



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 2018

No. 149

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CURTIS).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 7, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN R. CURTIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

You have blessed us with all good gifts, and with thankful hearts, we express our gratitude. You have created us with opportunities to serve other people in their need, to share together in respect and affection, and to be faithful in the responsibilities we have been given.

In this moment of prayer, please grant to the Members of this people's House the gifts of wisdom and discernment, that in their words and actions they will do justice, love with mercy, and walk humbly with You.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

ANONYMOUS COLUMN BY AN OFFICIAL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

(Mr. MCCLINTOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, a republic can survive only as long as all political sides abide by our elections, respect our institutions, and obey our Constitution.

The anonymous column by an official in the executive branch, who bragged of deliberately thwarting the will of the people as expressed through the Presidential election, expresses a sentiment that is absolutely toxic to our form of government.

He cites no constitutional breach to thwart the lawful decisions of a legitimately elected President but only his self-righteous disdain for the man and his policies.

Well, he doesn't get to make that decision. Nobody elected him. Congress, the courts, and the American people at the ballot box can check the President, but an unelected zealot within the government cannot.

What I find most alarming is the applause for this sentiment that we hear

from the far left. We should recognize it for what it is: a direct attack on the most fundamental principle that holds us together as a free people.

HONORING FEDERAL WORKERS

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the shipyard workers and park rangers and VA nurses, Forest Service land managers, and all of our Federal workers. These are men and women who work every day to protect our Nation's security and offer vital services and grow our economy.

These men and women dedicate their working lives to the betterment of our Nation, and, sadly, just a few days ago, the President froze the pay and locality adjustments for these Federal workers.

The President has boasted that the economy is great. These workers have certainly seen their costs rise. Their housing costs are rising, and other expenses are rising.

But do you know what won't rise? Their pay. And now the President is threatening a shutdown of the government again, raising the specter of furloughing these workers again.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this body to reject the notion that the problem with government is the people who work in government, and I urge my colleagues to work together to fund the government, including the pay for these hard-working men and women who are our neighbors.

RECOGNIZING THE VOLUNTEERS OF THE ALLEGHENY RIVER CLEANUP

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7923

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Saturday marks the start of the 10th annual Allegheny River and Watershed Cleanup, which is a weeklong effort in Warren County to keep the Allegheny River healthy and clean.

The Allegheny River is one of the Nation's most beautiful and clean waters. For more than 10 years, the waterway has been designated one of the Nation's wild and scenic rivers. It is also home to seven islands protected under America's National Wilderness Preservation System.

Every year, hundreds of people visit the river to enjoy its beauty and bounty. In 2017, 317 volunteers donated roughly 2,536 hours of their time while removing 5,350 pounds of metal, 94 tires, and 35 cubic feet of trash from the Allegheny and the Conewango Creek.

Adults and children participate in the cleanup. They walk along the riverbanks or use their canoes and kayaks to remove garbage found in or along the Allegheny River and its tributaries.

Mr. Speaker, the Allegheny River watershed is and continues to be an important recreational, ecological, and economic asset to Warren County. I commend all those who participate in this outstanding event.

HONORING WESTON CALL

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, today I honor Weston Call. Weston was a beloved member of our close-knit Big Sur community in my district on the central coast of California who, unexpectedly and unfortunately, passed away in August at the young age of 32.

Weston was a fourth-generation Carmel native and a 2004 graduate of the same high school I went to, Carmel High.

Although he grew up in Carmel, Wes would give everything and do anything for the people of Big Sur.

During the 2016 Soberanes fire, he helped Big Sur neighbors fight the flames from their properties.

During the 2017 storms, when the Pfeiffer Bridge got knocked out, Wes took it upon himself to transport people from the makeshift trail around the bridge to their jobs.

And as tourist traffic has become a major problem in Big Sur, rather than complaining about it, Wes did something about it. He created a shuttle service to alleviate the congestion along Highway 1. During those rides, he would always provide a local point of view about where to go and what to do. He wouldn't share too much about our secrets, but he always stressed how sensitive we should be about the environment.

I hope that Wes' life serves as an example for all of us of how to be better

neighbors, better citizens, and better stewards of our beloved home.

RECOGNIZING CHILDHOOD CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. KNIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Childhood Cancer Awareness Month, during which we pay a special tribute to the children who are now fighting or who have fought the number one disease killer and second leading cause of death of children in the United States.

We also affirm our support for the families, their doctors and their nurses and the foundations that provide financial and emotional relief to those struggling with the tremendous stress of cancer treatment and rehabilitation.

One group that is particularly close to me and my family is Jack's Angels. Jack's Angels fights for dedicated research for a particularly deadly kind of pediatric cancer, DIPG, the deadliest pediatric brain cancer.

DIPG tumors are inoperable and incurable, and its victims have a 5-year survival rate of less than 1 percent. The median survival time for children diagnosed with DIPG is only 9 months.

In 2011, just after his third birthday, Jack Demeter was diagnosed with DIPG. He was given steroid medication, then radiation therapy, and was put on supplements and several tailored diets.

He was brought into clinical trials. He tried infusions. His parents took him to dozens of doctors, each of whom provided their best advice and counsel. But the science for an effective treatment for DIPG has not yet been developed. Jack passed away only 9 months after diagnosis.

For me and for Jack's Angels, finding a cure for DIPG and all other pediatric cancers will continue to be a priority.

HONORING KATHLEEN DALEY

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Kathleen Daley—a friend, a trusted colleague, and a respected member of the Riverside community.

I met Kathleen Daley when I was elected to the RCC board of trustees. As I got to know her, I realized that she and I could not be more different. She was a conservative Republican, and I am a progressive Democrat. She was a tax accountant, and, back then, I was still a public schoolteacher. But in spite of these differences, when we served on the board of trustees, we were always able to work together and put the needs of students first.

I respected her for her expertise in finance. The board trusted her to chair

the finance committee during her tenure. I admired her for her knowledge and experience, and so did my colleagues. We often unanimously supported her to be the presiding officer of the board. And I befriended her because of the dedicated person she was, because she always worked in the best interest of students.

Riverside has lost a great public servant, and I join our community in remembering Kathleen Daley's passion for student success and recognizing her contributions.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND WORK OF MAYOR GEORGE PRADEL

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart at the passing of former Naperville, Illinois, Mayor George Pradel.

Mayor Pradel was an extraordinary public servant who was universally loved. He was also a great mentor to me. Throughout my career in public service, George was always an insightful counselor and beacon of much-needed encouragement to me and to so many others, and I am very grateful for his faithful prayers for me and my family over the years.

George had a tremendous impact on every individual he met, and he himself lived an extraordinary life.

A Naperville native, George served his family, community, and country as a dedicated community catalyst, soldier, police officer, father, and mentor.

As mayor, George served Naperville for two decades, from 1995 until 2015. His tenure ushered in a period of tremendous growth. Mayor Pradel was Naperville's number one cheerleader. His unbelievable energy and exuberance were infectious.

I will miss George as a man I admired and a public servant I sought to emulate. He truly had a servant's heart.

Today, we honor a life well lived. George Pradel embraced each day by celebrating the loves of his life: his God, his family, and his community; and I know his savior welcomed him, saying: "Well done, good and faithful servant."

CONGRATULATING HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate one of my great school districts. I have many in my congressional district, but I particularly want to cite the Houston Independent School District suffering from Hurricane Harvey and under the threat of the Texas Education Agency to be closed.

What a state of mind for parents and children, many of whom have been displaced.

Now, let it be very clear, there are a number of school districts in my congressional district, and I salute them all and the teachers and students; but in this instance, over the past couple of months, there was a question of, on opening day, would six or seven schools of HISD be closed.

I always went throughout the community to the meetings when I was in the district, and the refrain was: The schools will not be closed.

I am an optimist. I believe in our children and our teachers. And on August 27, a few days before, the TEA had indicated that the test that the children take, the scores that came out in early August, that they had passed, and the schools that were in jeopardy of closing were not going to close, and others had been given an extension because of the devastation of Hurricane Harvey and the complete displacement of our children.

So on that opening day of August 27, I went to four or five of my schools. I went with the mayor and the school board members, and I thanked them and our great school superintendent, because a lot of the work attributed to their success, TEA noted it was the great superintendent that we have in HISD. And I believe we should keep her. She is doing an excellent job.

Congratulations to the children, the teachers, the school district, because our children are our most precious resource.

□ 0915

HONORING THE MEMORY OF COMMAND SERGEANT MAJOR TIMOTHY A. BOLYARD

(Mr. MCKINLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Command Sergeant Major Timothy Bolyard who lost his life this past Monday in the line of duty in the Logar province in Afghanistan.

A native of Thornton, West Virginia, Sergeant Major Bolyard was a decorated soldier with 24 years of service. He had received numerous recognitions for his dedicated service, including, among others, six Bronze Star Medals, two with valor; four Meritorious Service Medals; six Army Commendation Medals; 9 Army Achievement Medals.

This was Sergeant Major Bolyard's seventh deployment. His tours have included Iraq, Afghanistan, Kuwait, Qatar, and Albania.

Yesterday, the State flags in West Virginia were flown at half-mast in his honor.

Mr. Speaker, we grieve with Sergeant Major Bolyard's family and are keeping them in our thoughts and prayers.

To Command Sergeant Major Bolyard, we thank you for your service and sacrifice. You, sir, were truly an American hero, an inspiration, and we will always honor your memory.

PROTECTING RELIGIOUSLY AFFILIATED INSTITUTIONS ACT OF 2018

Mrs. HANDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 994) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for the protection of community centers with religious affiliation, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 994

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 "Protecting Religiously Affiliated Institutions Act of 2018".

SEC. 2. PROTECTION OF COMMUNITY CENTERS WITH RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION.

Section 247 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by inserting after "threat of force," the following: "including by threat of force against religious real property,";

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting "or (c)" after "subsection (a)";

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking "and" at the end;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

"(4) if damage to or destruction of property results from the acts committed in violation of this section, which damage to or destruction of such property is in an amount that exceeds \$5,000, a fine in accordance with this title, imprisonment for not more than 3 years, or both; and"; and

(3) in subsection (f), by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", or real property owned or leased by a nonprofit, religiously affiliated organization".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNITY SAFETY AND SECURITY ACT OF 2018

Mrs. HANDEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1051, I call up the bill (H.R. 6691) to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the definition of "crime of violence", and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6691

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 "Community Safety and Security Act of 2018".

SEC. 2. CRIME OF VIOLENCE.

Section 16 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 16. CRIME OF VIOLENCE DEFINED.

"(a) The term 'crime of violence' means an offense—

"(1)(A) that—

"(i) is murder, voluntary manslaughter, assault, sexual abuse or aggravated sexual abuse, abusive sexual contact, child abuse, kidnapping, robbery, carjacking, firearms use, burglary, arson, extortion, communication of threats, coercion, fleeing, interference with flight crew members and attendants, domestic violence, hostage taking, stalking, human trafficking, piracy, or a terrorism offense as described in chapter 113B (other than in section 2332d); or

"(ii) involves the unlawful possession or use of a weapon of mass destruction; or

"(B) that involves use or unlawful possession of explosives or destructive devices described in 5845(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

"(2) that has as an element the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against the person or property of another; or

"(3) that is an attempt to commit, conspiracy to commit, solicitation to commit, or aiding and abetting any of the offenses set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2).

"(b) In this section:

"(1) The term 'abusive sexual contact' means conduct described in section 2244(a)(1) and (a)(2).

"(2) The terms 'aggravated sexual abuse' and 'sexual abuse' mean conduct described in sections 2241 and 2242. For purposes of such conduct, the term 'sexual act' means conduct described in section 2246(2), or the knowing and lewd exposure of genitalia or masturbation, to any person, with an intent to abuse, humiliate, harass, degrade, or arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person.

"(3) The term 'assault' means conduct described in section 113(a), and includes conduct committed recklessly, knowingly, or intentionally.

"(4) The term 'arson' means conduct described in section 844(i) or unlawfully or willfully damaging or destroying any building, inhabited structure, vehicle, vessel, or real property by means of fire or explosive.

"(5) The term 'burglary' means an unlawful or unprivileged entry into, or remaining in, a building or structure, including any nonpermanent or mobile structure that is adapted or used for overnight accommodation or for the ordinary carrying on of business, and, either before or after entering, the person—

"(A) forms the intent to commit a crime; or

"(B) commits or attempts to commit a crime.

"(6) The term 'carjacking' means conduct described in section 2119, or the unlawful taking of a motor vehicle from the immediate actual possession of a person against his will, by means of actual or threatened force, or violence or intimidation, or by sudden or stealthy seizure or snatching, or fear of injury.

"(7) The term 'child abuse' means the unlawful infliction of physical injury or the commission of any sexual act against a child under fourteen by any person eighteen years of age or older.

"(8) The term 'communication of threats' means conduct described in section 844(e), or the transmission of any communications containing any threat of use of violence to—

"(A) demand or request for a ransom or reward for the release of any kidnapped person; or

"(B) threaten to kidnap or injure the person of another.

"(9) The term 'coercion' means causing the performance or non-performance of any act

by another person under which such other person has a legal right to do or to abstain from doing, through fraud or by the use of actual or threatened force, violence, or fear thereof, including the use, or an express or implicit threat of use, of violence to cause harm, or threats to cause injury to the person, reputation or property of any person.

“(10) The term ‘domestic violence’ means any assault committed by a current or former spouse, parent, or guardian of the victim, by a person with whom the victim shares a child in common, by a person who is cohabiting with or has cohabited with the victim as a spouse, parent, or guardian, or by a person similarly situated to a spouse, parent, or guardian of the victim.

“(11) The term ‘extortion’ means conduct described in section 1951(b)(2), but not extortion under color of official right or fear of economic loss.

“(12) The term ‘firearms use’ means conduct described in section 924(c) or 929(a), if the firearm was brandished, discharged, or otherwise possessed, carried, or used as a weapon and the crime of violence or drug trafficking crime during and in relation to which the firearm was possessed, carried, or used was subject to prosecution in any court of the United States, State court, military court or tribunal, or tribal court. Such term also includes unlawfully possessing a firearm described in section 5845(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (such as a sawed-off shotgun or sawed-off rifle, silencer, bomb, or machine gun), possession of a firearm in violation of sections 922(g)(1), 922(g)(2) and 922(g)(4), possession of a firearm with the intent to use such firearm unlawfully, or reckless discharge of a firearm at a dwelling.

“(13) The term ‘fleeing’ means knowingly operating a motor vehicle and, following a law enforcement officer’s signal to bring the motor vehicle to a stop—

“(A) failing or refusing to comply; or

“(B) fleeing or attempting to elude a law enforcement officer.

“(14) The term ‘force’ means the level of force capable of causing physical pain or injury or needed or intended to overcome resistance.

“(15) The term ‘hostage taking’ means conduct described in section 1203.

“(16) The term ‘human trafficking’ means conduct described in sections 1589, 1590, and 1591.

“(17) The term ‘interference with flight crew members and attendants’ means conduct described in section 46504 of title 49, United States Code.

“(18) The term ‘kidnapping’ means conduct described in section 1201(a)(1) or seizing, confining, inveigling, decoying, abducting, or carrying away and holding for ransom or reward or otherwise any person.

“(19) The term ‘murder’ means conduct described as murder in the first degree or murder in the second degree described in section 1111.

“(20) The term ‘robbery’ means conduct described in section 1951(b)(1), or the unlawful taking or obtaining of personal property from the person or in the presence of another, against his will, by means of actual or threatened force, or violence or intimidation, or by sudden or stealthy seizure or snatching, or fear of injury, immediate or future, to his person or property, or property in his custody or possession, or the person or property of a relative or member of his family or of anyone in his company at the time of the taking or obtaining.

“(21) The term ‘stalking’ means conduct described in section 2261A.

“(22) The term ‘weapon of mass destruction’ has the meaning given such term in section 2332a(c).

“(23) The term ‘voluntary manslaughter’ means conduct described in section 1112(a).

“(c) For purposes of this section, in the case of any reference in subsection (b) to an offense under this title, such reference shall include conduct that constitutes an offense under State or tribal law or under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, if such conduct would be an offense under this title if a circumstance giving rise to Federal jurisdiction had existed.

“(d) For purposes of this section, the term ‘conspiracy’ includes any offense that is a conspiracy to commit another offense under State or Federal law, irrespective of whether proof of an overt act is required to establish commission of the conspiracy offense.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. HANDEL) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HANDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 6691.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6691, the Community Safety and Security Act of 2018. This legislation provides critical clarity to the definition of “crime of violence” in the United States Code in order to keep violent criminals off the streets and ensure the safety of our communities.

In the recent U.S. Supreme Court case *United States v. Dimaya*, the term “crime of violence” was determined to be unconstitutionally vague. Therefore, it is incumbent upon Congress to act to provide the necessary clarity in the law that allows our law enforcement and our judicial systems to work and, importantly, to protect the victims of these violent crimes.

The Community Safety and Security Act of 2018 provides that clarity by precisely and legally defining the phrase “crime of violence” and the related criminal acts that, when combined with the element of force are, indeed, considered violent.

They include crimes such as voluntary manslaughter, attempted kidnapping, lewd acts upon a child, sexual assault, assault on a police officer, domestic violence, murder, and all other crimes that a normal, regular individual would think of as a violent crime, as well as human trafficking.

In my State of Georgia, metro Atlanta is well known as a haven for human and sex trafficking, and as a recruiting center for vulnerable young people. In 2017 alone, it was reported

that nearly 3,600 females and more than 600 males were trafficked. These are just the reported cases. Thousands more go unreported every year.

This legislation that I bring forward today provides essential legal clarity to ensure that crimes like human trafficking and others in the bill are deemed legally as crimes of violence.

Failure to address this issue would foster vagueness and uncertainty in our courts, and potentially disrupt the prosecution of certain crimes of violence, like human trafficking, child abuse, domestic violence, and other acts that any reasonable individual would consider a crime of violence.

This legislation has the support of a number of organizations, including the Fraternal Order of Police and the National Association of Police Organizations.

In a recent letter to Speaker RYAN and Leader PELOSI, the Fraternal Order of Police noted that “there are numerous convictions and pending cases that would be jeopardized” in the wake of the *Dimaya* decision.

The Community Safety and Security Act of 2018 is another step that we, as Congress, can take, that we must take, in order to make our communities the safest that they can possibly be. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

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

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

I will take the opportunity to say good morning to the manager of the bill, my co-member on the House Judiciary Committee. I start this way, Mr. Speaker, and to my colleagues, because I always want to emphasize when I am on the floor that the Judiciary Committee has had many instances of bipartisanship.

I am very glad to have been on the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee for more than a number of years. I have seen our work, and it has certainly been in a bipartisan mode.

I want to acknowledge the chairman of the committee, Mr. GOODLATTE, and the ranking member of the committee, Mr. NADLER. In many instances on the crime reform issues, we have tried to work hand-in-hand together.

It seems that criminal justice reform has partners on both sides of the aisle. It is certainly an issue that draws a vast number of stakeholders, particularly my friends in the faith community; social justice community; my friends in the libertarian community, if you will; and, certainly, giants like the ACLU, the Lawyers’ Committee, and many others that have been engaged in these issues, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund. So you can see that we bring people together.

So I rise to discuss H.R. 6691, the Community Safety and Security Act of 2018, which amends section 16 of title 18.

Section 16 sets forth the universal definition of what constitutes a crime of violence for the entirety of the criminal code. Therefore, this definition is critically important, and I am deeply concerned that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are introducing such an important amendment in such a hasty, precipitous manner.

Although my colleagues claim that the introduction of this bill has not been hasty and that it has been vetted for months on their side of the aisle, on our side of the aisle, we have had no engagement.

This bill has been laid before us for 7 days. Last Friday, it was singly introduced when Members were not here and, as well, before a 3-day weekend.

Let me be very clear. Criminal justice reform is not a sausage. We would work over the months and years with academic experts; victims; law enforcement—that is our family; and beyond, our prosecutors; our law enforcement; and, certainly, the Sentencing Commission, for example; our judges. We are concerned about their viewpoints.

