```
1 NATIONAL CAPITOL CONTRACTING
```

- 2 RPTS AVERETT
- 3 HJU138000
- 4 MARKUP OF H.R. 1973; H.R. 2473;
- 5 H.R. 2431; H.R. 2407; H.R. 2406
- 6 | Wednesday, May 18, 2017
- 7 | House of Representatives,
- 8 | Committee on the Judiciary,
- 9 Washington, D.C.

- The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:24 a.m., in
- 11 Room 2141, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Bob Goodlatte
- 12 [chairman of the committee] presiding.
- 13 Present: Representatives Goodlatte, Sensenbrenner,
- 14 Smith, Chabot, Issa, King, Franks, Gohmert, Jordan, Poe,
- 15 Marino, Gowdy, Labrador, Farenthold, Collins, DeSantis,
- 16 Buck, Ratcliffe, Roby, Gaetz, Johnson of Louisiana, Biggs,
- 17 | Conyers, Nadler, Lofgren, Jackson Lee, Cohen, Johnson of
- 18 Georgia, Deutch, Bass, Richmond, Jeffries, Cicilline, Lieu,
- 19 Raskin, Jayapal, and Schneider.
- 20 | Staff Present: Shelley Husband, Staff Director; Branden

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

41

42

Ritchie, Deputy Staff Director; Zach Somers, Parliamentarian and General Counsel; George Fishman, Chief Counsel, Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security; Andrea Loving, Counsel, Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security; Joe Edlow, Counsel, Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security; Meg Barr, Counsel, Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security; Alley Adcock, Clerk; Perry Apelbaum, Minority Chief Counsel and Staff Director; Danielle Brown, Minority Chief Legislative Counsel and Parliamentarian; Aaron Hiller, Minority Chief Oversight Counsel; Joe Graupensperger, Minority Chief Counsel, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations; Monalisa Dugue, Minority Deputy Chief Counsel, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations; David Shanovlian, Minority Chief Counsel, Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security; Maunica Sthonki, Minority Counsel; David Greengrass, Minority Counsel; Arya Hariharan, Minority Counsel; Rosalind Jackson, Minority Professional Staff; 40 Joseph Ehrenkrantz, Minority Professional Staff; Elizabeth McElvein, Minority Professional Staff; and Matthew Morgan, Minority Counsel.

Chairman Goodlatte. Good morning. The Judiciary

Committee will come to order. Without objection, the chair is authorized to declare recess at any time.

I would like to take a moment, before we begin our markup today, to honor a very special member of my staff. Burak Guvensoylar, at the age of 30, lost his courageous battle with cancer this past weekend. Burak was a valued member of the Judiciary Committee team and worked on a variety of issues, including digital privacy and intellectual property. His vast knowledge and grasp of the issues impacting the technology community was a tremendous asset to the committee.

Most recently, Burak's work included the development of the committee's Innovation Agenda, and his steadfast work and tenacious attitude were not only essential to making this initiative a success, but were also a testament to his character. In fact, while he was undergoing intensive cancer treatments, he was aggressively working and sending follow-up emails from his hospital bed.

Burak was a true technology policy enthusiast. Prior to joining the staff of the Judiciary Committee, he served as the legislative adviser for Congressman Randy Forbes. While working for Congressman Forbes, Burak handled the diverse range of issues that fall under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, but it was always evident that

technology policy was his true passion.

He co-founded the Congressional Tech Staff Association and served as an executive officer responsible for the professional development program. Prior to his career on Capitol Hill, Burak worked at TechAmerica and CompTIA, focusing on international trade policy. Burak has many friends here in the halls of Congress on both sides of the aisle, and I know all of you join me in extending our deepest sympathies to his mother, Filiz Guvensoylar, and his sister, Aylin Forbes, and all of his loved ones. Burak will be deeply missed.

I would now like to recognize the ranking member, Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Conyers. Thank you, Chairman Goodlatte. On behalf of all of us on this side of the aisle, I would like to begin this hearing by offering my condolences to the family, friends, and coworkers of Burak Guvensoylar. During his service in the House of Representatives, Mr. Burak worked for Representative Randy Forbes of Virginia on technology and other issues. I have heard of the profound impact that he had on those who spent time with him, and he was a great friend, possessed a brilliant mind, and I sincerely join with my colleagues in offering my condolences to his friends and family. Thank you.

