units, vice/narcotics, administration, and various assignments as a detective including homicide. He was a SWAT operator, team leader and tactical commander. He has held the ranks of Officer, Corporal, Sergeant, Lieutenant, Commander and Deputy Chief. He was appointed Chief of the Salinas Police Department on June 11, 2012, and was the first Chief to be promoted from within the ranks since 1965.

While he was serving as a full time officer, Kelly earned an Associate’s Degree from Hartnell College, a BA from Saint Mary’s Col-

lege, and a Masters of Public Policy from the Panetta Institute at California State University Monterey Bay. He is a 2003 graduate of the 213th session of the FBI National Academy at Quantico, Virginia. In 2012, the White House recognized Kelly as a “Champion of Change” for his work in youth violence prevention in 2012.

Kelly is married to his wife Teresa, a Physician Assistant who owns a cosmetic dermatology practice in Salinas. Their son Liam has followed in his father’s public service footsteps and is currently a Plebe at the United States Military Academy at West Point.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for the whole House in congratulating Chief Kelly McMillin on the occasion of his retirement and to thank him and his family for his many years of selfless service.

RECOGNIZING THE 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF WEST ORLANDO BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 2016

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge a special occasion for West Orlando Baptist Church in Winter Garden, Florida. West Orlando Baptist Church will celebrate their 45th anniversary and new building dedication on October 2, 2016.

On October 3, 1971, more than 100 charter members founded Metropolitan Baptist Church in Pine Hills, Florida. Today, known as West Orlando Baptist Church it serves more than 700 in Winter Garden, FL. In honor of their 45th anniversary, West Orlando Baptist Church is dedicating a new 32,000-square foot expansion in Winter Garden, which includes a brand-new sanctuary and additional classrooms.

I would like to thank West Orlando Baptist Church for their 45 years of faithful ministry to our community and their dedication to Christian leadership. Many lives have been impacted through the church’s ministry.

On behalf of the people of Central Florida, it is my pleasure to recognize and congratulate West Orlando Baptist Church on this momentous occasion. May God continue to bless their church and ministry throughout future generations.

RESTORATION TUESDAY: UNITED WE STAND, DIVIDED WE FALL

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 2016

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to address the dangerously divisive effect that voter suppression has had on this country and the pressing need to restore the vote.

The unique diversity of the people of the United States of America is indeed one of our greatest strengths. However, it is our unity of principles that forms the strong foundation that our greatness is built upon. This country stands on the principles of liberty, justice and