So I know there may be one or two who have written and may be supporting this, but this is not the way we get to the floor.

H.R. 6691 would expand the definition of crimes of violence in section 16 in two ways: enumerating certain offenses that do not currently exist under Federal law, and it would have been good to have a hearing or a series of hearings on this to be recognized for crimes of violence for Federal purposes; and by adding alternative definitions to already-existing Federal offenses, in order to have these new definitions also qualify as Federal crimes of violence.

Again, here is the trigger: More and more people incarcerated maybe could find another way of addressing these questions, even by law enforcement.

The Supreme Court recently decided *Sessions v. Dimaya*, holding that subsection (b) of section 16, known as the residual clause, is unconstitutionally vague. Subsection (a) in the *Dimaya* case left untouched defines a crime of violence as one that requires as an element, the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against the person or property of another.

In response to *Dimaya*, my colleagues are now putting forth a bill to substitute subsection (b) for a list of crimes of violence, many of which have no element involving the use, attempted use, or threatened use of force.

In addition, even the residual clause stricken down by *Dimaya* requires that a crime of violence at least be a felony. H.R. 6691 strips away the felony requirement.

For these reasons, this bill radically amends section 16. We go back to the old days of throwing everybody in jail.

This bill does not just list a few statutes that are obvious crimes of violence. It enumerates at least 32 separate crimes, some of which are not Fed-

eral crimes. It even offers alternative definitions for several Federal crimes. This requires careful consideration.

How dare anyone suggest that anyone on this side of the aisle is soft on crime. Some of my best friends, as we have heard others say in other settings, are law enforcement. I speak to my police officers every time I see them in the district. I am talking to the command frequently. Sometimes I congratulate them for a successful capture of a dastardly criminal.

Obviously, many of those crimes are State laws. But I know the State of Texas has been working to reduce the numbers of persons incarcerated. There is no doubt with law enforcement who the bad actors are. On the Federal level, it is the same.

But here we are, with a 1-week-old baby that has not been vetted and helped and nurtured to be able to make it work. This is serious work that we do here. So rather than proceeding through regular order by having a hearing to ascertain the relevant information from experts that will help us establish the best approach for dealing with the constitutionality of section 16, and the Federal definition of crimes of violence, we have been given 1 week to vote, with no markups to allow amendments germane to the bill's purpose.

Mr. Speaker, regular order is not a crime. Instead of taking the time to fashion a definition that takes into consideration the many legal ramifications of changing this term as proposed, the bill's sponsors are haphazardly pushing forward an overly expansive definition of crime of violence for political purposes.

Where are my civil libertarians? Where are my persons who believe in the Constitution, due process?

The bill is overbroad; two, unnecessary; and three, it could have substantial harmful effects.

First, the bill is overbroad and includes in its list of crimes of violence a number of offenses that have no element of violence or force at all. No one likes burglary, but burglary, for example, is included in the enumerated list of crimes of violence, though it would simply mean remaining in a building without authorization and, while there, forming the attempt to commit even a minor, nonviolent offense.

Likewise, the bill lists coercion through fraud as a violent felony, though violence plays no part in that criminal offense.

The bill would also make simple assault a crime of violence, even in the circumstances where the underlying act is merely a push or a shove.

None of us applaud any of that, but we recognize in this vast country that our citizens have basic rights. One of the more egregious examples of an offense listed as a crime of violence is fleeing by automobile, which is knowingly operating a motor vehicle and failing or refusing to comply with a law enforcement officer's signal to

bring the motor vehicle to a stop, or fleeing or attempting to elude a law enforcement officer. This definition does not even require intent to elude law enforcement.

Under this bill, what could have amounted to a traffic violation is, instead, a crime of violence.

It doesn't mean that we do not utilize these elements, but we are able to have vetted it in a way that truly is the crime that law enforcement seeks to protect themselves against and the public against.

Another specific area of concern is in the context of juvenile justice. If the Federal Government is prosecuting a juvenile, this bill would authorize the government to seek the transfer to adult court of someone as young as 15 years old if they were accused of committing a felony crime of violence. That may be a burglary, unintentionally in a building. We note where teenagers are and how they behave.

Under this new definition is even interference with a flight crew or an argument with a flight attendant over a Diet Coke.

□ 0930

And we want safety everywhere, on the highways and byways, throughout our neighborhoods and schools. We want to make sure that we attend to this, but this is serious work and it should have been done in regular order.

The consequences of H.R. 6691 are dangerous, especially as we look to the new attitude of the Justice Department, which is charging on every offense. Unlike the comprehensive and collaborative manner previously utilized in the past administration, working with faith leaders, working with law enforcement, working with advocates for social and criminal justice, U.S. attorneys were directed to not charge up, to focus on the highest crime.

Now we have the tendency to use a sprawling, overbroad definition of violent crime to justify more arrests and prosecutions and long prison sentences.

Has anybody met an ex-felon, many of them wanting to do right? I see a lot of them where good businesses have hired them. They want their head down, they want to work, they want to get an apartment, they want to support their family. They are not interested in going back again, nor are they interested in being accused of a minor offense and being "felonized," if you will.

Second, a new definition of "crime of violence" is unnecessary, even in light of *Dimaya*. The court in *Dimaya* held that the residual clause is unconstitutional, but left in place subsection a. While perhaps not an ideal formulation, subsection a can, for now, suffice as a placeholder until Congress can undertake a more deliberate approach. Even so the Senate would have a companion bill, which to our knowledge, it does not. It is important to take note of the fact.

Third, changing the definition of a crime of violence can have other harmful effects; for example, it could have

significant exclusionary effects for criminal justice reform legislation. There is proposed legislation that excludes people convicted of a crime of violence from pretrial release considerations, expungement of crimes, and receiving visitors. So it would exclude people convicted of a crime of violence from pretrial release consideration, expungement of crimes, and receiving visitors while in custody. Unnecessarily expanding who is ineligible for these provisions is both unwise and counterproductive.

So as I have indicated, it is important that when we work together, we must work together through the goals of reforming our criminal justice system, which Congress has acknowledged needs dire fixing. Let's work together.

I am pushing for the revisions of criminal justice reform for juveniles. Reforming the juvenile justice system that locks up juveniles forever and ever because they are not sentenced in many instances. Certainly there are few juveniles in the Federal system, but in our State systems. And when we use the bully pulpit, States begin to reform their systems.

In addition, Families Against Mandatory Minimums, ACLU, Center for American Progress, and several others have opposed this bill.

We are on the Judiciary Committee. We believe in justice. Along with the advocates, we need true experts, and we are experts on these subject matters. And we are troubled by the reckless speed in which this bill was brought to the floor.

We understand the intent. We welcome it. But I have listed the fractures, the problems, the undermining of due process, the throwing the key away on good people who want to do better or who did not intend to exercise some of the elements that are in this bill.

So I ask my colleagues in this instance to recognize that this is too fast and to vote "no" on this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss H.R. 6691, the "Community Safety and Security Act of 2018," which amends section 16 of Title 18.

Section 16 sets forth the universal definition of what constitutes a "crime of violence" for the entirety of the criminal code.

Therefore, this definition is critically important and I am deeply concerned that my colleagues on the other side are introducing such an important amendment in such a reckless manner.

Although my colleagues claim that the introduction of this bill has not been hasty and that it has been vetted for months, on this side we have had this bill for seven days. It was introduced exactly one week ago today, on the day before a three-day weekend. That is reckless.

H.R. 6691 would expand the definition of crimes of violence in section 16 in two ways: (1) by enumerating certain offenses that do not currently exist under Federal law to be recognized as crimes of violence for Federal purposes; and (2) by adding alternative definitions to already-existing Federal offenses in order to have these new definitions also qualify as Federal crimes of violence.

The Supreme Court recently decided *Sessions v. Dimaya*, holding that subsection (b) of section 16, known as the "residual clause," is unconstitutionally vague.

Subsection (a), which *Dimaya* left untouched, defines a crime of violence as one that requires, as an element, the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against the person or property of another.

In response to *Dimaya*, my colleagues are now putting forth this bill to substitute subsection (b) for a list of "crimes of violence," many of which have no element involving the use, attempted use, or threatened use of force.

In addition, even the residual clause stricken down by *Dimaya* required that a crime of violence at least be a felony. H.R. 6691 strips away the felony requirement.

For these reasons, this bill radically amends section 16. This bill does not just list a few statutes that are obvious crimes of violence. It enumerates at least 32 separate crimes, some of which are not Federal crimes, and it even offers alternative definitions for several Federal crimes. This requires careful consideration.

But rather than proceeding through regular order by having a hearing, to ascertain relevant information from experts that will help us establish the best approach for dealing with the constitutionality of section 16 and the Federal definition of crimes of violence, we have been given one week to vote, with no markups to allow amendments, germane to the bill's purpose.

Instead of taking the time to fashion a definition that takes into consideration the many legal ramifications of changing this term as proposed, the bill's sponsors are haphazardly pushing forward an overly-expansive definition of "crime of violence" for political purposes. The bill is (1) overbroad, (2) unnecessary, and (3) could have substantial harmful effects.

First, the bill is overbroad and includes in its list of crimes of violence a number of offenses that have no element of violence, or force, at all. Burglary, for example, is included in the enumerated list of crimes of violence though it could simply mean remaining in a building without authorization and, while there, forming the intent to commit even a minor, non-violent offense. Likewise, the bill lists coercion through fraud as a violent felony, though violence plays no part in that criminal offense. The bill would also make simple assault a crime of violence even in circumstances where the underlying act is merely a push or a shove.

One of the more egregious examples of an offense listed as a crime of violence is "fleeing by automobile" which is "knowingly operating a motor vehicle and—(A) failing or refusing to comply with a law enforcement officer's signal to bring the motor vehicle to a stop; or (B) fleeing or attempting to elude a law enforcement officer." This definition does not even require an intent to elude law enforcement. Under this bill, what could have amounted to a traffic violation becomes, instead, a "crime of violence".

Another specific area of concern is in the context of juvenile justice. If the Federal government is prosecuting a juvenile, this bill would authorize the government to seek transfer to adult court of someone as young as 15 years old if they are accused of committing a

felony "crime of violence" under this new definition—even for something as minor as getting in an argument with a flight attendant over a Diet Coke.

The consequences of H.R. 6691 are dangerous, especially in the hands of a Sessions Justice Department, which has displayed a general tendency to use a sprawling, overbroad definition of violent crime to justify more arrests and prosecutions and longer prison sentences.

Second, a new definition of crime of violence is unnecessary, even in light of *Dimaya*. The Court in *Dimaya* held that the residual clause is unconstitutional, but left in place subsection (a). While perhaps not an ideal formulation, subsection (a) can for now suffice as a placeholder until Congress can undertake a more deliberate approach, instead of the reflexive one proposed by H.R. 6691.

Third, changing the definition of a crime of violence can have other harmful effects. For example, it could have significant exclusionary effects for criminal justice reform legislation. There is proposed legislation that excludes people convicted of a crime of violence from pretrial release considerations, expungement of crimes, and receiving visitors while in custody. Unnecessarily expanding who is ineligible for these provisions is both unwise and counterproductive to the goals of reforming our criminal justice system, which Congress has acknowledged needs dire fixing.

Families Against Mandatory Minimum (FAMM), ACLU, Center for American Progress (CAP), and several other organizations have opposed this bill.

We on the Judiciary Committee, along with advocates that are true experts on these subject matters are troubled by the reckless speed with which this bill was brought to the floor today.

We should take the time to explore why.

According to a recent report by the Pew Research Center on January 12, 2018, the number of African Americans in prisons are 33 percent. The number of Hispanics are 23 percent. Therefore, together they make up 56 percent of today's prison population.

Mrs. HANDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, to my colleague from Texas, I want to say good morning to her as well and also recognize her significant efforts in criminal justice reform, and indeed I was proud to be able to support that recent piece of legislation that came through our committee as well.

A couple of points. I very much appreciate the concerns that have been raised, Mr. Speaker, but I assure you that this law, as crafted, does not go beyond the scope contemplated when Section 16 was originally crafted.

This is a responsible, carefully crafted piece of legislation that does what the United States Supreme Court recommended. It enumerates what crimes are crimes of violence so that there can be no vagueness and people know what the law is. In fact, it goes to protect due process, Mr. Speaker.

This is our responsibility as legislators. And indeed, Mr. Speaker, time is of the essence, given the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision, and indeed

there would be substantial harmful effects if we fail as Congress to act today on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman HANDEL for bringing this forth, this very important piece of legislation that has been reviewed by the United States Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court in *Sessions v. Dimaya* ruled that 18 U.S.C. Section 16 was unconstitutionally void for vagueness.

That is the way the process works. We, the legislators, write the law, not an unelected bureaucrat. We, as legislators, are supposed to write the law, then the court interprets that law if an issue is brought before the court, as in this particular case.

So there is a several-page slip opinion, we call it, that explains why the court ruled the way it did, saying we need more of an explanation as to what a violent crime is. The court ruled that the statute in question failed to properly provide a definition for a crime of violence.

H.R. 6691 eliminates that vagueness and addresses the Supreme Court's concerns and preserves the pre-*Dimaya* status quo.

It has the support of the Justice Department.

The legislation before us today is supported by the Department of Justice, I want to reemphasize that, and will properly define what a crime of violence is. It is clearly delineated here in eight pages, the crimes, what constitutes them, the meaning, the intent, crime by crime on these pages. It does not prevent anyone from due process.

As a former Federal prosecutor and State prosecutor, I have seen serious violent crimes that were committed. And we must make sure that those that are here illegally and commit these violent crimes be sent back to their countries from where they came.

Over 18 years as a prosecutor, I have seen my share of bodies on slabs in morgues because of violent crime, and many of those were young kids.

This legislation defines crime by crime by crime and sets forth the criteria that the legislature was responsible for doing in the first place.

I want to explain the process on how this works. The crime is committed, it is reported, law enforcement goes in and does an investigation. If they feel that a crime has been committed, they file a complaint or go to the DA or go to the United States Attorney and present probable cause, evidence that the crime probably was committed. And then, in whatever situation, whether it is the State or the Federal level, there can be an indictment, the evidence can go before a grand jury, and then the decision is made if it proceeds. Then that individual goes before a judge on a preliminary hearing to the point where the person's actual con-

stitutional rights kick in. None of that, none of that is eliminated.

I support this legislation because of what I have seen over my career. And taking care of issues of violence that we see so much of and the violence that we see, particularly by individuals that are here illegally, this remedies that matter.

We have a lot of violence in this country committed by people that are citizens, and we take care of that through the judicial system as well.

But this is commonsense legislation. It addresses the issue immediately and it does what the American people want it to do.

There is due process, but if you are here illegally, you commit a violent crime, and once that is established, then you are sent back to your country of origin.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, if I might respond to the gentleman's presentation.

Due process is denied and could be denied, based upon the fact that there is no element of the offenses that are just listed in a laundry-list type. That would come about if we had done this in an extensive manner of review.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law and a member of the Judiciary Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6691, the so-called Community Safety and Security Act.

This legislation would dramatically expand the definition of a crime of violence in the Federal criminal code, with many, many unintended consequences. The gentlewoman from Texas spoke about fleeing. That is just one example of one of the unintended consequences of this.

This is partly happening because this legislation is being rushed through the House without any meaningful debate or committee consideration. It was introduced just last week before the Labor Day weekend when most Members were home for the district work period. We have had zero markups, zero hearings on this bill, and this bill has never been considered in the previous Congress. So not in this Congress, not in the previous Congress.

It has not been considered through regular order, and that means key stakeholders, like outside experts and criminal justice reform advocates, have been given little chance to provide input on the bill.

It is a demonstration, frankly, of the arrogance of this body. We don't even think we need to listen to anybody about the implications of this bill. We know best. We are not going to have a hearing. We are just going to bring it to the floor.

In the very short time that the public has had to analyze it, groups like Families Against Mandatory Minimums, the ACLU, and the National Immigration Justice Center have expressed opposition to the bill.

It is basically fast tracked, even though changing the definition of a crime of violence will have a domino effect on our laws, given its prevalence in Federal criminal law and its application in immigration law.

This so-called Community Safety and Security Act could lead to more criminalization, harsh sentencing, and unfair results. It is overly broad and will open the doors to massive incarceration and people being unjustifiably detained, both pretrial and post-conviction. It could exacerbate racial disparities that already exist in policing and in the courts, and it could accelerate the number of immigrant detentions and deportations.

I really don't understand why my Republican colleagues are scrambling to push this through, this just-introduced bill, without careful consideration.

We do have to respond to the Supreme Court decision. We need to do it properly, and after careful deliberations, with a full understanding of all of the consequences. This bill will have far-reaching effects, not only on citizens of this country, but on people who are here in the United States.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, passing this bill today without a full understanding of these effects would be irresponsible.

We have been able to engage in really deliberative, thoughtful consideration of criminal justice reform. This May we passed the FIRST STEP Act. There was a lot of good bipartisan collaboration. There were hearings and discussions and listening to experts. That is how we should be doing business. This will affect people's lives.

We have a lot more work to do. I encourage my colleagues to reject this legislation so that we can get back to working in a bipartisan way to get rid of mandatory minimums, to making investments in reentry programs, to ending racial profiling, and so many of the other reforms that I know we can work on together. That is how we should be doing the business of the American people, not jamming things through in the dark of night with no hearings, no witnesses, no understanding of the bill that just passed.

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

Mr. Speaker, first, I certainly appreciate my colleagues and the fact that they have read the bill so very thoroughly.

I must reiterate, however, that this legislation is not overly broad. In fact, it specifically maintains the status quo. And we drew those lines because

we crafted the bill to maintain that status quo.

The legislation will not be able to fix some of the outrageous injustices that have occurred when courts have found certain offenses do not qualify as crimes of violence. For example, where a defendant who has a conviction for sexual abuse escapes more serious consequences because the State's sexual abuse statute also encompasses certain consensual conduct and, therefore, it was not categorically a crime of violence even when and where this particular defendant committed horrific acts that were most certainly not consensual.

□ 0945

Some of these injustices must be fixed through State legislation. We refrained specifically from expanding the law, despite the very human desire to want to fix these kinds of injustices and recognizing that the States have the duty to fix this.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, does affect people's lives. Specifically, it is going to affect the lives of individuals who are victims of violent crimes.

A couple more points have been raised. First of all, on the issue of fleeing, we have heard the concerns that the written text is a little bit too broad on fleeing. Well, let me just correct that. Courts have found fleeing to be a crime of violence. This is not an expansion. This applies only in vehicles. It is not on foot.

The Seventh Circuit called this specific conduct "inherently aggressive." The 11th Circuit reasoned that "fleeing from law enforcement, an individual has already resorted to an extreme measure to avoid arrest, signaling that he is likely prepared to resort to the use of physical force."

So, Mr. Speaker, we approach this bill with great diligence. Time, as I said, is of the essence, given the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision. We heard from the police officers association that they are very concerned about the fact that pending cases and convictions could be effective if Congress does not act. Indeed, substantial harm will occur if we fail to act.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the status quo is the very point we are making, that the status quo is the unclarity, if you will, and, therefore, it is important that we pursue this in a manner of constructively understanding what is the best approach to protect the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), the vice ranking member on the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 6691, the Community Safety and Security Act of 2018.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to my colleague's attention an issue I don't

think the majority considered when rushing this bill to the floor without any hearings or markup. They departed from regular order, and doing so always has some, I think, unintended consequences.

H.R. 6691 will help deport veterans, people who have served in our military and often who have served in combat. Current law makes certain crimes a deportable offense for legal permanent residents. For the thousands of service-members and veterans who are legal permanent residents, this bill will make it easier to deport them.

If a soldier comes home with PTSD or if a veteran is struggling with substance abuse or gets in trouble with the law, this bill makes it harder to grant them any kind of discretion.

I have met with dozens of deported veterans who have served their country honorably, even been to war, but were deported when they came home. They made mistakes. They paid their debt to society, and their service meant nothing when it came time to permanently banish them from our country.

Now, that is unfair. It is cruel and unusual punishment. I believe that if anyone deserves a second chance in our country, it is our veterans.

Now, I agree with many of my colleagues that the Supreme Court is right and that we need to change the vagueness in the current law; however, we need to do that through regular order. This bill would classify certain crimes as violent, even if no one was harmed in the act. These are serious issues and they deserve a serious process.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will have many unintended consequences if made into law. I implore my colleagues to vote against it and have it go through regular order and get the hearings that it merits.

Mrs. HANDEL. Mr. Speaker, just one clarification to the most recent comments. The part that was left out in those comments was the fact that it would apply only if a violent crime is committed.

May I inquire as to how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Georgia has 18¾ minutes remaining.

Mrs. HANDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation introduced by my colleague, Congresswoman KAREN HANDEL from Georgia, H.R. 6691, the Community Safety and Security Act.

This is an important piece of legislation for multiple reasons. First, passage of this legislation fulfills Congress' duty to fix a loophole in our Federal legal code that the Supreme Court has decided must be changed. Specifically, the U.S. Supreme Court has said that our definition of "crime of violence" is unconstitutionally vague, ap-

plicable throughout U.S. Code. This means courts must decide on a case-by-case basis which crimes are of violence and which are not.

Unfortunately, this vagueness leads to inconsistencies. Individuals who commit crimes of sexual assault, kidnapping, assault on a police officer, and much more may be set free by the courts because of this vague phrase in our code.

With this legislation, we can ensure those committing these acts stay behind bars. And further, fixing this problem is exactly what Congress was designed to do, allowing those elected directly by the people to create and update the laws we live by, creating consistent and clear laws to uphold the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I thank my colleague from Georgia for sponsoring this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, if I might inquire how many speakers the gentlewoman from Georgia has remaining.

Mrs. HANDEL. Mr. Speaker, I have two additional speakers.

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

Mrs. HANDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING).

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6691, the Community Safety and Security Act, and urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

I also want to thank my colleague, Congresswoman HANDEL, for her very hard work in advancing this legislation.

In April, as we know, the Supreme Court held, in *Sessions v. Dimaya*, that the term "crime of violence" was unconstitutionally vague. This decision meant certain obviously violent offenses would no longer qualify as violent crimes and, thus, made it more challenging to deport illegal immigrants who have committed what we would all call violent crimes.

Justice Gorsuch was the deciding vote in the case, casting his vote for fear that vague laws invite arbitrary power. In his opinion, he indicated that it was the duty of the legislature to add to the list of what constitutes a crime of violence that could lead to a person's deportation. This legislation does just that.

As a former United States attorney, I understand that clarity is the cornerstone of justice. So by clearly defining what constitutes a violent crime, we are not only strengthening our judicial system, but also ensuring the safety of the American people.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, earlier I indicated the work of the Judiciary Committee, and it has been enhanced by the ranking member, Mr. NADLER. We have worked on criminal justice issues bipartisanship, and I want to thank Mr. NADLER for doing so. That is the tragedy of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I must oppose the so-called Community Safety and Security Act. This highly flawed bill is an example of why regular order and a meaningful, deliberative process is essential to the proper crafting of legislation.

Last April, the Supreme Court, in *Sessions v. Dimaya*, ruled that a portion of the criminal code's definition of criminal violence is unconstitutionally vague. That was nearly 6 months ago.

The Judiciary Committee has had ample time to examine the decision, to hold hearings, to gather input from a range of stakeholders, and to carefully develop legislation through markup and regular order—but none of those things have happened.

Instead, a bill with significant ramifications for criminal law in immigration cases was introduced just last week while Members were out of town and is being rushed to the floor today without any hearings, without any markup, without any adequate opportunity for review by the public, by legal experts, or by stakeholders. So it is not a surprise that we are left with many unanswered questions and concerns about the impact of the bill.

The term “crime of violence” is referred to throughout the criminal code and is, for example, used to determine whether a juvenile may be prosecuted as an adult in Federal court. It also has serious implications in immigration law because a noncitizen convicted of an aggravated felony, described under the Immigration and Nationality Act to include a crime of violence under this section, is deportable and would be denied the opportunity for certain discretionary relief from removal.

If we do not define this term properly, it could have significant adverse consequences. H.R. 6691 specifies a long list of offenses that would be considered crimes of violence, some of which are not currently included in the Federal criminal code. The bill further defines some of the offenses that are in the code, adding layers of confusion to the bill.

We need proper definitions. For example, the crime of fleeing is identified as a crime of violence. Now, if by fleeing you mean that, when the cop pulls you over, you hit the gas and flee at 100 miles per hour, endangering anybody on the road, that is a crime of violence. But if by fleeing it is meant that you don't pull over immediately because you are looking for a safe place to stop, well, that probably shouldn't be a crime of violence, and yet, in this bill, it seems to be.

We should carefully examine all of these offenses to determine which are appropriate to be included in this definition, and we should consider what the consequences will be for each one.

In writing for the majority in *Dimaya*, Justice Kagan noted that:

A host of issues respecting the definition of “crime of violence” application to specific crimes divide the Federal appellate courts.

Although Congress has the power to clarify the definition or to establish a new one, as this bill would do, it is absolutely essential that we consider carefully what offenses should be included.

Indeed, in considering a change to the definition of “crime of violence” for the purposes of the sentencing guidelines, the United States Sentencing Commission held a hearing and received testimony. It also sought public comments in response to proposed revisions. At a minimum, we should do the same.

Finally, I note that, even in the brief time since the bill has been introduced, a week, a broad array of advocates have expressed opposition to this bill, including the American Civil Liberties Union and Families Against Mandatory Minimums.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the additional time.

Others opposing the bill are Asian Americans Advancing Justice, the Immigrant Justice Network, the Immigrant Defense Project, the National Center for Lesbian Rights, the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, and others. Such opposition should, at the very least, tell us that we should not be considering this legislation without thoughtful deliberation.

This bill is a perfect example of a bill whose topics should be covered, but we could do it properly instead of having a sloppily drafted bill that does things we don't know it does and doesn't do things we think it does. We must have a hearing. We should have testimony. We should carefully consider this bill, and then we should pass some version of it.

For those reasons, I oppose passage of this version of this bill, and I ask that we take the time to examine this issue through regular order.

Mrs. HANDEL. Mr. Speaker, again, I want to make the point that time really is of the essence in being able to protect due process and, equally and perhaps more importantly, being able to protect victims of certain violent crimes.

For example, right now, today, under Fourth Circuit precedent, sex trafficking is not considered a crime of violence; and I think that most of us would all agree that sex trafficking is, indeed, a crime of violence.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Georgia has 14¾ minutes remaining.

Mrs. HANDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some clarifications. First of all, I am tired of hearing from the other side that bills are rushed through, bills are pushed through, there is no thought put into this, which is nothing more than a red herring.

□ 1000

The Supreme Court said that the term “crime of violence” is not specific enough. So what we did was we put into this new statute this new law explaining what murder is, and voluntary manslaughter, sexual abuse, aggravated assault, aggravated sexual abuse, child abuse, kidnapping, robbery, carjacking, firearms use, burglary, arson, extortion, communication of threats, and fleeing.

These are already laws that have been on the books for two decades. The Court just simply said it wants the specifics in the legislation for removing someone who is here illegally and who has committed one of these crimes.

Now, let's go into this. They are making, again, a red herring, a big deal, out of this term “fleeing.” Now, all the crimes, plus there were many more in here that I didn't have time to go over, explain and define those.

One thing I want to talk about in “fleeing” is, it is not if a person is speeding and an officer wants to stop that person and the person drives a little longer to find a safe place to pull over. That is absurd.

Here is the term. “Fleeing” means knowingly operating a motor vehicle and, following a law enforcement officer's signal to bring the motor vehicle to a stop: A, failing or refusing to comply; or, B, fleeing or attempting to elude a law enforcement officer.

The term “force” means the level of force capable of physical pain or injury, or needed or intended to overcome resistance.

That means that that individual is fleeing in that automobile at a high rate of speed to get away from the officer because they don't want to be caught, and that person could cause much more havoc, much more danger and death, to somebody else if, when they are fleeing, they cause an accident.

My colleagues on the other side leave out these important details. It is all listed here. It is very specific. It is exactly what the Court asked for, and this is good law.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, there are some things in this bill that probably make sense, and there are some things in this bill that I think are very poorly crafted and will have adverse implications for juvenile law or for sentencing reform.

We should have had a hearing. We should have looked into this whole

matter and come up with something that we could all support.

Now, one of the things, I hate to say, is that there is a sense of urgency here. The problem is the majority sat on their hands.

This decision of the Supreme Court was April 17 of this year. What did the committee do in response? Nothing. Nothing. No bill was introduced. No hearings were held. Then, last week, this piece of legislation was introduced and rushed to the floor without adequate thought.

So, yes, we need to act, but we need to act like grownups. We need to make sure that we are doing something that makes sense.

I am actually going to vote "present" on this vote, because I don't want a "no" vote on the portions of the bill that I know are correct having to do with child abduction.

But I can't support something that is so poorly crafted, that is a product of such disdain for the need to be serious about this issue.

If we don't want to trample on the good work we did, and we have yet to bring to fruition on sentencing reform the juvenile justice issues that loom so large in our communities, we just can't go ahead blindly on this bill.

I thought it was important to point out that the majority has a responsibility to react to court decisions, and they failed in this case.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Texas has 16¼ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, sometimes vagueness is the extinguishing of constitutional rights. I know, and I will have the numbers, that the predominant numbers of incarcerated persons throughout the Nation are African Americans and Hispanics. That is men and women. A rising number of women are being incarcerated, some of them tied to crimes of their boyfriend, husband, or other significant other.

Juveniles are also being incarcerated throughout the State system.

Mass incarceration is a big deal, so it behooves us to be diligent. In this particular bill, yes, Mr. Speaker, it should have been collaborative and bipartisan, because none of us will yield to a dastardly criminal act that impacts our constituents or the American people. But a fact is a fact. This generates racial disparities.

As my friend from California indicated, individuals who put on the uniform, who may be legal permanent residents, veterans, have the potential, in spite of the uniform that they put on and their willingness to sacrifice their life for America, caught in the wrong situation, could be deported.

This is not to be taken lightly. Frankly, if my friends had studied the

Constitution and read the Supreme Court decision, they would have seen the statement that Justice Kagan made, and that is that this is dividing the Federal appellate courts. She raised the question: Does car burglary qualify as a violent felony under 16(b)? She indicated that some courts say yes, some courts say no.

She went on to say, residential trespass, what is that? The same is true. She went on to say, it does not exhaust the conflict in the courts.

Well, you don't answer the conflict by doing as was stated in the Families Against Mandatory Minimums letter dated September 6. On substantive grounds, H.R. 6691 has the potential to have severe unintended consequences on sentencing in our justice system writ large.

Under this bill, seemingly nonviolent offenses will be considered violent offenses, for example, under H.R. 6691, burglary of an unoccupied home. How many teenagers—I am not condoning that—I am not condoning burglary, but it would be considered a violent offense.

Burglary is a serious offense, but should it be considered violent if the perpetrator does not even interact with another person? Yes, they should be prosecuted. But you have in this bill violent offense.

Then, of course, in this legislation, legal service providers who filed an amicus brief, these are the guys and ladies who are our public defenders who see these people every day—the indigent, and many of them minority—they wind up, as everyone says, on the road in these large, massive prisons, and their lives are ruined because we have not fixed the criminal justice system.

Legal service providers who filed the amicus brief in the Dimaya case described the different applications of subsection (b) of section 16 across Federal circuits, using the example of residential trespass, which was considered a crime of violence by the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals but not by the Seventh Circuit. This bill does little to resolve the inconsistent way courts apply the crime of violence based on subsection (b) because it includes vague definitions of offenses and creates definitions for the same crimes that differ from those currently in the criminal code.

That is a denial of due process, and that is not taking on this important issue. As was mentioned, there is a list of important elements. I support the fact that these are difficult and a terrible dilemma. But it can be done in a manner that is preferable, and that is through unceasing commitment and effort.

Mr. Speaker, this is why we are here today having different positions. I cannot yield to what will be claimed as individuals who do not understand how important this bill is when I know the young African American men and

young men of color who are entrapped in this system, and that the better approach and the better angels are for us to do comprehensive criminal justice reform and, I might add, immigration reform as well.

But let me indicate that we support victims of crime, especially those who are victims of violent crimes. We want relief for them.

This bill dangerously leads to overcriminalization, and we should not take the task of amending the definition of "crime of violence" lightly.

In the Rules Committee, we addressed overcriminalization and mass incarceration. Representative TORRES aptly stated that we should not proceed with haste, which will further exacerbate the overcrowdedness in our prisons.

One Member suggested, in the Rules Committee, just build prisons, that is how we stop this criminal siege, as indicated, even though the FBI and the Bureau of Justice Statistics have indicated that crime is going down.

Yes, we have our concerns. Even conservative groups that work with these very complicated and important criminal justice reform issues, like the Cook Foundation and Right on Crime, do not agree that building more prisons is the answer. Right on Crime states that, by reducing excessive sentence lengths and holding nonviolent offenders accountable through prison alternatives, public safety can often be achieved.

We recognize that the violent perpetrators should be incarcerated. If that is the case, I would stand with my colleague.

I would also stand with the Mothers of the Movement who saw their sons gunned down, in that we need to have relief in that direction.

There are many issues of criminal justice reform that should be on this floor—as I mentioned, sentencing reduction and juvenile justice reform—but we have not come to that point.

So I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues vote "no," because as Justice Kagan said in her opinion, the interpretation of crime and violence has divided the Federal appellate courts because the answer is not obvious. Therefore, we must carefully consider the alternatives to the approach prepared in this bill. We must do more than eliminate vagueness. We must achieve a just and fair result.

Nothing in this Supreme Court opinion, nothing, says, go alone, put a bill on the floor for 1 week, give Members no chance to amend, try to deny due process, build more prisons, make sure that the disparities of those who go into our jails rises and goes up, rather than giving our young people opportunities, a fair chance, and justice. So I ask my colleagues to oppose this bill.

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters from the ACLU, the Center for American Progress, Asian Americans Advancing Justice, the National Center

for Lesbian Rights, and immigrant rights organizations ranging from the National Immigrant Justice Center to others.

ACLU,
September 6, 2018.

Re The ACLU Says Vote NO on H.R. 6691
Community Safety and Security Act of 2018.

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

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), we write to urge you to vote NO on H.R. 6691, the Community Safety and Security Act of 2018. H.R. 6691 is overbroad and expands the definition of a “crime of violence” to include a number of offenses that have no element of violence which will further fuel mass incarceration for low level offenses. The ACLU will include your vote on The Community Safety and Security Act in our voting scorecard for the 115th Congress.

For nearly 100 years, the ACLU has been our nation’s guardian of liberty, working in courts, legislatures, and communities to defend and preserve the individual rights and liberties that the Constitution and the laws of the United States guarantee everyone in this country. With more than 2 million members, activists, and supporters, the ACLU is a nationwide organization that fights tirelessly in all 50 states, Puerto Rico, and Washington, D.C. for the principle that every individual’s rights must be protected equally under the law, regardless of race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, disability, or national origin.

The Community Safety and Security Act is a flawed attempt to address the unconstitutionally vague definition of a crime of violence after the Supreme Court’s decision in *Dimaya v. Sessions*. To the contrary, the bill does not fix the vagueness issue, but actually renders the statute even less clear and concise than the unconstitutional language that the Supreme Court struck down.

H.R. 6691 WILL EXACERBATE MASS INCARCERATION BY EXPANDING THE DEFINITION OF “CRIME OF VIOLENCE”

While H.R. 6691 amends only one definition, it has far reaching impact. The definition of “crime of violence” in 18 U.S.C. §16 is referenced throughout U.S. Code in various contexts including in immigration law. Amending the definition of a “crime of violence” would expand the impact of a number of federal sentencing provisions as well as impact pretrial detention decisions. It would allow for severe, costly, and punitive sentences to apply to low level crimes, and could prevent people accused of misdemeanors from being released pretrial. This hastily drafted legislation would have wide, costly, and harmful consequences.

VAGUENESS HAS NOT BEEN SOLVED

While attempting to address the vague language found unconstitutional in *Dimaya*, this bill creates even more statutory uncertainty in its wake. In the *Dimaya* decision, sub-section (b) of Section 16 was declared unconstitutionally vague in the immigration context due to the arbitrary and unpredictable decisions that were sure to result from its wording. H.R. 6691 however, creates new, imprecise definitions of crimes, adding confusing and ambiguous language to the statute.

Perhaps most concerning is this bill’s inclusion of conduct and offenses unrelated to actual violence in a definition for a “crime

of violence.” For example, the definitions of fleeing, coercion, burglary, and carjacking in H.R. 6691 would include within their list of qualifying conduct for a “crime of violence” acts without threats to or actual bodily harm. The definition of coercion for example, includes coercion by fraud, carrying no risk of actual bodily harm, threatened bodily harm, or fear of bodily harm to the victim. By not connecting behavior that is actually violent to the meaning of a “crime of violence” the legislation diminishes the meaning of violence and opens the door for people convicted of low level, nonviolent offenses to face the same severe sentences as those convicted of more serious offenses.

Legal services providers who filed an amicus brief in the *Dimaya* case described the different application of subsection (b) of Sec. 16 across federal circuits, using the example of residential trespass which was considered a “crime of violence” by the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals but not by the Seventh Circuit. This bill does little to resolve the inconsistent way courts applied the “crime of violence” based on subsection (b) because it too includes vague definitions of offenses and creates definitions for the same crimes that differ from those currently in the criminal code.

For instance, this legislation offers new and alternative meanings to carjacking, fleeing, coercion, and extortion among others without amending the respective criminal code to make them consistent. The definition of carjacking in the bill expands the language to include acts without intent to cause death or serious bodily harm as well as acts that are considered merely unauthorized use of a vehicle. The most confusing and ill-advised expansion in the bill is “fleeing” as a “crime of violence” offering one definition of the offense as simply failing to comply with an officer’s signal to pull over. On top of being somewhat confusing and vague, these new definitions could include routine traffic stops and joyriding. This bill is so broad as to include acts considered non-violent while creating a numerous conflicting definitions of the same conduct.

Instead of attempting to expand the definition of crime of violence to the point of rendering the word “violent” meaningless, a more thoughtful approach would be to adopt the U.S. Sentencing Commission Guidelines list of “crimes of violence” in §4B1.2 that hold true to the meaning of “violent” while solving the vagueness issue found in *Dimaya*. §4B1.2 offers a definition of “crime of violence” as “a murder, voluntary manslaughter, kidnapping, aggravated assault, a forcible sex offense, robbery, arson, extortion, or the use or unlawful possession of a firearm described in 26 U.S.C. §5845(a) or explosive materials defined in 18 U.S.C. §841(c).”

H.R. 6691 IS DUPLICATIVE AND EXCESSIVELY PUNITIVE WHEN APPLIED TO CASES OF DEPORTATIONS

The term “crime of violence” is included in one of the harshest provisions of our immigration laws—triggering mandatory detention and leading to deportation with little to no due process. By expanding the existing “crime of violence” definition, H.R. 6691 would lead to generally non-violent offenses—such as communication of threats or simple assault (which could include minor offenses such as spitting on another person)—triggering no-bond detention and deportation. Currently, immigrants who have had contact with the criminal justice system are often subject to harsh and overbroad immigration penalties. Residents who have lived here for decades, including lawful permanent residents, can face deportation for minor offenses like shoplifting or using a

false bus pass. Given there is already an exhaustive list of crimes that are addressed by current immigration laws, this bill is unnecessary, duplicative, and excessively harsh. At a time when resources are limited and the public is concerned with over-criminalization, this bill would expand the way in which our laws criminalize immigrants and communities of color.

CONCLUSION

H.R. 6691 would impose a sweeping and unwise expansion of what are known as “crimes of violence” that would have significant and wide-ranging impacts on immigrant communities and communities of color and further burden our failing criminal justice system.

For these reasons, the ACLU urges you to vote “No” on H.R. 6691 the Community Safety and Security Act of 2018. If you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact Jesselyn McCurdy, Deputy Director.

Sincerely,

FAIZ SHAKIR,
National Political Director, National Political Advocacy Department.

JESSELYN MCCURDY,
Deputy Director, Washington Legislative Office.

[From the Center for American Progress]
COMMUNITY SAFETY AND SECURITY ACT—H.R. 6691

ANALYSIS

The Center for American Progress is deeply concerned about H.R. 6691, a bill to amend Title 18, United States Code, which purports to clarify the definition of a “crime of violence” in 18 U.S.C. §16. The bill was written in response to the Supreme Court’s decision in *Dimaya v. Sessions*, which held that subsection (b), known as the “residual clause,” is unconstitutionally vague. Yet, instead of taking time to fashion a definition that takes into consideration the many legal ramifications across federal proceedings of changing this term, the bill’s sponsors are recklessly pushing forward a definition of a crime of violence for political purposes. The bill is unnecessary, overbroad, and could have substantial harmful effects.

The bill is overbroad and includes in its list of crimes of violence a number of offenses that have no element of violence at all. Burglary, for example, is included in the list of crimes of violence though it is defined as the unlawful or unprivileged entry into a building. Likewise, the bill lists coercion through fraud as a violent felony though no element of violence is part of that criminal offense. Simple assault is also considered a violent crime even in circumstances where the underlying act was merely a push or shove.

One of the more egregious examples of an offense listed as a crime of violence is “fleeing” which is described as “knowingly operating a motor vehicle and, following a law enforcement officer’s signal to bring the motor vehicle to a stop, (A) failing or refusing to comply; or (B) fleeing or attempting to elude a law enforcement officer.” Depending on factual circumstances, this provision elevates what could have amounted to a traffic violation to a crime of violence.

The bill dangerously expands the definition of violent crime which leads to overcriminalization. Every existing definition of a crime of violence in federal law or for federal purposes includes as an element the use, threatened use, or attempted use of force—see 18 U.S.C. §§924(c)(3), 3156; Uniform Crime Reports. But H.R. 6691 omits this crucial and basic requirement. The consequences are

dangerous, especially in the hands of a Sessions Justice Department which has displayed a general tendency to use a sprawling definition of violent crime to justify more arrests and prosecutions and longer prison sentences. The residual clause, while expansive, at least had the requirement that the crime of violence be classified as a felony that involves a substantial risk of force against person or property, but even that requirement has been removed by H.R. 6691.

A new definition of crime of violence is unnecessary, even in light of *Dimaya*. The Court in *Dimaya* held that the residual clause is unconstitutional but left in place subsection (a) which defines a crime of violence as “an offense that has as an element the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against the person or property of another.” While not an ideal formulation, it can for now suffice as an adequate placeholder until Congress can undertake a more deliberate approach instead of a reflexive one.

H.R. 6691 could have significant exclusionary effects on federal criminal justice laws and legislation. Carelessly expanding the definition of a “crime of violence” will change criminal procedures under current law and lead to more people being unnecessarily detained both pretrial and post-conviction. This goes against bipartisan efforts to reform the criminal justice system. For example, proposed legislation such as H.R. 4833 (Bail Fairness Act); H.R. 5043 (Fresh Start Act); and H.R. 5575 (Pathway to Parenting Act) bars people convicted of a crime of violence from pretrial release considerations, expungement of crimes, and receiving visitors. Expanding the definition of a crime of violence would exclude some of the very people meant to be helped by these bills.

[From Asian Americans Advancing Justice]
AAJC OPPOSES H.R. 6691

Asian Americans Advancing Justice—AAJC, a national civil rights organization, urges Members of Congress to vote NO on the House Community Safety and Security Act (H.R. 6691)—a measure that would dangerously expand the definition of a “crime of violence” to include many offenses that have no element of violence at all, leading to overcriminalization and unnecessary detention.

This bill’s overly broad definition opens the door to a massive increase in people being unjustifiably detained both pre-trial and post-conviction because the bill omits the crucial requirement that a “crime of violence” involve the use, threatened use, or attempted use of force. Such severe adverse consequences are highly likely to occur, especially since the Department of Justice has exhibited an alarming tendency to use an overly broad definition of a violent crime to justify increased arrests, prosecutions, and harsher prison sentences.

Congress owes a duty to the American public to carefully craft a definition of a “crime of violence” that takes into consideration the many harmful legal consequences that might flow from changing such a key term. Instead of following a reasoned, deliberate approach to lawmaking, the sponsors of this bill have hastily proposed a damaging definition that would frustrate current bipartisan efforts to reform the criminal justice system.

We oppose any expanded definition of “crime of violence” that would criminalize at-risk and marginalized communities. We need more fairness and relief within our criminal justice system, not less. This bill would disproportionately harm communities of color, including Southeast Asian refugees who are already being deported in high num-

bers for old criminal convictions. A new, sprawling definition for “crime of violence” would have negative ripple effects for community members’ eligibility for immigration relief, further fueling Trump’s draconian, anti-immigrant enforcement agenda.

We urge Congress to stand with us against this harmful and reckless bill. If you have any questions, please contact Megan Essaheb or Hannah Woerner.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR
LESBIAN RIGHTS,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The National Center for Lesbian Rights urges you to vote “No” on HR 6691, Community Safety and Security Act of 2018. This bill would only serve to exacerbate mass incarceration and racial inequality in our country. The bill vastly broadens the scope of the federal term “crime of violence,” a definition with sentencing repercussions throughout the federal criminal code. Additionally, because the term is also referred to in various immigration statutes, the bill would also expand the already vast category of crimes that render even lawfully present immigrants subject to immigration mandatory detention and deportation.

This bill will likely lead to more lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) people being incarcerated or detained, where they are more likely to experience violence than non-LGBTQ people. Currently LGBTQ people, especially those of color, are disproportionately incarcerated due to higher rates of poverty and to a history of anti-LGBTQ discrimination, including by law enforcement. For adults 40% of incarcerated women and 9% of incarcerated men are sexual minorities. Additionally, one in eight transgender people have been incarcerated; among transgender women, that number jumps to one in five. The rate of incarceration is higher for transgender people of color, with one in four trans Latinas and nearly half of Black trans people experiencing incarceration. In the last year, transgender people were incarcerated at twice the rate of the general population, with Black (9%) and American Indian (6%) transgender women being the most impacted.

Incarceration exposes LGBTQ people to verbal, physical, and sexual harassment and abuse. LGBTQ prisoners are significantly more likely to be sexually assaulted in prison, with 12% of gay and bisexual men and 40% of transgender people reporting a sexual assault in 2011. In a survey of LGBTQ inmates, 85% of respondents had been placed in solitary confinement—many purportedly for their own protection—and approximately half had spent two years or more in solitary. LGBTQ, and especially transgender inmates are often denied needed medical care while incarcerated including transition-related care, HIV-related care, and mental and behavioral care. In the previous year 37% of transgender people who were on hormone treatment were denied medication once incarcerated. Furthermore, LGBTQ individuals held at federal immigration detention centers are 97 times more likely to be sexually assaulted than other detainees.

By causing more people to be deported, this bill will lead to LGBTQ immigrants being sent back to countries where they have little to no legal rights and are more likely to experience anti-LGBTQ violence and possibly death. Nearly 80 countries criminalize same-sex relationships and many without explicit laws remain very dangerous for the LGBTQ community.

We urge you to vote “No” on HR 6691, because this bill would hurt LGBTQ and non-LGBTQ people, especially those who are of

color and immigrants. As a community that experiences high rates of violence, LGBTQ people understand the important of addressing violence in our communities. However, incarceration is not the solution to violence. Instead, Congress should support community-based prevention strategies and address the structural causes of violence.

For more information, you can read the attached documents which further explain the harms this bill would cause.

Warmly,

TYRONE HANLEY, ESQ.
Policy Counsel.

[September 5, 2018]

IMMIGRANTS’ RIGHTS ORGANIZATIONS ENCOURAGE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO VOTE NO ON H.R. 6691, A RETROGRESSIVE MASS INCARCERATION BILL

H.R. 6691 is a retrogressive measure that seeks to expand the federal criminal code and exacerbate mass incarceration at a time when the vast majority of Americans believe the country is ready for progressive criminal justice reform. The bill vastly broadens the scope of the federal term “crime of violence,” a definition with sentencing repercussions throughout the federal criminal code. Because the term is also referenced in one of the harshest provisions of immigration law, the bill would also expand the already vast category of crimes that render even lawfully present immigrants subject to immigration detention and deportation. The bill will cause numerous harms, outlined here and described in detail below:

1. H.R. 6691’s expansion of Section 16 of Title 18 of the United States Code, the definition of a “crime of violence,” will expand the criminal justice and incarceration systems. Because this definition is cross-referenced widely throughout the criminal code and incorporated into federal immigration law, this bill will trigger a significant expansion of the penalties attached to even minor criminal conduct in federal criminal court, exacerbate the mass incarceration crisis, and render even more immigrants subject to the disproportionate penalty of deportation.

2. H.R. 6691 broadens the “crime of violence” definition far beyond what the statute included prior to the Supreme Court’s decision in *Dimaya*, including offenses as minor as simple assault and as vague as “communication of threats.”

3. H.R. 6691 will expand the already overly punitive immigration consequences of involvement in the criminal justice system by further broadening the already sweeping list of offenses that constitute an “aggravated felony,” in a manner almost entirely duplicative and sometimes at odds with other provisions in federal immigration law.

4. If H.R. 6691 became law, there would be serious questions about its constitutionality.

This bill represents a cynical effort to deepen the penalties attached to even minor criminal offenses, further criminalizing immigrants and communities of color. The Immigrant Justice Network, Immigrant Defense Project, Immigrant Legal Resource Center, National Immigrant Justice Center, and the National Immigration Project of the National Lawyers Guild urge Members of Congress to vote NO on H.R. 6691.

1. H.R. 6691 EXPANDS THE FEDERAL DEFINITION OF “CRIME OF VIOLENCE,” WITH VAST RIPPLE EFFECTS

H.R. 6691 purports to amend only one provision of U.S. law—the definition of what constitutes a “crime of violence” as defined at Section 16 of Title 18 of the United States Code. Section 16, however, serves as the “universal definition” of a “crime of violence” for the entirety of the federal criminal code. The language is cross-referenced in the definitions and sentencing provisions for

numerous federal offenses, including racketeering, money laundering, firearms, and domestic violence offenses. Additionally, the definition is incorporated into the Immigration and Nationality Act as one of a list of 21 different types of offenses that constitute an “aggravated felony,” which in turn constitutes a ground of deportability and a bar to nearly every type of defense to deportation.

Expanding the “crime of violence” definition is anathema to progressive criminal justice reform, criminalizing more conduct and attaching greater penalties across numerous provisions of the federal code, all while rendering more immigrants subject to the double penalty of deportation.

2. H.R. 6691 BROADENS THE “CRIME OF VIOLENCE” DEFINITION FAR BEYOND WHAT THE STATUTE INCLUDED PRIOR TO THE SUPREME COURT’S DECISION IN *DIMAYA*

H.R. 6691 is a solution in search of a problem. Section 16 is written in two sub-parts, (a) and (b). The text of the statute already broadly defines “crime of violence” in subsection (a), including any offense “that has as an element the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against the person or property of another.” We can assume that H.R. 6691 was written in response to the Supreme Court’s April 2018 decision in *Sessions v. Dimaya*, in which the Court struck down sub-section (b) as unconstitutional in the immigration context. Section 16(b) includes any felony offense that “by its nature” involves a substantial risk of the use of such force; in *Dimaya*, the Court found its application so vague as to create “more unpredictability and arbitrariness than the Due Process Clause tolerates.” In short, the Court found the second half of the statute void for vagueness, but left the first half intact.

The *Dimaya* decision remedied significant injustices that had resulted from the inconsistent and often random application of section 16(b). Immigration legal service providers, serving as amici to the *Dimaya* Court, noted that the statute’s “only predictable outcomes are continued disagreements among the courts and continued harms to immigrants.” To demonstrate this harmful disparity, amici described how the offense of residential trespass was considered a crime of violence under section 16(b) in the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals, but not in the Seventh Circuit, which noted the offense could be committing simply by walking into a neighbor’s open door under “the mistaken belief that she is hosting an open house . . .”

Now comes H.R. 6691, which proposes to keep section 16(a) intact while expanding the “crime of violence” definition to encompass dozens of other offenses that are in some cases given their own new definitions and in others defined via reference to the existing criminal code. Many of these offenses move section 16 far beyond its pre-*Dimaya* scope, including offenses as minor as spitting on another person. The bill stretches the imagination by calling generally nonviolent offenses, such as simple assault, “communication of threats,” and extortion, crimes of violence.

3. H.R. 6691 WILL EXPAND THE ALREADY OVERLY PUNITIVE IMMIGRATION CONSEQUENCES OF INVOLVEMENT IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM, IN A MANNER ALMOST ENTIRELY DUPLICATIVE AND SOMETIMES AT ODD WITH OTHER PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL IMMIGRATION LAW

The immigration penalties of involvement in the criminal justice system are already breathtakingly harsh and overbroad; undocumented immigrants and decades-long lawful permanent residents alike can face deportation for offenses as minor as shoplifting, using a false bus pass, or simple drug posses-

sion. Immigration detention and deportation are frequently imposed as a penalty even in cases where a criminal court judge found community service or an entirely suspended sentence sufficient punishment for the offense committed.

The “crime of violence” definition at 18 U.S.C. §16 is incorporated as one of twenty-one types of offense that constitute an “aggravated felony” as defined at section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. An “aggravated felony” is one of dozens of categories of offenses that trigger deportation from or preclude entry to the United States, layered on top of the provisions of federal immigration law that authorize deportation for those unlawfully present. The “aggravated felony” category is different, however, because it triggers mandatory no-bond detention in almost every case and categorically precludes nearly all immigrants from presenting a defense to their deportation.

By adding dozens of offenses to the existing “crime of violence” definition, H.R. 6691 therefore grows the already vast expanse of offenses that render lawfully present immigrants in the United States subject to immigration detention and enforcement.

The bill is largely duplicative of other grounds of removability, in several cases putting forth new definitions of offenses that are defined in other provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, setting up a nearly impossible-to-effectuate removal scheme. Many of the offenses delineated in the bill constitute their own independent aggravated felony grounds (including, for example, murder and burglary), their own independent ground of removability (including, for example, child abuse, stalking, and domestic violence), or—in nearly every other case—already fall within the wide-reaching “crime involving moral turpitude” grounds of deportability and inadmissibility, and those excluded from those grounds are by nature largely minor offenses.

This bill will further criminalize immigrant communities, communities already living in fear of increasingly militarized immigration enforcement operations. The bill’s expanded list of “crime of violence” offenses includes relatively minor offenses including simple assault, vaguely worded offenses such as “communication of threats,” and a sweeping list of inchoate offenses including solicitation or “aiding and abetting” any of the enumerated categories.

This bill will further marginalize historically marginalized communities, triggering heightened immigration penalties in already over-policed neighborhoods.

4. IF THIS BILL WERE TO PASS, IT WOULD RAISE SERIOUS CONSTITUTIONAL CONCERNS

If this bill were to become law, there would be serious questions about its constitutionality because it jeopardizes the long established “categorical approach” in our legal system.

What is the “categorical approach”? Over the years, the Supreme Court has carefully crafted an efficient and predictable legal framework to determine whether a non-citizen’s crime makes him or her deportable or inadmissible. This framework is called the “categorical approach,” which applies to determine deportability and inadmissibility for criminal grounds. It sets a clear and uniform standard to evaluate the immigration consequences of the crime of conviction. The categorical approach helps to eliminate subjectivity in adjudication by ensuring that convictions are characterized based on their inherent nature and official record, rather than on potentially disputed facts, and thus ensures that two people convicted of the same crime will be treated similarly under the law.

This bill makes a strong push to systematically switch from the established framework of the “categorical approach” to a “conduct based” definition. The conduct based definition would effectively allow an immigration judge to go back and “re-try” a conviction that was already decided in a court of law. This bill, if passed, would raise the same Sixth Amendment concerns that the Supreme Court identified in *Mathis v. United States*: “. . . allowing a sentencing judge to go any further would raise serious Sixth Amendment concerns. This Court has held that only a jury, and not a judge, may find facts that increase a maximum penalty, except for the simple fact of a prior conviction. See *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466, 490 (2000). That means a judge cannot go beyond identifying the crime of conviction to explore the manner in which the defendant committed that offense.”

Like the burglary provision analyzed in *Mathis*, the crime of violence definition this bill amends is used as a sentencing enhancement under 8 U.S.C. §1326(b)(2). As a result of switching to a conduct-based definition rather than “the simple fact of a prior conviction,” the bill presents the same Sixth Amendment concerns that troubled the *Mathis* Court.

A yes vote on H.R. 6691 is a vote for mass incarceration, for increased criminalization of communities of color, and for even further militarization of immigration enforcement. Members of Congress must vote no.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I leave my colleagues with a simple challenge. The simple challenge is: Read the Constitution.

Vagueness can be the death of us. This bill is that kind of death, and I would hope that we would have the opportunity to do this as it should be: constitutionally sound and in a bipartisan way to save lives.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. We support victims of crime, especially those who are victims of violent crime. But classifying particular offenses as crimes of violence has tremendous consequences for the individuals accused of committing them. This bill dangerously leads to over-criminalization and we should not take lightly the task of amending the definition of “crime of violence.”

At Rules on Wednesday, we addressed over-criminalization and mass incarceration. Rep. TORRES aptly stated that we should not proceed with haste, which will further exacerbate the over crowdedness in our prisons. Rep. BUCKS responded that we should build more prisons to address that problem.

Even conservative groups that work with these very complicated and important criminal justice reform issues, like the Koch Foundation and Right on Crime, do not agree that building more prisons is the answer.

Right on Crime states, “by reducing excessive sentence lengths and holding non-violent offenders accountable through prison alternatives, public safety can often be achieved.”

In a recent forum, the Koch Foundation stated, “After four decades of increasing punitiveness and sky-rocketing levels of imprisonment, American incarceration rates have declined in many states over the past five years. In fact, a bipartisan consensus has emerged in favor of major criminal justice reforms that would reduce mass incarceration much further.”

The original spark for this coalition of “unlikely bedfellows” has come from a group of conservative leaders who emphasize a variety of different factors, ranging from economic, to

freedom, to religious groups embracing redemption and second chances.

The Koch Foundation went on to say, “Although the 2016 presidential election temporarily halted this movement’s momentum, the coalition has reemerged recently and seems prepared to make progress in 2018.”

So I disagree with the notion that we should build more prisons and not exercise due diligence to ensure that in responding to the Supreme Court’s finding that the statute was unconstitutionally vague, that we are doing so in a well-informed, heavily-engaged and thoughtful manner.

Due to the seriousness of our criminal justice system, we should always use due care and give thorough considerations when amending the criminal code.

For all these reasons, I oppose this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first let me address the criticism regarding burglary being too broad in the way it is addressed in the legislation. This is the Federal generic definition of burglary and one that courts have found satisfies the definition of “crime of violence.”

Mr. Speaker, the detractors of this fail to recognize that these definitions are not an expansion of actual State laws but only seek to cover the generic definition and reasonable iterations found in State law.

In fact, prior to the Dimaya Supreme Court case, the Supreme Court had previously unanimously agreed in *Leocal v. Ashcroft* that “burglary is the classic example of a crime of violence under subsection 16(b).”

The Community Safety and Security Act of 2018 is a necessary, crucial piece of legislation that will fix a major loophole in our system. We squarely address the issues raised by the United States Supreme Court, eliminating the vagueness, giving notice, and explaining which offenses Congress intended to cover when they had first crafted the language in clause 16(b) from the very beginning.

By moving the legislation, we are avoiding potentially dangerous consequences of giving very serious, dangerous criminals a pass. We have examined the case law surrounding these offenses; we have considered the equities; we have been deliberative; and we have shown great restraint in many ways.

Congress cannot sit idly by and allow criminals to disrupt our communities because of this loophole. This bill is a product of necessity, and we do not have the privilege to squabble over hypotheticals that ultimately have no bearing on real-life applications of this law. We must move to protect our communities to prevent more victims of crime.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I can assure my colleagues that this bill is not overly broad. It is not, as some have irresponsibly stated, a “dangerous expansion of criminal law.” Instead, it is a carefully crafted response to the U.S. Supreme Court’s recommendations in

the Dimaya case. Frankly, it is just the sort of bill that our system was designed to produce.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” for this bill. Vote “yes,” and in doing so, demonstrate to your constituents your commitment to protecting law-abiding Americans from violent criminals. It is a simple choice. Make the correct one and vote “yes.”

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

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I will vote present on H.R. 6691. I support the premise of this legislation and agree that action needs to be taken after the Supreme Court’s ruling earlier this year. However, in their finding the Court cautioned that careful consideration should be exercised before any new or expanded criminal definitions are finalized. This bill does not meet that test.

In April, the Supreme Court ruled that the current definition of “crimes of violence” was unconstitutionally vague and needed to be clarified. I support efforts to rectify this issue and make certain we are prosecuting criminals to the fullest extent of the law. Yet since the Court’s ruling, Republicans have taken no steps to meaningfully consider what this new definition should be. Instead, they rushed the bill to the floor without a hearing, markup or time for proper review.

I agree clarification is needed to ensure we are able to prosecute those who are guilty and uphold our laws as they are intended. However, rushing through a hasty definition of crimes of violence is dangerous and irresponsible. The definition is used in a number of federal criminal offenses beyond just the Immigration and Nationality Act. For instance, it also applies when determining whether a juvenile may be prosecuted as an adult in federal court.

There is simply too much potential for unintended consequences to rush through a definition written impulsively and without proper review. I would rather the House carefully consider what an appropriate definition should include, in order to properly balance the rights of Americans with the need to fully enforce our laws and protect our fellow citizens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1051, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 152, answered “present” 2, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 393]

YEAS—247

Abraham	Allen	Arrington
Aderholt	Amodei	Babin

Bacon	Graves (MO)	Olson
Balderson	Grothman	Palazzo
Banks (IN)	Guthrie	Palmer
Barletta	Handel	Panetta
Barr	Harper	Paulsen
Barton	Harris	Pearce
Bera	Hartzler	Perry
Bergman	Hastings	Peterson
Biggs	Hensarling	Pittenger
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Poe (TX)
Bishop (MI)	Hice, Jody B.	Poliquin
Bishop (UT)	Higgins (LA)	Polis
Black	Hill	Posey
Blum	Holding	Ratcliffe
Bost	Hollingsworth	Reed
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Reichert
Brat	Huizenga	Rice (SC)
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Roby
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Buchanan	Hurd	Rogers (AL)
Buck	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Jenkins (KS)	Rohrabacher
Budd	Johnson (LA)	Rokita
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Rooney, Francis
Bustos	Johnson, Sam	Rosen
Byrne	Jordan	Roskam
Calvert	Joyce (OH)	Ross
Carbajal	Katko	Rothfus
Carter (GA)	Keating	Rouzer
Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Ruiz
Cartwright	Kelly (PA)	Russell
Chabot	Kind	Rutherford
Cheney	King (IA)	Sanford
Cloud	King (NY)	Scalise
Coffman	Kinzinger	Schrader
Cole	Knight	Schweikert
Collins (GA)	Kuster (NH)	Scott, Austin
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Sensenbrenner
Comer	LaHood	Sessions
Comstock	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Conaway	Lamb	Shuster
Cook	Lamborn	Simpson
Costa	Lance	Sinema
Costello (PA)	Latta	Smith (MO)
Crawford	Lesko	Smith (NE)
Crist	Lewis (MN)	Smith (NJ)
Cuellar	Lipinski	Smucker
Curbelo (FL)	LoBiondo	Stefanik
Curtis	Loeback	Stewart
Davidson	Long	Stivers
Denham	Loudermilk	Suozi
DesJarlais	Love	Taylor
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Tenney
Donovan	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (CA)
Duffy	Lujan Grisham,	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (SC)	M.	Thornberry
Duncan (TN)	Lynch	Tipton
Dunn	MacArthur	Trott
Emmer	Marchant	Turner
Estes (KS)	Marino	Upton
Faso	Marshall	Valadao
Ferguson	Mast	Wagner
Fitzpatrick	McCarthy	Walberg
Fleischmann	McCaul	Walden
Flores	McClintock	Walker
Fortenberry	McHenry	Walorski
Fox	McKinley	Walters, Mimi
Frelinghuysen	McMorris	Weber (TX)
Gaetz	Rodgers	Webster (FL)
Gallagher	McSally	Wenstrup
Garamendi	Meadows	Westerman
Garrett	Messer	Williams
Gibbs	Mitchell	Wilson (SC)
Gohmert	Moolenaar	Wittman
Goodlatte	Mooney (WV)	Womack
Gosar	Mullin	Woodall
Gottheimer	Murphy (FL)	Yoder
Gowdy	Newhouse	Yoho
Granger	Norman	Young (AK)
Graves (GA)	Nunes	Young (IA)
Graves (LA)	O'Halleran	Zeldin

NAYS—152

Adams	Butterfield	Courtney
Aguilar	Cárdenas	Crowley
Amash	Carson (IN)	Cummings
Barragán	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Bass	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny
Beatty	Chu, Judy	DeGette
Beyer	Cicilline	Delaney
Bishop (GA)	Clark (MA)	DeLauro
Blumenauer	Clarke (NY)	DeBene
Blunt Rochester	Clay	Demings
Bonamici	Cleaver	DeSaulnier
Boyle, Brendan	Clyburn	Deutch
F.	Cohen	Dingell
Brady (PA)	Connolly	Doggett
Brown (MD)	Cooper	Doyle, Michael
Brownley (CA)	Correa	F.

Engel	Larson (CT)	Quigley
Espallat	Lawrence	Raskin
Esty (CT)	Lawson (FL)	Rice (NY)
Evans	Lee	Roybal-Allard
Foster	Levin	Ruppersberger
Frankel (FL)	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Fudge	Lieu, Ted	Sánchez
Gabbard	Lowenthal	Sarbanes
Gallego	Lowe	Schakowsky
Gomez	Lujan, Ben Ray	Schiff
Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney,	Schneider
Green, Al	Carolyn B.	Scott (VA)
Green, Gene	Massie	Scott, David
Griffith	Matsui	Serrano
Grijalva	McCollum	Sewell (AL)
Gutiérrez	McEachin	Sherman
Hanabusa	McGovern	Sires
Heck	McNerney	Smith (WA)
Higgins (NY)	Meeks	Soto
Himes	Meng	Swalwell (CA)
Hoyer	Moore	Takano
Jackson Lee	Moulton	Thompson (MS)
Jayapal	Nadler	Tonko
Jeffries	Napolitano	Torres
Johnson (GA)	Nolan	Vargas
Johnson, E. B.	Norcross	Veasey
Kaptur	O'Rourke	Vela
Kelly (IL)	Pallone	Velázquez
Khanna	Pascrell	Visclosky
Kihuen	Payne	Wasserman
Kildee	Pelosi	Schultz
Kilmer	Perlmutter	Waters, Maxine
Krishnamoorthi	Peters	Watson Coleman
Labrador	Pingree	Welch
Langevin	Pocan	Wilson (FL)
Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)	Yarmuth

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

DeFazio Lofgren
 NOT VOTING—28

Blackburn	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen
Capuano	Jones	Royce (CA)
Cramer	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Culberson	Maloney, Sean	Shea-Porter
Davis, Rodney	Neal	Smith (TX)
DeSantis	Noem	Speier
Ellison	Renacci	Titus
Eshoo	Richmond	Tsongas
Gianforte	Rooney, Thomas	Walz
Huffman	J.	

□ 1049

Messrs. SANFORD and SUOZZI changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), my friend, the majority leader.

(Mr. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday and Tuesday, no votes are expected in the House.

On Wednesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 3798, the Save American Workers Act, sponsored by Representative JACKIE WALORSKI. This package of bills will reduce unnecessary burdens on employers by restoring the 40-hour full-time workweek, providing relief from the employer mandate, delaying the Cadillac tax until 2023, and saving small businesses time and money in compliance costs.

Mr. Speaker, the House also plans to vote on the conference report to accompany H.R. 5895, the Energy and Water, Legislative Branch, and Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs Appropriations Act of 2019.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, additional legislative items are possible in the House, including WRDA, which represents a critical investment in America's infrastructure. As soon as items are added to our schedule, I will be sure to inform all Members.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his information. And the minibus that he referred to is what we refer to, I guess, as the first minibus. Has that conference report been completed at this point in time, Mr. Leader?

I yield to my friend.

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

Not at this moment, but I hope that it will be today. All the reports are there. It is just finishing a very few items, and I expect it to be done today. Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information. Mr. Speaker, we have some 7 days left to go, and, of course, next week is essentially one full day, and then we have 4, maybe 5 days the following week, depending upon what is necessary.

I would ask the majority leader, does he contemplate us trying to effect a continuing resolution for those appropriation items which have not been addressed in the next 7 days? And if so, how long does he expect that continuing resolution to go?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his question. Just as I announced, next week, the House is expected to send the full year appropriations for three bills directly to the President's desk. And just this week, we entered into conference with the Senate on six additional bills. These nine bills make up 87 percent of the discretionary budget and represents the most appropriation bills in conference at any point in the last 20 years.

I am encouraged by the work our committees are doing, and I believe that we are making good progress. As soon as further items are scheduled for the floor, I will be sure to inform the Members.

But the gentleman's question is about a continuing resolution. I want

to focus on appropriations, because we have never been at this point in the last 20 years, and I would like to get as many, if not all of them, done before we depart, and we can deal with the continuing resolution with whatever is left when that moment comes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I hope his optimism is met because I think that would be a better thing for us to do, so I appreciate that observation.

Let me ask the gentleman as well, if we accomplish what he suggests that we might accomplish over the next 7 legislative days, there will still be a needed CR. Assuming we adopt a resolution which will fund all of government through a particular time, both because we passed appropriations bills, your point being that there are nine that are possible to pass with three remaining.

The gentleman has scheduled, as of now, for us to be meeting the first 2 weeks in October.

□ 1100

Obviously, Members are very interested in whether or not that schedule will be kept or whether there is a possibility that assuming we do, in fact, fund government to some date, either through the year, the next fiscal year, or for a period of time, for those bills that have not passed and been signed by the President, does the gentleman still contemplate that we will be here the first 2 weeks in October?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

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

I have no changes to the schedule at this time, but I am always encouraged. If we get all of our work done, there wouldn't be a point to be here. But as of now, we don't have our work done, so we will need to finish the job.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that. I would hope that, for scheduling purposes for all Members, we could make that decision by the end of next week so that Members would have the opportunity to plan. I realize full well that it depends upon whether or not, in fact, we get the work done, which is why I was asking about the CR.

In addition to that, the gentleman has mentioned a couple of bills, but the Violence Against Women Act, the farm bill, and the FAA, as the gentleman knows, expire on September 30. Does the gentleman expect us to be dealing with those bills in one form or another?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

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

As the gentleman knows, in the farm bill, we are still in conference on that; and then additional items, I would like to deal with and get done before we depart, yes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, so the gentleman's hope is to vote on these conference reports prior to the 30th of September?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

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

I continue to monitor the conference reports.

I was talking to Chairman CONAWAY just this week, along with his counterparts over in the Senate. They are making progress. But as we know, I was hopeful that the first minibus, that we could have voted on that today. But I do think the conference will finish up for us to be able to vote on that next week.

So as these come together, as soon as they are done, I would like to be able to vote and finish as much business as we can before the end of the year.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that observation.

My presumption, therefore, is, if the conference cannot come to agreement, I would presume that we would have an extension on those three bills and others that might need that. Is that accurate?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his question.

I do not want to slow the conference for their work and others, but I would like to see us finish that. And, of course, we do not want those items to expire, so we would deal with that at the appropriate time. But as of now, if we can solve them and vote for the continuation, I would take that up first.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the information.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF RICHARD M. DeVOS

(Mr. HUIZENGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, it was with a heavy heart yesterday that we learned of the passing of Richard M. DeVos, Sr.

Rich, along with his wife, Helen, who passed away in October of 2017, dedicated their lives to transforming west Michigan and making our community an even greater place to call home. Frankly, it is hard to imagine what west Michigan would look like without Richard DeVos and his leadership.

Through his philanthropic activities, Rich led by example. He put a premium on supporting educational institutions across west Michigan, such as Grand Rapids Christian High School, Calvin College, and Grand Valley State University.

He was equally passionate about west Michigan residents having access to high-quality, specialized medical care.

He also worked to enrich the arts across Michigan, including by supporting his grandson, Rick, in establishing ArtPrize, which has opened up so many opportunities for Grand Rapids.

He was also very involved with many projects at Hope College in Holland, Michigan. Generally, anything that helped make the community thrive, Rich was fully behind.

As significant as those achievements are, his impact on west Michigan's economy was even greater and simply cannot be understated. Through his business sense, passion, and servant's heart, he created economic opportunities for countless west Michigan residents.

Despite his monumental influence, Rich was as approachable and down to earth as they come. Rich generally cared about his community and the people he shared it with.

Thank you for all you have done for west Michigan, Rich; and while your legacy will live on, know that your leadership and friendship will be deeply missed.

Rest well, Rich. Rest well, knowing you ran a race well done.

UPDATE THE EQIP PROGRAM

(Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, as the farm bill conference committee begins their negotiations, I rise today to urge conferees to include a provision important to Delaware farmers.

Many of our farmers utilize cost share programs under the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, known as EQIP. The program provides growers with funds to make necessary farm improvements, while also mitigating environmental risks.

Farmers know what they need. They should be able to access these funds when they anticipate a problem, not after one has cropped up. That is why, this morning, I join my Delaware colleagues, Senators CARPER and COONS, in urging the farm bill conference committee to include updates to the EQIP program so farmers can get access to the funds sooner, reducing their costs and environmental footprint, while promoting stewardship of our cherished farmland.

Tweaking the EQIP program may seem like a small change, but it produces big wins for Delaware's farmers and our environment. I urge my colleagues to include this language in the conference report.

SPEAK OUT AGAINST THE ATROCITIES IN SYRIA

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue to speak out against the atrocities being committed in Syria by the brutal dictator, Assad, and his evil collaborators and coconspirators, Russia and Iran.

I commend President Trump for taking a stand against the reckless attack on Idlib province and the tens of thousands who could be killed.

I am proud of the work that Arkansans are doing in Syria, particularly in Idlib province, on behalf of the Syrian people. Through the work of the Syrian Emergency Task Force, led by a Syrian American, an Arkansan, Mouaz Moustafa, Arkansans are directly supporting the reopening of a kindergarten and women's center in Idlib province.

I am especially concerned about the tragic consequences and loss of life that an assault, particularly a chemical weapons assault, on Idlib will have on this vital kindergarten and work for women there.

I stand in support of the President's recent message but call on him to strengthen his resolve against Assad's brutal actions and to continue to support the innocent Syrian people.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ZEBEDEE STRONG

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Zebedee "Zeb" Strong.

Zeb was from Kilgore, Texas, and was raised on a cattle farm down in the oilfields there. But when he came to Arlington and settled in that city, he left a strong legacy.

He worked at his alma mater, which was the University of Texas at Arlington, known as UTA, for 25 years. As director of multicultural services and recruitment, he really embodied the spirit of the UTA campus. He served as an adviser for over 40 student organizations and mentored so many students.

Zeb was someone whom I first met when I was a congressional staffer back in the 1990s, and he was someone who really helped me out a lot as I was beginning my career in that field.

He was also dedicated and committed to volunteer work at Big Brothers & Big Sisters, and he was also one of the individuals who was really the driving force behind starting an African American studies program at UTA.

He was also one of the founders of the Arlington African American Chamber of Commerce and the Arlington chapter of the NAACP.

My prayers and condolences go out to his four children and his wife, Sheri, who lost Zeb unexpectedly.

But I want the family and friends of Zeb Strong to know that he was such a uniting force. If you walked around the campus of UTA at any moment, anyone, from any background, would come up to Zeb and they would feel like Zeb was their best friend because that was just the type of gentleman that he was.

My prayers, again, go out to the family.

GOVERNMENT INACTION IS FAILING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. DELANEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, this week we have seen firsthand another example of how government inaction is failing the American people.

With preexisting conditions at risk, hospitals are being forced to take on drug companies alone without any action from their Congress, and we continue to have a staggering mental health crisis in this country.

The Kaiser Family Foundation found that 75 percent of the American people want preexisting conditions to be protected, conditions like asthma, mental health, cancer, arthritis, Alzheimer's, MS, Crohn's, colitis, surgery, and pregnancy—yes, pregnancy.

Are we really going to allow women to be charged more for their healthcare because they want to be mothers?

With out-of-control drug prices, 90 percent of the American people agree that we should be allowing the government to negotiate with pharmaceutical companies to lower those prices and stop the wealth transfer from the taxpayers of the U.S. to the shareholders of these companies. But that is not taking place.

I, for one, am tired of Congress' inaction. This week, I introduced a letter, a bipartisan letter, to ask for additional funding to expand programs for mental health education, treatment, and suicide prevention.

Mr. Speaker, 87 percent of the American people believe more mental health support should be provided to our youth, and the funding requested in this letter will do just that.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for joining me in their work and strongly encourage the rest of the Congress to start acting on these important issues.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUTHERFORD). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 14 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1630

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL) at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following commu-

nication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 7, 2018.

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 September 7, 2018, at 1:36 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1417.

That the Senate passed S. 1586.

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 302.

That the Senate passed without an amendment H.R. 6124.

That the Senate agrees to Conference with the House of Representatives H.R. 6147.

That the Senate agrees to Conference with the House of Representatives H.R. 6157.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1649

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL) at 4 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 2018, TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2018, AND ADJOURNMENT FROM MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2018, TO WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2018

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 3:30 p.m. on Monday, September 10, 2018; and, further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Wednesday, September 12, 2018, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's

table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1417. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to develop a categorical exclusion for covered vegetative management activities carried out to establish or improve habitat for greater sage-grouse and mule deer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 1586. An act to require the Under Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere to update periodically the environmental sensitivity index products of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for each coastal area of the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6124. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to authorize voluntary agreements for coverage of Indian tribal council members, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on September 6, 2018, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 4318. To amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to modify temporarily certain rates of duty.

H.R. 5385. To amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program of payments to children's hospitals that operate graduate medical education programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5772. To designate the J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Courthouse in Amarillo, Texas, as the "J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Mary Lou Robinson United States Courthouse".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 10, 2018, at 3:30 p.m.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Member executed the oath for access to classified information:

Troy Balderson

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6183. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval and Air

Quality Designation; AL; Redesignation of the Etowah County Unclassifiable Area [EPA-R04-OAR-2018-0173; FRL-9982-71-Region 4] received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6184. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRL/O, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Office of the Inspector General, Freedom of Information Act Program [Docket ID: DOD-2017-OS-0024] (RIN: 0790-AJ65) received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6185. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's summary presentation of final rules — Federal Acquisition Regulation: Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-100; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR 2018-0001, Sequence No.: 4] received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6186. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Permits; Removal of Depredation Orders for Double-crested Cormorants To Protect Aquaculture Facilities and Public Resources [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2017-0091; FF09M21200-189-FXMB12320900000] (RIN: 1018-BC12) received September 4, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6187. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Seasons and Bag and Possession Limits for Certain Migratory Game Birds [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2017-0028; FF09M21200-178-FXMB1231099BPP0] (RIN: 1018-BB73) received September 4, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6188. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 2018-19 Season [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2017-0028; FF09M21200-178-FXMB1231099BPP0] (RIN: 1018-BB73) received September 4, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6189. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Delisting and Foreign Species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Five Poeciloteria Tarantula Species From Sri Lanka [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-ES-2016-0076; 4500030115] (RIN: 1018-BC82) received September 4, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6190. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Delisting and Foreign Species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing the Hyacinth Macaw [Docket No.: FWS-R9-ES-2012-0013; 4500030115] (RIN: 1018-BC79) received September 4, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-

121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6191. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, Creswell, OR [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0044; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-35] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6192. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace and Class E Airspace, and Revocation of Class E Airspace; New Smyrna Beach, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0328; Airspace Docket No.: 18-ASO-7] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6193. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0168; Product Identifier 2017-NM-135-AD; Amendment 39-19344; AD 2018-16-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6194. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0028; Product Identifier 2017-NM-143-AD; Amendment 39-19356; AD 2018-17-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6195. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class E Airspace; St Marys, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0255; Airspace Docket No.: 18-ASO-6] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6196. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0709; Product Identifier 2018-NM-100-AD; Amendment 39-19359; AD 2018-17-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6197. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Biloxi, MS, and Gulfport, MS [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0865; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ASO-19] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6198. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace and Class E Airspace; Wrightstown,

NJ [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1188; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AEA-23] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6199. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace and Class E Airspace; Jacksonville, NC and Establishment of Class D Airspace; Jacksonville, NC [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1159; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ASO-23] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6200. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Guidance on section 481(a) adjustment period for eligible terminated S corporations [Revenue Procedure 2018-44] received September 4, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6201. A letter from the Regulations Officer, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Making Permanent the Attorney Advisor Program [Docket No.: SSA-2018-0033] (RIN: 0960-AI23) received August 17, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 5923. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange certain public lands in Ouachita National Forest, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-922). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCaul: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 6198. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction Office, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-923, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1320. A bill to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 related to Nuclear Regulatory Commission user fees and annual charges, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-924). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2278. A bill to extend the authorization of the Uranium Mill Tailing Radiation Control Act of 1978 relating to the disposal site in Mesa County, Colorado; with amendments (Rept. 115-925). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2389. A bill to reauthorize the West Valley demonstration project, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-926). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 5532. A bill to redesignate the Reconstruction Era National Monument as the Reconstruction Era National

Historical Park, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-927). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 6198 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 6730. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit the issuance of national injunctions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa (for himself and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 6731. A bill to provide for reallocation of the renewable fuel obligation of exempted small refineries under section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)) to other refineries, blenders, distributors, and importers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 6732. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require Federal political appointees to sign a binding ethics pledge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 6733. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act and title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prohibit group health plans, health insurance issuers, prescription drug plan sponsors, and Medicare Advantage organizations from limiting certain information on drug prices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of Michigan (for himself, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 6734. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require a full military honors ceremony for certain deceased veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself, Mr. HURD, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 6735. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a vulnerability disclosure policy for Department of Homeland Security internet websites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 6736. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify reporting requirements, promote tax compliance, and reduce tip reporting compliance burdens in the beauty service industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 6737. A bill to amend the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer

Protection Act to clarify seasoning requirements for certain refinanced mortgage loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. BIGGS, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. LESKO, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 6738. A bill to authorize, direct, expedite, and facilitate a land exchange in Bullhead City, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mrs. LESKO, and Mr. DESANTIS):

H.R. 6739. A bill to provide for the unencumbering of title to non-Federal land owned by Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, Florida, for purposes of economic development by conveyance of the Federal reversionary interest to the University; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 6740. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish Border Tunnel Task Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. DAVIDSON):

H.R. 6741. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to increase monetary policy transparency and accountability and to make reforms to the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MAST (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 6742. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to ensure that appropriate officers and agents of U.S. Customs and Border Protection are equipped with secure radios or other two-way communication devices, supported by system interoperability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 6743. A bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide a national standard for financial institution data security and breach notification on behalf of all consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. POCAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. CARDENAS):

H.R. 6744. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize Federal assistance to State adult protective services programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 6745. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to revise the shareholder threshold for registration under such Act for issuers that receive support through certain Federal universal service support mechanisms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HENSARLING:

H.R. 6746. A bill to protect American taxpayers and homeowners by creating a sustainable housing finance system for the 21st century, and for other purposes; to the Com-

mittee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa):

H.R. 6747. A bill to provide States with funding to establish new tools to prevent suicide and violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 6748. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 6749. A bill to provide protections for amateur and professional athletes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Ms. BASS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. BARRAGAN):

H.R. 6750. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of portions of the Los Angeles coastal area in the State of California to evaluate alternatives for protecting the resources of the coastal area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 6751. A bill to increase transparency with respect to financial services benefitting state sponsors of terrorism, human rights abusers, and corrupt officials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 6752. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a grant program to support the restoration of San Francisco Bay; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALDEN (for himself and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 6753. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a public-private partnership for purposes of identifying health care waste, fraud, and abuse; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DONOVAN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H. Res. 1055. A resolution to affirm strong United States-Liberia ties and support for democratic principles, and call for full implementation of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission recommendations, including the establishment of an Extraordinary Criminal Tribunal for Liberia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GROTHMAN (for himself, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GALLAGHER, Ms. MOORE,

Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. VARGAS):

H. Res. 1056. A resolution recognizing the celebration of the Hmong New Year in 2018; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H. Res. 1057. A resolution calling on Burma's civilian leader, Aung San Suu Kyi, to release two jailed journalists reporting on violence inflicted upon that nation's Rohingya population; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 6730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 9; Article III, Section 1, Clause 1; and Article III, Section 2, Clause 2 of the Constitution, which grant Congress authority over federal courts.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa:

H.R. 6731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 6732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 6733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress Under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BISHOP of Michigan:

H.R. 6734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 6735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under the Constituion Article I, Section 8

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 6736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 1

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 6737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 6738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (the Property Clause). Under this clause, Congress has the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States. By virtue of this enumerated power, Congress has governing authority

over the lands, territories, or other property of the United States—and with this authority Congress is vested with the power to all owners in fee, the ability to sell, lease, dispose, exchange, convey, or simply preserve land. The Supreme Court has described this enumerated grant as one “without limitation” *Kleppe v New Mexico*, 426 U.S. 529, 542–543 (1976) (“And while the furthest reaches of the power granted by the Property Clause have not been definitely resolved, we have repeatedly observed that the power over the public land thus entrusted to Congress is without limitation.”) Historically, the federal government transferred ownership of federal property to either private ownership or the states in order to pay off large Revolutionary War debts and to assist with the development of infrastructure. The transfers codified by this legislation are thus constitutional.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 6739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (the Property Clause). Under this clause, Congress has the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States. By virtue of this enumerated power, Congress has governing authority over the lands, territories, or other property of the United States—and with this authority Congress is vested with the power to all owners in fee, the ability to sell, lease, dispose, exchange, convey, or simply preserve land. The Supreme Court has described this enumerated grant as one “without limitation” *Kleppe v New Mexico*, 426 U.S. 529, 542–543 (1976) (“And while the furthest reaches of the power granted by the Property Clause have not been definitely resolved, we have repeatedly observed that the power over the public land thus entrusted to Congress is without limitation.”) Historically, the federal government transferred ownership of federal property to either private ownership or the states in order to pay off large Revolutionary War debts and to assist with the development of infrastructure. The conveyance codified by this legislation is thus constitutional.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 6740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 6741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes); Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 (To coin money, regulate the value thereof; and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures); Article I, Section 8, Clause 6 (To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States); and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department thereof).

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 6742.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 6743.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution, and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which grants Congress the ability to make laws necessary to carry out that power. Additionally, Article I, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be made law; and therefore it implicitly allows Congress to amend any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 6744.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 6745.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. HENSARLING:

H.R. 6746.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The primary Constitutional authority for this legislation is the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 6747.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 6748.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 6749.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 6750.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 6751.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (“To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes”)

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 6752.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 6753.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 564: Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 754: Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 762: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1187: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1368: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1377: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1437: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1447: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KIHUEN, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1456: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 1475: Mr. LAMB.
H.R. 1531: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 1552: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 1612: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 1683: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 2008: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
H.R. 2016: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2051: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 2092: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 2095: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2327: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 2358: Mr. WELCH, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. SOTO, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 2366: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2401: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2418: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2472: Mrs. LAWRENCE and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2911: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 3057: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3113: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 3118: Mr. MAST.
H.R. 3124: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 3222: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3325: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 3494: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3513: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 3543: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 3770: Mr. RUSSELL.
H.R. 3834: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 3840: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 4022: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 4052: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 4099: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 4107: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4256: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. DEUTCH, and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 4417: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CRIST, Mrs. DINGELL, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 4608: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 4691: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 4693: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 4724: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 4983: Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 5006: Mr. GIANFORTE and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 5031: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 5114: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 5129: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
H.R. 5141: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 5266: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 5306: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. HANABUSA, and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 5621: Mrs. LOVE.
H.R. 5697: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 5760: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 5819: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 5963: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 6003: Mr. KINZINGER.
H.R. 6011: Mr. HILL.
H.R. 6018: Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 6093: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 6108: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 6140: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 6145: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 6193: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 6267: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 6287: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. REED, Ms. MENG, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 6292: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 6391: Mr. GOWDY.
H.R. 6406: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 6409: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 6410: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 6417: Mr. GAETZ and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 6510: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 6517: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 6525: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 6527: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BASS, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 6551: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 6561: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 6562: Mr. NUNES and Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 6578: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 6595: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 6635: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 6647: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 6649: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 6655: Mr. BERA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 6657: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 6663: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
H.R. 6681: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CLYBURN, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 6683: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 6703: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 6711: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 6713: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 6722: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 12: Mrs. HANDEL.
H. Res. 274: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. Res. 393: Mr. WOODALL.
H. Res. 750: Mr. KILMER.
H. Res. 766: Mr. KATKO.
H. Res. 864: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H. Res. 1018: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H. Res. 1043: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BEYER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CRIST, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. GARAMENDI.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 2018

No. 149

Senate

The Senate met at 9 and 10 seconds a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JOHN KENNEDY, a Senator from the State of Louisiana.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 7, 2018.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN KENNEDY, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KENNEDY thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY,
SEPTEMBER 11, 2018, AT 5 P.M.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 5 p.m. on Tuesday, September 11, 2018.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 9 and 43 seconds a.m., adjourned until Tuesday, September 11, 2018, at 5 p.m.

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S6111

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING SETON GARDNER

HON. PAUL D. RYAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when I accepted this job, I did not fully appreciate all of its institutional and ceremonial responsibilities. Today I can say it is one of the best things about being Speaker. This is in no small part due to having Seton Gardner as our director of special events and protocol. Seton started with Speaker Boehner as an intern in 2011, and joined the special events department in 2013. If there is a major event in the Capitol—be it a Gold Medal Ceremony, a Joint Meeting, or State of the Union—Seton is at the helm. She is highly regarded for maintaining our traditions, while making everyone from world leaders to everyday citizens feel at home in the people's House. No matter the stage, Seton never breaks a sweat. She makes what is surely a stressful process go seamlessly. For all of this, and for her years of dedicated service, I extend my thanks to Seton on behalf of a very grateful institution.

CITY OF EDMONTON

HON. JAMES COMER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the incorporation of the City of Edmonton in the First Congressional District of Kentucky. The local community is holding a celebration the weekend of September 7th through 9th in the downtown area, which will highlight their shared heritage and reflect on the city's past.

I appreciate the generations of local officials and citizens of Edmonton who have steadfastly devoted themselves to the betterment of others, as well as all those who have assisted with the planning of the event. This historic milestone is a culmination of their efforts and a testament to their collective pride for their beloved hometown.

I look forward to continuing to work with local leaders and the residents of Edmonton to further the economic and industrial prosperity of Metcalfe County for generations to come, and I join with the city's current and former residents in honoring this tight-knit, culturally rich community.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MRS. OLLIE RUTH HUNTER

HON. DAVID SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to join

my fellow Georgians in commemorating the passing of a lifelong resident of the Atlanta suburbs, Mrs. Ollie Ruth Hunter, who passed away on August 28, 2018, at the age of 84. Mrs. Hunter was a proud nurse who committed her life to care for her fellow citizens.

Mrs. Ollie Ruth Hunter was born on March 31, 1934. Having spent her entire life as a resident of Atlanta, she attended school at Ben Hill Elementary School, then on to Booker T. Washington High School. After high school, Mrs. Hunter continued her education at the Belmont Nursing School and Grady Nursing School. During her career, Mrs. Hunter worked as a nurse for Holy Family Hospital, various nursing homes, and individual private duty assignments. Subsequently, Mrs. Hunter held several jobs, but the one that allowed her to contribute most to her community was her job as the first black manager of Barricini Candies at Greenbriar Mall in Atlanta, GA. As a trailblazer, she provided the opportunity for numerous young black women to work their first job.

Mrs. Hunter loved to travel, especially, to Florida, but according to her, the best places to be were church, home, ball games, and car races. She was an active member of several clubs and lodges, including the Three Rose Social Club, Eastern Star, Heron of Jericho, and, her favorite, the Red Hat Society. She was the founder and Queen of the Red Hat Gems of Atlanta.

I celebrate Mrs. Hunter for her admirable service to the city of Atlanta and her family. My colleagues and I extend our heartfelt condolences to her surviving family members which include her three children, three grandchildren, and eleven great-grandchildren. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my deepest sympathies to Mrs. Hunter's family and friends during this difficult time.

HONORING TYLER J. MANN, JR.

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Tyler Mann, Jr. Tyler is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 215, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Tyler has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Tyler has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Tyler has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Tyler completed landscaping around the new electronic sign at his church.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Tyler Mann, Jr. for his accom-

plishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING THE WORK OF NEW LIFE REFUGE MINISTRIES IN COMBATting HUMAN TRAF- FICKING AND BRINGING HEAL- ING TO ITS VICTIMS

HON. MICHAEL CLOUD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, human trafficking is a tragic, dehumanizing plague that must end. This year, Congress has taken significant steps to combat this horrible crime. Yet, more must be done both on the national level and in our communities.

The victims—children, women, and men—have had their lives forever changed and they will bear the scars, both mental and physical, for years to come. There are over 300,000 victims of human trafficking in the State of Texas alone. To make matters worse, many human trafficking victims are never rescued from their vicious captors.

Despite this darkness, there are rays of light across this nation making a difference in the battle against human trafficking. I rise today to highlight one of these remarkable organizations, the New Life Refuge Ministries, which is doing incredible work to combat this scourge by rescuing victims.

Organizations, such as New Life Refuge Ministries, serve as a voice for the voiceless, and work to empower the victims so that they can be heard. Their mission is simple: ending child sex trafficking by educating the community, partnering with other organizations in the fight against modern-day slavery, and providing a refuge for adult and child survivors alike.

Thank you to New Life Refuge Ministries for the work you are doing to end trafficking by bringing hope and healing to these shattered victims. Since its founding, New Life Refuge Ministries has worked tirelessly to educate more than 11,000 individuals on the dangers and effects of sex trafficking including healthcare workers, Law Enforcement officials, first responders, and even high school students, demonstrating to them the effects this modern-day slavery has on the youth of America.

Through their efforts, New Life Refuge Ministries, and many similar organizations have saved countless children from the vicious entrapments and effects of human trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize New Life Refuge Ministries in their fight to end child sex trafficking and bring healing and hope to the brave children who have suffered under this abuse. Mr. Speaker, please join me in extending my sincerest desire for the success of their mission and may they inspire others to do the same.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

May God Bless the New Life Refuge Ministries and their mission, may God Bless the victims, and may they find refuge, hope, and—ultimately—healing.

HONORING THE GILROY DISPATCH OF THE CITY OF GILROY

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Gilroy Dispatch (Dispatch), the local printed news source for the City of Gilroy. On September 12, 2018, the Gilroy Dispatch will celebrate a true milestone, its 150th anniversary. I would like to commend the Dispatch for its century and a half of service, fellowship, and leadership to the Gilroy community.

Founded initially as the Gilroy Advocate, the Dispatch is one of the oldest continuous businesses in the region. The Dispatch has chronicled the community's growth from a small agricultural town to the nation's Garlic Capital.

The Dispatch has been at the heart of its Gilroy community through connecting neighbors to each other and to small businesses. It continues to serve as both a spotlight and watchdog for neighbors and readers alike on the changes and developments in Gilroy.

In its history, the Dispatch's pages have accounted for stories of all sizes and angles. It has chronicled wars, fires, earthquakes, floods as well as new schools, big harvests and citizen achievements. Despite its many awards over the years, the Dispatch is most proud of the trust it has earned by the Gilroy community.

As the Gilroy Dispatch celebrates 150 years of service to the Gilroy community, I join in congratulating them and wishing them the best for the next 150 years.

HONORING JANE L. HOUGH

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Jane L. Hough, who passed away on August 11 at the age of 91. She was a friend to me and to many who live in Salem, the city she loved. While most notable as the first woman to serve on Salem's City Council, she contributed in many ways to the welfare of her community.

Jane was born in Norton and grew up in the coalfields of Virginia. She attended Randolph Macon Women's College, where she earned a dual degree in Latin and math. Her son Andy told the Roanoke Times that she still spoke fluent Latin years after graduating, but she drew on her math degree to teach algebra at Andrew Lewis High School.

Jane was a longtime member of the Salem Republican Committee. In 1972, she decided to run for Salem's City Council. She ran as an independent, won, and served three terms, helping Salem find its footing in its early years as an independent city. Her leadership boosted the city's fiscal health. During her tenure,

she served on the executive board of the Virginia Municipal League and the National League of Cities' Small City Commission.

Jane's active citizenship in Salem extended beyond her time in elected office. Beside her career as a teacher prior to her time on City Council, she mentored children at the Virginia Baptist Children's Home supervised by her husband Franklin. Beginning in 1953, she also helped beautify the city by planting and landscaping as a member of the Salem Garden Club.

Jane is survived by Franklin, her husband of 69 years; their four children, Frank, Amelia, Jay, and Andy; their four grandchildren, Amy, Morgen, Lucy, and Samantha; and their great-grandchildren, Amelia and Olivia. She will be missed in Salem, the city for which she did so much.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN H. RUTHERFORD

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavailable and missed Roll Call Vote 390. Had I been present, I would have voted "Nay" on Roll Call No. 390.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN

SPEECH OF

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2018

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, thank you to Mr. HILL for organizing this tribute.

Last week, Arizonans said goodbye to our senator, our patriot, and our hero, John McCain. Thousands of us took a time off work, school, and our daily lives to pay our respects.

We honored Senator McCain because he was first and foremost an American patriot. He represented the very best about our country. He was loyal above all else to our core values as Americans. Before he left us, he wrote us a parting letter. One part of that letter spoke to me, and should be a daily reminder for us all:

"[W]e have always had so much more in common with each other than in disagreement. If only we remember that and give each other the benefit of the presumption that we all love our country, we'll get through these challenging times . . . believe always in the promise and greatness of America, because nothing is inevitable here. Americans never quit. We never surrender. We never hide from history. We make history."

John lived those values in the halls of the U.S. Senate, at home in Arizona, and around the world as a beacon of light and hope.

The memory of John McCain will never fade, but it's up to us to carry on his legacy. We must strive to find common ground and stand taller than the divisive and toxic politics of the moment. Some days, some will fall short of the expectations we set for ourselves, but we must wake up each day determined to do better and do right by the American people.

No matter our party, we should all aspire to live up to his measure and always try to do what's best for our country.

REPUBLIC OF THE RIO GRANDE: THE 7TH FLAG OVER TEXAS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, to a Texan, "Six Flags" is more than just the name of an amusement park. As those of us from great state know, the term refers to the six different flags that have flown over our state: those of Spain, France, Mexico, the Republic of Texas, the Confederacy, and—since 1865—the flag of the United States.

However, what many folks don't know is that there was a 7th flag over Texas that has long been overlooked: the flag of the Republic of the Rio Grande. Now, if you're from the little border town of Laredo this is no news to you. Laredo has adopted this flag as the city's official flag. It can be found waving on the streets, hanging on houses, and even prominently displayed in halls of City Council. Red, white, and black with three stars and two stripes, this flag is a symbol for a group of fighting Texans that will not be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, the Republic of the Rio Grande was a small, unrecognized nation. After Texas broke away from Mexico, leaders in other Mexican states were empowered to do the same. In 1840 the courageous leaders met in Laredo, Texas and declared their independence, claiming the territories of Mexican states, parts of current-day Texas, and even New Mexico for the Republic of the Rio Grande.

Those of us who have taken Texas history in school know that Mexico isn't a country keen on giving up territory without a fight. It's no surprise that the young Republic soon found itself facing the well-prepared Mexican army on the battlefield. Despite several months of intense battle, the revolutionaries were soon captured. The Republic of the Rio Grande was no more.

The Republic of the Rio Grande may have been a small and short-lived nation, but it captures the mind and spirit of generations of Texans. The Republic of the Rio Grande reminds us all to never give up without a fight, especially when fighting for freedom.

If you make it out to Laredo, Texas, look up. The flag of the Republic of the Rio Grande will be there, waving in the soft breeze. Look up and remember the brave soldiers that fought for Texas, the stars and stripes of that 7th flag, and remember the Republic of the Rio Grande.

And that's just the way it is.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. PETE HANSE

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Mr. Pete Hanse on being honored

as the Lemoore Chamber of Commerce 2018 Agriculturalist of the Year.

Pete Hanse was born and raised in California's Central Valley, attending local schools and choosing to remain in the community as an adult. Establishing a successful family business, Hanse Farms Inc., Mr. Hanse has earned a well-known reputation for his dedication to protecting and preserving the agriculture industry in Kings County and the greater Central Valley region.

Mr. Hanse has further shown his service to the community by his involvement in the Kings County Farm Bureau. For forty-four consecutive years, which is an accomplishment in and of itself, he has volunteered on its Board of Directors. He has held every position on the Board, including serving as President from 1986 to 1988. His involvement continued with his participation in numerous California Farm Bureau state conventions, establishing relationships and gaining knowledge from organizations outside of Kings County.

Through his decades of experience, Mr. Hanse has become known for his superior knowledge on many topics in the agriculture industry. His peers look to him for direction on industry challenges and he is consistently willing to share his wisdom with others. Through his dedication and involvement in the community, Mr. Hanse has become known for his reliability, hard-working character, and leadership for the industry.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in commending Mr. Pete Hanse on his dedicated service to the Central Valley and on being honored as the Lemoore Chamber of Commerce 2018 Agriculturalist of the Year.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EDW. C. LEVY CO.

HON. TIM WALBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of the Edw. C. Levy Co., which was founded in 1918 when Edward C. Levy, Sr. started a trucking business in Detroit, Michigan area.

A short time later, Levy started hauling away steel slag for the Ford Motor Company's River Rouge plant, and then other steel mills.

He began to crush the slag and sell it as road-base material—a move that paved the way for the company's continuing expansion and development.

Today, under the leadership of Ed Levy, Jr. and S. Evan Weiner, the Levy Group of Companies has grown into an international business with locations across the United States and the globe.

Their products and services include steel mill services, slag, natural aggregates, asphalt, concrete and cement, specialty products, logistics, lab services, land development, and agricultural products.

The company is committed to promoting the well-being of their employees and recognizing contributions made by the hardworking, loyal people who work there.

As a good neighbor, Levy is also active in helping to fund local projects and in contributing to charitable organizations that improve

the quality of life in the communities where they are located.

As they celebrate 100 years, Levy maintains a prominent position in the global marketplace and has a sterling reputation for excellence, innovation, and cooperation.

It is a lasting legacy that undoubtedly reaches far beyond Edward C. Levy, Sr.'s wildest dreams.

IN HONOR OF ALVARADOSMITH

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the AlvaradoSmith law firm in California. Since 1993, AlvaradoSmith has provided legal counsel to public agencies, large non-profit corporations, municipalities, emerging businesses, mid-sized companies and Fortune 500 companies. Since then they have opened three offices across California in Santa Ana, Los Angeles and San Francisco, in addition to international locations in Latin America. AlvaradoSmith uses state-of-the-art technology and attorneys with a wealth of experience in different sectors to provide clients with innovative solutions.

The AlvaradoSmith firm was established by Ray Alvarado and Ruben A. Smith with core principles around diversity, excellence, integrity, and community leadership. They have shown their commitment to these values as one of the largest minority-owned law firm in the nation and the largest certified minority-owned law firm in California. Their highly-qualified attorneys attended the nation's prestigious law schools including Berkley Law, Cornell, Georgetown, UCLA, USC and Yale. Their attorneys have breadth in their expertise ranging from business litigation to intellectual property. Their clients include Netflix, Shell, University of California, Restoration Hardware, Southern California Edison and Northrop Grumman.

Today, AlvaradoSmith serve as champions for diversity in legal counsel and continue to set the example for other law firms. AlvaradoSmith fosters inclusivity through their ability to speak over five different languages, investment in a multi-generational workforce, creation of women's leadership forum, and multi-disciplinary practice. I am honored to recognize AlvaradoSmith and its 25 years of dedication to diversity and inclusion.

HERB MEYER

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of an inspirational community leader, Herb Meyer, who recently passed away at the age of 87. Mr. Meyer was one of the sailing world's premier disabled racers, and he was dedicated to reducing barriers facing people with disabilities.

Born in 1931, Mr. Meyer began his sailing career at 12 years old in New Jersey. After serving in the Korean War as a jet fighter pilot,

he moved to California in 1963. Once in the Bay Area, Mr. Meyer started racing out of Belvedere Cove and eventually moved to Marin county in 1980.

In July of 1993, while sailing on San Francisco Bay, Mr. Meyer broke his neck and became a paraplegic. After sailing for over 30 years, Herb thought his days on the water were over. Thanks to the Bay Area Association of Disabled Sailors, Mr. Meyer was re-trained on sailing with a disability, and back out on the bay just one year after his accident. He continued competitive sailing and participated in Paralympic and other international races including in Canada, Italy, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Australia.

Over the years, Mr. Meyer joined many community organizations serving the disabled. In addition to serving as Commodore for the Bay Area Association of Disabled Sailors in 2002, he was on the boards of the Marin Center for Independent Living and the Treasure Island Sailing Center, and he was a founding member of the county's In-Home Support Services chapter. These efforts also translated to national action, as Mr. Meyer chaired the Special Needs Committee for the United States Sailing Association.

Herb Meyer served his country during a time of war and his community thereafter. He faced his disability and worked tirelessly to not only continue his passion for sailing but to lower the barriers for other to do the same. Mr. Speaker, it is therefore fitting that we honor Herb today for his decades of commitment to helping people with disabilities overcome barriers and follow their passions. His presence will be sorely missed, and his leadership not be soon forgotten.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, due to tropical storm Gordon, which impacted my district on 9/4/18, I was en route back to Washington and unable to vote on the following roll call votes on 9/6/18. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 392.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONSECRATION OF ST. GEORGE'S MACEDONIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 50th anniversary of the Macedonian Orthodox Church's consecration in Syracuse, New York. The Macedonian Orthodox Church has long been a staple in the Syracuse community and currently serves 200 families in the area.

Known locally as St. George, the congregation traces its roots back to 1964 when twenty Macedonian immigrant families established the church in upstate New York. Once established, the church registered under the jurisdiction of the Mother church, the Macedonian

Orthodox Church and the Holy Synod of Bishops in Skopje, Macedonia. Shortly thereafter, in 1965, the first Divine Liturgy was delivered to St. George's church by Archbishop Dositej Stojković in Macedonian. The visit by Archbishop Dositej was a success, resulting in the consecration of a permanent church on July 1, 1968.

St. George's rapidly expanded in the 1970's and by the end of the decade there was a need for a new church to accommodate more members. A new church hall was constructed and occupied by St. George's in 1981. On September 15, 1985, the new church was consecrated by the Metropolitan Kiril. After further successes and a growing parish, St. George's underwent its final renovation to date in the 1990's. This renovation included an expansion of the church hall and the installment of a beautiful stain glass window collection. These efforts were led by Father Branko Postolovski, who continues to lead St. George's today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the members of the House to join me in honoring the history and contributions of St. George's Macedonian Orthodox Church. It is my hope that St. George's continues to thrive and serve the Syracuse area for many more years to come.

HONORING BRIGADIER GENERAL
BENJAMIN F. ADAMS III

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Brigadier General Benjamin F. Adams III. He is an exemplary leader who has served our nation for forty years in military service.

General Adams received his commission through the ROTC program at the University of Mississippi in 1978. He completed flight school in 1980 and spent 15 years on active duty with the United States Army. He has commanded at the company, battalion, and brigade levels. Active duty assignments included the United States Army Aviation Center, Fort Rucker, Alabama; the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) and the 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment (Airborne) at Fort Campbell, Kentucky; Army Reserve Personnel Center, Saint Louis, Missouri; and the Combined Forces Land Component Command, Kuwait and Baghdad, Iraq. He served as a military technician in the Kentucky National Guard as the Commonwealth of Kentucky's State Army Aviation Officer; J1 and Army Chief of Staff from September 1999 to November 2012.

General Adams' most recent service has been as Commander, Land Component Command, Kentucky Army National Guard. In this position, he served as an assistant and advisor to the Adjutant General of Kentucky. He was responsible for manning, training, and equipping a force of over 8,500 Army and Air Guardsmen.

Following a career of forty years of service, General Adams is retiring from Army service. He will continue to serve as the Kentucky Department of Veteran's Affairs Commissioner. His service there is valuable to all of Kentucky's many veterans.

It is my honor today to recognize this extraordinary patriot, Brigadier General Benjamin

F. Adams, as he retires from Army service. His service and his leadership are greatly appreciated.

TACKLING FENTANYL: THE CHINA
CONNECTION

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we held a hearing at the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, which I chair.

Chinese-made fentanyl, a synthetic opioid, is killing Americans—more than 29,000 in 2017 alone. We must hold the Chinese government accountable.

Kirsten D. Madison, Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs testified that China is “a primary source of illicit synthetic drugs coming to the United States.”

Paul E. Knierim, Deputy Chief of Operations at the Office of Global Enforcement for the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), stated in his testimony that “China is one of the world's top producers of the precursor chemicals used to manufacture methamphetamine and fentanyl, as well as the chemicals used to process heroin and cocaine.”

Ocean County, New Jersey Prosecutor Joseph Coronato, has called the China-made fentanyl sent into the United States a “synthetic storm” that is “devastating.”

He noted thankfully that local law enforcement is doing something about it—like his program that allows drug abusers to voluntarily turn themselves in at a police station—more than 800 since 2017—without being prosecuted. A program that has almost certainly reduced deaths.

Still, Prosecutor Coronato noted that based on his medical examiner toxicology analysis, in 2014, 10 percent of overdose deaths had fentanyl in their systems. Shockingly, in 2018, fentanyl-related deaths have jumped to 80 percent or more.

He also told the committee that “synthetics will become the predominate type of illegal drugs abused within the next 5 years” and that “in many instances” it is being sold “right over the internet.”

I asked both the State Department and DEA what the U.S. is doing to hold China accountable for fentanyl in the U.S. Are we using existing tools to hold bad actors in China accountable? We have tools, such as the Global Magnitsky Act, which targets corrupt officials and human rights abusers.

Recently the House passed comprehensive legislation to address the opioid crisis including the Synthetics and Overdose Prevention Act. The bill requires the U.S. Postal Service (as private carriers like UPS and Fed-Ex are currently required to do) to obtain advance electronic data (AED)—detailed info on the shipper and addressee and other data-empowering Customs and Border Protection to target fentanyl and other illegal drug shipments.

Bryce Pardo of the RAND Corporation testified that the potency of fentanyl has sharply increased the number of opioid overdoses

... and that the drug overdose crisis now surpasses major public health epidemics of prior generations, including the HIV/AIDS epidemic.

Every single Congressional district in America has felt the scourge of the opioid epidemic. Don Holman, who was in the audience yesterday, lost his son, Garrett, to an overdose of synthetic fentanyl. Don's written testimony submitted to the committee, reports that the package came straight from China. His son ordered it online, not knowing of the poisonous effects fentanyl has.

Last week, I spoke at the Mercer County, International Overdose Awareness Day sponsored by Prosecutor Angelo Onofri and Robbinsville Mayor David Fried. Personal testimonies offered by survivors and recovering abusers were deeply moving.

Trenton Police Chief Pedro Medina spoke of the loss of his son, Petey, and assured the audience that there is a “God who can help all of you.”

Advocate Mark Manning, who lost his son Christopher, spoke of his ongoing pain but urged all to work together to help the vulnerable.

And Adrienne Petta recounted the horrors of her addiction and the impact on her family—she is now a recovery specialist.

For the record, Monmouth County Prosecutor Christopher Gramiccioni's Opioids Diversion Program, steers certain low-level non-violent offenders to treatment rather than traditional criminal prosecution, and Mercer County Prosecutor Angelo Onofri's Community Addiction Recovery Effort (CARE) program which emphasizes treatment-first interventions for opioid addicts.

We must look at this as a disease. Go after those who are marketing and selling fentanyl and offer programs and assistance to those who need help.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH WEDDING
ANNIVERSARY OF DAVID AND
CAROL WITHERINGTON

HON. ERIC A. “RICK” CRAWFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th wedding anniversary of David and Carol Witherington. When they met, Chicagoan Carol Leonard was 17. Tennessean David Witherington was on leave, and visiting Carol's hometown of Melrose Park, Illinois. Following David's honorable discharge, they eloped and married on September 7, 1968, in Clinton, Kentucky. Mr. and Mrs. Witherington worked in the plastics industry, and their careers took them across the United States, along the way adopting two sons. In 1985 the family sold their house, moved to Colorado, and started their own successful plastics company—the BroCom Corporation. Today, the Witheringtons live in beautiful Mountain Home, Arkansas, and are celebrating 50 years of marriage.

HONORING THE CALISTOGA
SPEEDWAY

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Calistoga Speedway in Calistoga, California for being a long-standing place for our community to gather together and enjoy racing.

Calistoga Speedway is an important institution in our community. It is the home of a half mile dirt track loop, one of only several left in the United States. In 1937, the racetrack transitioned from hosting horse racing to car racing and since then has made a great impact in Calistoga and our surrounding community.

In the middle of the 20th century, Louie Vermeil and others founded the Northern Auto Racing Club (NARC), now called the Golden State Challenge Series. The Calistoga Speedway was NARC's home for 25 years. Currently, drivers from associations including the Bay Cities Roadster Racing Association, the American Racing Association and the Golden State Challenge Series make a point to race at the classic racetrack at the Calistoga Speedway. Additionally, the Calistoga Speedway has been an incredible venue for local racers, including Rico Abreu, to develop their passions for racing and begin their careers.

Numerous generations of racers and race fans have spent time at the Calistoga Speedway. During the two-day races, Calistogans and out-of-town race enthusiasts fill the RV park at the Napa County Fairgrounds and pack the seats at the racetrack. The crowds that the Calistoga Speedway draw also strengthen our local economy. Visitors eat at our restaurants, shop at our stores and stay at our hotels. Other facets of our community, in addition to local businesses, benefit from the Calistoga Speedway. Profits from the Wildcat Boosters' snack bar at the racetrack fund sports and music programs in our community, which Calistoga children may not have access to otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, the Calistoga Speedway is an important pillar of our community. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor it here today.

IN RECOGNITION OF KINGS
COUNTY FARM BUREAU

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Kings County Farm Bureau on being honored as the Lemoore Chamber of Commerce 2018 Agriculture Supporter of the Year.

Kings County Farm Bureau has become a foundational institution in California's Central Valley. Celebrating one-hundred years of operation, an incredible achievement in and of itself, Kings County Farm Bureau acts as the sole agriculture advocacy organization for Kings County, California.

Kings County Farm Bureau not only acts as an advocate, but also leads the way on nu-

merous community service initiatives. Included is an emphasis on students and young adults in Kings County. One such initiative is their annual Farm Day, where they strive to educate students on agriculture-related topics and allow them to interact with industry professionals. Every third-grader in Kings County is given this opportunity at no cost to the schools. Additionally, Kings County Farm Bureau awards thousands of dollars in college scholarships to graduating high school seniors each year.

Kings County Farm Bureau exists as a direct reflection of their stated mission: "To provide education, promotion and representation of agriculture." They educate the community, students, and adults alike, on the importance of agriculture for Kings County and the Central Valley as a whole. Through their initiatives, they directly inspire the next generation of agricultural leaders. They promote the industry by connecting the consumer to the farmer, providing a platform for both to communicate and learn from each other. Finally, they represent the agriculture industry through their policy advocacy on the local, state, and federal levels of government. Kings County Farm Bureau has consistently demonstrated their commitment to protect, preserve, and enhance agriculture throughout Kings County.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in commending Kings County Farm Bureau on their dedicated service to the Central Valley and on being honored as the Lemoore Chamber of Commerce 2018 Agriculture Supporter of the Year.

STANDING UP FOR THE PEOPLE
OF IRAN

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Iranian people are still in the streets calling for the end of the regime. Despite continued violence by the regime's thugs, they persist in their cries for freedom. Across Iran, in more than 80 cities, thousands of Iranians are saying they have had enough with the corruption and repression of the mullahs. The free world cannot ignore their calls. America, the beacon of liberty, must stand with the Iranian people as they confront their oppressors.

For more than two decades, protests in Iran have grown more and more frequent as the promises of the Islamic revolution have proven false. The clerics and IRGC thugs have hoarded Iran's wealth to enrich themselves and support terrorism across the Middle East. The people of Iran know that their nation should be prosperous. They know their country is blessed with abundant resources, a proud history, and population of talented and hardworking people—they should not be struggling to get by. But they know it is the mullahs—not sanctions from the U.S. or the existence of the state of Israel—that starve them and keep them poor. The Iranian people are not fools who believe the hollow rhetoric of the regime.

Even before President Trump rightly chose to abandon the Iran deal, the Iranian people saw no benefit from sanctions relief. The se-

cret shipments of cash from the Obama administration, the flood of foreign investment, the unfreezing of Iranian foreign assets, none of it reached the average Iranian. And so in late 2017 and into this year, the Iranian people bravely came to the streets again to demand that the regime fall. They shouted "death to the regime" and "down with the mullahs." And the regime responded, as it has so many times before, with brutality, killing 25 and arresting more than 4,000. But the Iranian people remain undaunted and have not yielded.

The boldness of the protesters who initially took to the streets over the economic hardships quickly inspired others to come forward. Women threw their required headscarves to the ground in public squares, religious minorities spoke-out about their persecution, workers went on strike, and secularists stormed clerical seminaries. Their motives represented a wide-range of grievance against the regime, but they were unified in message: this illegitimate regime must end. These protests continue to expand as Iranians see their futures diminish under the Supreme Leader and his band of terrorists.

There has been an awakening in Iran and we must support it. It is not through bombs or guns that Iran will become free. It will be through the enduring courage and actions of everyday Iranians standing up to the regime thugs. They are demanding change now and, in growing numbers, putting fear into the hearts of the mullahs and their stooges. We can encourage and amplify their heroism. America has the resources and innovative tools to broadcast Iranians' messages of hope. Through our technological edge, the U.S. can help Iranians communicate and provide whatever assistance is requested. We can also ensure that the brutality of the regime is seen by all and that the theocrats become more isolated and punished because of it.

America will never turn its back on people yearning to be free. Whether in Iran or anywhere else. We have learned throughout history that ruthless despots that rule far from our shores still present a threat to us and our ideals. If we stand silently as they savagely crush dissent within their own country, their ambitions will eventually turn to opponents beyond their borders. The regime in Tehran has already demonstrated this intent by spreading terror throughout the region. Therefore we must remain committed to the cause of freedom throughout the globe. The terrorists who rule Iran today will meet justice, and we will help the Iranian people deliver it. And that's just the way it is.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, due to tropical storm Gordon, which impacted my district on 9/4/18, I was en route back to Washington and unable to vote on the following roll call votes on 9/6/18.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 386; YEA on Roll Call No. 387; NAY on Roll Call No. 388; NAY on Roll Call No. 389; and NAY on Roll Call No. 390.

HONORING RONALD V. DELLUMS

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2018

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to remember and pay tribute to Ronald V. Dellums, the pioneering, legendary, brilliant, and dynamic former Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee who represented the residents of California's 9th Congressional District in this body for 27 years.

Ronald Dellums died peacefully on July 30, 2018, at his home in Washington D.C. after waging a heroic but losing battle against prostate cancer; he was 82 years old.

Born November 24, 1935 in Oakland, California, to Verney and Willa Dellums, Ronald Vernie Dellums would go on to lead a consequential life marked by public service, active engagement, and passionate leadership.

These qualities—service, engagement, passionate commitment—were Dellums family traits; Ron's father was a longshoreman and active in the labor movement and his uncle, Cottrell Laurence Dellums, helped A. Philip Randolph organize the Brother of Sleeping Car Porters, before being elected President of the union in 1966.

In 1954, after graduating from high school, and during the height of the Cold War, Ronald Dellums enlisted in the United States Marine Corps and served two years before being honorably discharged in 1956.

His honorable service to the nation enabled him to attend college on the G.I. Bill and in 1958 he earned an Associate of Arts degree from Oakland City College, followed by a Bachelor of Science degree in 1960 from San Francisco State University, an M.S.W. from the University of California at Berkeley in 1962.

Upon graduation from UC-Berkeley, Ronald Dellums worked as a psychiatric social worker for the California Department of Mental Hygiene and taught at San Francisco State University and the University of California at Berkeley, work which soon led him to become involved in local politics.

In 1967, at the age of 32, Ronald was elected to the Berkeley City Council, where he served until 1970, when he was elected to Congress as an anti-Vietnam War activist, defeating the incumbent in the primary, and winning the general election in a landslide.

In 1972, Ronald Dellums was reelected to the 93rd Congress and to the succeeding Congresses, never winning election with less than 57 percent of the vote.

During his tenure in Congress, Ronald Dellums served on the House Committees on Foreign Affairs, the District of Columbia, Post Office and Civil Service, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and Armed Services, which he chaired from 1993 to 1995 and was Ranking Member from 1995 until his retirement from the House in 1998.

Throughout his congressional career, Ronald Dellums, who cofounded the Congressional Black Caucus in 1971 and the Congressional Progressive Caucus in 1991, was one of the Capitol's leading authorities and voices challenging the underlying assumptions of the U.S. military budget.

Ronald Dellums also led the congressional opposition to the apartheid regime in South Africa, winning passage of the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986 by congressional override of President Reagan's veto, the first override in the 20th century of a presidential foreign policy veto.

Ronald Dellums championed for equal rights for Americans and was one of the first to call for the integration of gays and lesbians into the military.

In addition to championing equal rights, Ron Dellums was a strong supporter of historic preservation.

He emerged as one of the most radical and outspoken Congressmen in Washington, and a spokesperson for African American community affairs and for his radical political beliefs.

After retiring from Congress in 1998, Ronald Dellums served as president of Healthcare International Management, an organization that worked with the newly democratic South African government to develop low cost, affordable healthcare and bring awareness, prevention and treatment in response to the AIDS epidemic.

Mr. Speaker, Ron Dellums lived a long and fulfilling life and made his mark in the world by making a difference in the lives of untold numbers of individuals.

I hope that Ron's family and loved ones are comforted by the fact that the lives of millions of people here at home and around the world were touched by the service of one of the great social activists, political leaders, and statesmen of the 20th century.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in memory of Ronald V. Dellums, a tireless and eloquent voice for justice and equality, who did so much to ensure that America always strives to live up to the promise of its founding ideals and remain a beacon and example for the world.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I missed Roll Call votes 386 and 387. Had I been present, I would have voted NO on the Previous Question in order to allow the House to take up and debate the Child Care for Working Families Act. I would have voted NO on the closed rule for debate on H.R. 6691.

RECOGNIZING THE 208TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEXICAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 208th Anniversary of Mexican Independence and the 125th Anniversary of the Consulate General of Mexico in Denver.

In October 1893, Mexican President Porfirio Diaz appointed Mr. Casemiro Barela as the first Consul General of Mexico in Denver, Colorado. This moment marked the beginning of

the long and rewarding relationship between the people of Colorado and Mexico. I am proud to offer this recognition of this important day for the Mexico-United States relationship, but also for the Mexico-Colorado relationship, here in the United States House of Representatives. Not only is Mexico an important neighbor, but it is also one of our nation's greatest trading partners and closest friends.

Mexico is home to a hardworking and caring people. Through the generations, we have seen the Mexican people exemplify resiliency and courage leading to the development of their country. Mexico is a country of great culture, which has positively influenced the United States and its citizens for the better. The United States is home to a large Mexican-American community, and their contributions have undoubtedly made our nation stronger.

I am pleased to recognize the 208th Anniversary of Mexican Independence and to mark the 125th anniversary of the opening of the Mexican consulate here in Colorado. I look forward to the continued success of our southern neighbor and to watching the bond between our two nations grow stronger.

TRIBUTE TO CHIEF TIM WALL
CHAIR OF THE VOLUNTEER AND
COMBINATION OFFICERS SECTION
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF FIRE CHIEFS**HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, as the co-chair of the Congressional Fire Services Caucus I wish to recognize Timothy S. Wall, who will be stepping down as Chair of the Volunteer and Combination Officers Section (VCOS) of the International Association Fire Chiefs (IAFC) in November at the annual Volunteer and Combination Officers Section's Conference in Clearwater, Florida.

A third-generation firefighter, Chief Wall joined the North Farms Volunteer Fire Department in 1979. For the past 20 years, he served as the department's chief. Active in civic organizations and public safety agencies, Chief Wall became a deputy sheriff of New Haven County in 1980 and has served as a Connecticut state fire marshal since 2000. In addition, he is a former president of the Connecticut Fire Chiefs Association and the New England Division of Fire Chief.

The mission of VCOS is to provide chief officers who manage volunteer and combination departments within the fire, rescue, and EMS delivery system with information, education, services, and representation to enhance their professionalism and capabilities. Chief Wall was elected Chair of the Volunteer and Combination Officers Section in 2005. Under his leadership, VCOS has been successfully performing its mission.

Most recently, VCOS published a joint publication with the National Volunteer Fire Council on cancer prevention within the fire service, which is the most pressing issue in the fire service. Other challenges include volunteer recruitment and retention, workplace safety, leadership accountability and emergency medical services. VCOS has always demonstrated leadership in addressing the emerging issues

that confront their members—whether it's through publishing reports, developing training materials or delivering important messages to our elected leaders. These actions require strong leadership, which Chief Wall has demonstrated throughout his term as Chair.

As a co-chair of the Congressional Fire Services Caucus, I extend my thanks to Chief Wall for the support he has provided to the Fire Caucus throughout the years. He understands the importance of grassroots advocacy and has always offered his support to my fellow fire caucus co-chairs and me to help us advance fire service legislation through Congress.

President Abraham Lincoln once said, "Don't worry when you are not recognized, but strive to be worthy of recognition." To me, these words describe the character of the men and women of our nation's fire service. Firefighters perform their mission not for recognition, but for a much higher cause: to safeguard the citizens of their communities. While Chief Wall has never sought recognition, I would like to take this opportunity to express my thanks and appreciation for his selfless dedication and commitment to public safety. He has certainly earned the right to be recognized.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, due to tropical storm Gordon, which impacted my district on 9/4/18, I was not present in the House and unable to vote on Wednesday, September 5, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 382; YEA on Roll Call No. 383; NAY on Roll Call No. 384; and YEA on Roll Call No. 385.

HONORING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SANTA CLARA VALLEY OPEN SPACE AUTHORITY

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 25th Anniversary of the Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority. The OSA's work helps sustain and enrich our lives and is singularly important to the well-being of future generations.

The OSA was established in 1993 in response to grassroots efforts by citizen activists and the public seeking to protect Santa Clara Valley's natural resources. From a small agency, it expanded into a diverse organization with 700 currently active volunteers, serving areas of Santa Clara County outside the Mid peninsula Regional Open Space District. The OSA now owns and manages the Sierra Vista Open Space, the Rancho Canada del Oro Open Space, and the Coyote Ridge and Coyote Valley Open Space Preserves.

The OSA's accomplishments over the past 25 years are numerous and significant, involv-

ing extensive planning and collaboration with a variety of partners to develop foundational research and planning tools that guide their projects and inform their work. It is the first public agency to receive Land Trust Alliance Accreditation in 2017, ensuring best practices and standards for professional land conservation.

Currently, the OSA protects over 22,000 acres of land and provides permanent protection of habitat for 25 rare and endangered species of wildlife and plants. The OSA is the first agency in California to sponsor and develop a Regional Conservation Investment Strategy to promote the preservation of species, habitats, and other natural resources.

Year-round, the OSA maintains the availability of three open space preserves to the public and runs hundreds of different types of free environmental education programs for the public in our preserves and urban parklands. The OSA also provides over \$10,000,000 in funding to over 30 Urban Open Space Projects throughout our jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in commending the Open Space Authority for 25 years of hard work, its progress in its mission of conserving the natural environment, supporting agriculture and connecting our communities to nature is noteworthy. The OSA has been a key agency in our area to help guard our future by preserving vital natural communities, and connecting people to nature in our beautiful Santa Clara Valley.

THE SPANISH FLAG LOWERED FOR THE FINAL TIME ON TEXAS SOIL

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the day was July 21, 1821. The heat of the Texas summer sun beat down upon San Antonio de Bexar, the future site of the Battle of the Alamo. The flag of Imperial Spain billowed in the wind above the roofs of the mission town. This day, however, would be the final day that this flag would fly over Texas.

For nearly three centuries, the Spanish governed Texas. Conquistadores, missionaries, and adventurers made their way to Texas, drawn in by the bountiful opportunities of the seemingly endless land. However, resistance against Spanish rule began to take root within its overseas colonies. In Texas, filibusters from the United States crossed into Spanish territory attempting to claim land loosely controlled by Spanish royal forces. Mexico caught the fever of revolution, and by the early 1800's, certain individuals, including Father Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, were promoting resistance to aspects of Spanish rule.

To make matters worse, Spain was forced to cede Louisiana as a result of the Napoleonic Wars at home to France, who then sold it to President Thomas Jefferson and the United States.

Eventually, the pressure became too great from within, and the Mexican War of Independence began in 1810. Revolutionaries, both Hispanic and Anglos, living across Spanish Mexico took up arms in open revolt against the Spanish occupiers. In Texas, Jose

Bernardo Gutierrez de Lara and Augustus W. Magee captured Nacodoches, La Bahia, and San Antonio, the capital of Spanish Texas at the time, and proclaimed Texas an independent nation in 1813. Despite their early success, the group eventually was defeated decisively by Spanish forces, thus keeping Texas under Spain's control.

However, the days of Spanish rule were numbered, and eventually the independence movement in Mexico under Agustin de Iturbide and Vicente Guerrero successfully drove the Spanish from Mexican shores once and for all. Mexico would officially become an independent nation on July 21, 1821. Having provided resistance against Spanish rule, Texas remained a part of an independent Mexico until the Texas Revolution fifteen years later.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to honor the state's history. The Spanish flag is one of the Six Flags over Texas, part of the rich tapestry of the state's history, and this event represents an important moment in the history of our nation. And that is just the way it is.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present during roll call vote numbers 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, and 392 on September 6, 2018, due to recent surgery. I would like to reflect how I would have voted:

On roll call vote no. 386 I would have voted NO.

On roll call vote no. 387 I would have voted NO.

On roll call vote no. 388 I would have voted YES.

On roll call vote no. 389 I would have voted YES.

On roll call vote no. 390 I would have voted YES.

On roll call vote no. 391 I would have voted YES.

On roll call vote no. 392 I would have voted NO.

HONORING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. LAWRENCE CATHOLIC CHURCH

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize St. Lawrence Catholic Church of Greenville, Illinois, on the occasion of its 150th anniversary.

St. Lawrence began as a mission of the Mother of Dolors in the 1850s but the first mass wasn't celebrated until 1868. At that time the congregation consisted of just a dozen families without an assigned priest. Eventually, the faithful were rewarded with a parish of their own in 1877, under the patronage of St. Lawrence the Martyr. The first church was erected a year later. A resident priest began to occupy the parochial residence in 1895, and shortly thereafter land for the church's cemetery was purchased.

In 1910, a fire destroyed the church shortly after the arrival of father John Enright, who went on to serve as St. Lawrence's pastor for 47 years. The congregation quickly set to work rebuilding and two years later a new church was dedicated, serving the congregation until a new church replaced it in 1994. In the interim, a rectory was added as well as a confraternity school.

To celebrate St. Lawrence's important milestone, the church held a "Mass in the Grass," followed by a time capsule ceremony. Musicians performed during the celebration, which

included activities, games, food, and a good deal of fellowship.

Mr. Speaker, since its start, St. Lawrence has had a strong presence in Greenville and been a focal point for the religious and spiritual needs of the community. I want to wish its pastor, Father Alan Hunter, and parishioners of St. Lawrence Catholic Church, the very best as they celebrate 150 years of service.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 7, 2018

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, due to tropical storm Gordon, which impacted my district on 9/4/18, I was not present in the House and unable to vote on Tuesday September 4, 2018.

Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 380 and YEA on Roll Call No. 381.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate met at 9:00:10 a.m. in pro forma session, and adjourned at 9:00:43 a.m. until 5 p.m., on Tuesday, September 11, 2018.

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Brett M. Kavanaugh, of Maryland, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, after receiving testimony from Representative Cedric Richmond; Rebecca Taibleson, Assistant United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin; Theodore B. Olson, and Paul Clement, both a former Solicitor General, and Maureen E. Mahoney, former Deputy Solicitor General; John Dean, former White House Counsel to President Richard M. Nixon; A.J. Kramer, Federal Public Defender, Office of the Federal Public Defender for the District of Columbia; Paul T. Moxley, Salt Lake City, Utah, and John R.

Tarpley, Nashville, Tennessee, both of the American Bar Association; Luke McCloud, Williams and Connolly LLP, Colleen E. Roh Sinzdak, Hogan Lovells LLP, Lisa Heinzerling, Georgetown University Law Center, and Monica Mastal, all of Washington, D.C.; Louisa Garry, Friends Academy, Locust Valley, New York; Akhil Amar, Yale Law School, New Haven, Connecticut; Rochelle Garza, Garza and Garza Law, Brownsville, Texas; Elizabeth Weintraub, Association of University Centers on Disabilities, Silver Spring, Maryland; Melissa Murray, New York University School of Law, New York, New York; Kenneth Christmas, Marvista Entertainment, Los Angeles, California; Melissa Smith, U.S. Grant Public High School, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; Adam White, Hamilton, Virginia, and Jennifer Mascott, Arlington, Virginia, both of the George Mason University Antonin Scalia Law School; Rebecca Ingber, Boston University School of Law, Boston, Massachusetts; Peter Shane, Ohio State University Moritz College of Law, Columbus; Alicia Baker, Indianapolis, Indiana; Aalayah Eastmond, Parkland, Florida; Jackson Corbin, Hanover, Pennsylvania; and Hunter LaChance, Kennebunk, Maine.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 24 public bills, H.R. 6730–6753; and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 1055–1057 were introduced. **Pages H7941–42**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H7943**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 5923, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange certain public lands in Ouachita National Forest, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–922);

H.R. 6198, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Countering Weapons of

Mass Destruction Office, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–923, Part 1);

H.R. 1320, to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 related to Nuclear Regulatory Commission user fees and annual charges, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–924);

H.R. 2278, to extend the authorization of the Uranium Mill Tailing Radiation Control Act of 1978 relating to the disposal site in Mesa County, Colorado, with amendments (H. Rept. 115–925);

H.R. 2389, to reauthorize the West Valley demonstration project, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–926); and

H.R. 5532, to redesignate the Reconstruction Era National Monument as the Reconstruction Era National Historical Park, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–927). **Pages H7940–41**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Curtis to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H7923**

Protecting Religiously Affiliated Institutions Act of 2018: The House agreed to take from the Speaker's table and pass S. 994, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for the protection of community centers with religious affiliation. **Page H7925**

Community Safety and Security Act of 2018: The House passed H.R. 6691, to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the definition of “crime of violence”, by a yea-and-nay vote of 247 yeas to 152 nays with two answering “present”, Roll No. 393. **Pages H7925–37**

H. Res. 1051, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6691) was agreed to yesterday, September 6th.

Recess: The House recessed at 11:14 a.m. and reconvened at 4:30 p.m. **Page H7939**

Recess: The House recessed at 4:36 p.m. and reconvened at 4:49 p.m. **Page H7939**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 3:30 p.m. on Monday, September 10th and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Wednesday, September 12th for Morning Hour debate. **Page H7939**

Senate Referrals: S. 1417 was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources. S. 1586 was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources. **Page H7939**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today and appears on page H7939.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of today and appears on pages H7936–37. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 4:49 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a markup on H.R. 3325, the “ACE Kids Act”; H.R. 3891, to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to clarify the authority of State Medicaid fraud and abuse control units to investigate and prosecute cases of Medicaid patient abuse and neglect in any setting, and for other purposes; H.R.

5306, the “EMPOWER Care Act”; legislation to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act and title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prohibit group health plans, health insurance issuers, prescription drug plan sponsors, and Medicare Advantage organizations from limiting certain information on drug prices; legislation on the Strengthening the Health Care Fraud Prevention Task Force Act of 2018; and legislation to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission with access to certain drug rebate information. H.R. 3891, legislation to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act and title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prohibit group health plans, health insurance issuers, prescription drug plan sponsors, and Medicare Advantage organizations from limiting certain information on drug prices, and legislation to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission with access to certain drug rebate information were forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment. H.R. 5306, H.R. 3325, and legislation on the Strengthening the Health Care Fraud Prevention Task Force Act of 2018 were forwarded to the full Committee, as amended.

SURVEY OF TERRORIST GROUPS AND THEIR MEANS OF FINANCING

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Terrorism and Illicit Finance held a hearing entitled “Survey of Terrorist Groups and Their Means of Financing”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

BUILDING A 21ST CENTURY INFRASTRUCTURE FOR AMERICA: WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS AND POLICY, PART II

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing entitled “Building a 21st Century Infrastructure for America: Water Resources Projects and Policy, Part II”. Testimony was heard from Major General Scott Spellmon, Deputy Commanding General, Civil and Emergency Operations, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY,
SEPTEMBER 10, 2018**

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

5 p.m., Tuesday, September 11

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

3:30 p.m., Monday, September 10

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will meet in a pro forma session.

House Chamber

Program for Monday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 3:30 p.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barr, Andy, Ky., E1222
 Cloud, Michael, Tex., E1219
 Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1224
 Comer, James, Ky., E1219
 Correa, J. Luis, Calif., E1221
 Crawford, Eric A. "Rick", Ark., E1222
 Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E1225
 Graves, Sam, Mo., E1219

Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E1220
 Huffman, Jared, Calif., E1221
 Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E1224
 Katko, John, N.Y., E1221
 Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E1220, E1225
 Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E1224
 Palazzo, Steven M., Miss., E1221, E1223, E1225, E1226
 Pascrell, Bill, Jr., N.J., E1224
 Poe, Ted, Tex., E1220, E1223, E1225
 Rutherford, John H., Fla., E1220

Ryan, Paul D., Wisc., E1219
 Scott, David, Ga., E1219
 Shimkus, John, Ill., E1225
 Sinema, Kyrsten, Ariz., E1220
 Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E1222
 Thompson, Mike, Calif., E1223
 Valadao, David G., Calif., E1220, E1223
 Walberg, Tim, Mich., E1221



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.