Chairman Goodlatte. I think it would be appropriate if

93 we had a moment of silence for Burak. 94 Thank you. 95 Mr. Conyers. Thank you. 96 Chairman Goodlatte. Pursuant to notice, I now call up 97 H.R. 1973 for purposes of markup and move that the committee 98 report the bill favorably to the House. 99 The clerk will report the bill. 100 Ms. Adcock. H.R. 1973, to prevent the sexual abuse of 101 minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt 102 reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, 103 and for other purposes. 104 [The bill follows:] 105 \*\*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT 1 \*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the bill is considered as read and open for amendment at any time, and I will begin by recognizing myself for an opening statement.

Protecting the amateur athletes who represent the
United States in competitions throughout the world is
vitally important to the Judiciary Committee. These
athletes are overseen by national governing bodies, such as
USA Swimming and USA Gymnastics, which were chartered by the
U.S. Olympic Committee. One of the greatest challenges
facing these governing bodies is preventing the sexual abuse
of the athletes they support.

According to a recent study, over the past 20 years, up to 368 amateur athletes were subjected to sexual abuse by adults affiliated with one governing body: USA Gymnastics. The Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act addresses the problem of abuse within amateur athletics. The act implements changes to reporting requirements, strengthens civil remedies for victims of abuse, and clarifies the duties of national governing bodies in handling allegations of abuse.

The bill first establishes a reporting requirement which includes a penalty for failing to report sexual abuse of the athletes. It also broadens the scope of individuals covered under mandatory reporting to include coaches, team doctors, or any adult authorized by a national governing

body to interact with children. These are the same requirements imposed on other professionals and those who are in a unique position to observe abuse or evidence of abuse, such as nurses, teachers, and even film developers.

Additionally, the act bolsters civil remedy options for amateur athletes who are victims of sexual abuse. The provision clarifies that a victim of sexual abuse need not prove personal monetary injury of \$150,000 when they sue their abuser. The act also allows for a court to award punitive damages to victims when warranted. Furthermore, the bill specifies that national governing bodies are authorized to develop and implement training, oversight practices, and safety procedures with the goal of ending sexual abuse within amateur athletics.

The bill is introduced by Congresswoman Susan Brooks in the House with bipartisan support, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1973.

It is now my pleasure to recognize the ranking member of the committee, Mr. Conyers, for his opening statement.

[The prepared statement of Chairman Goodlatte follows:]

151 | \*\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. Conyers. Thank you, Chairman Goodlatte. I support H.R. 1973, the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse, for several reasons.

Most importantly, this is a reasonable and important measure that is intended to help protect young athletes from abuse and preserve the sanctity of sports associated with the United States Olympic Committee, the organization responsible for preparing and training young athletes who might, one day, represent their country competitively all over the world.

Children deserve to fully enjoy the innocence of their youth by exploring the curiosities of the world, taking pleasure in the arts, and participating in sports, free from betrayal, harm, or danger. Involvement in sports and instruction and guidance from adult coaches can positively influence young people's growth and development and their potential for future success through adulthood. The sexual abuse of children and youth is intolerable in any context, and we must take appropriate measures to eliminate it from youth sports. Such exploitation betrays and harms young people, sometimes severely and irreparably.

Young people look to adults to protect them and keep them safe. We all have a responsibility to do so. With H.R. 1973, we have the opportunity to ensure that individuals abide by this duty. Existing Federal law

requires certain professionals, such as doctors, dentists, social workers, psychologists, teachers, and daycare workers, who regularly interact with children, to report suspected abuse to law enforcement.

While our discussion of this legislation today may focus primarily on sexual abuse, H.R. 1973 will require adults, who interact with young athletes in connection to national governing bodies of various sports, to report suspected abuse of any kind.

The need for this legislation is best illustrated by an ongoing scandal of widespread abuse and exploitation of young gymnasts over the course of 20 years within the USA Gymnastics, a prominent governing body of the United States Olympic Committee. Many complaints of sexual and emotional abuse went unreported, allowing coaches, instructors, and doctors to repeatedly victimize gymnasts as young as 6 years old.

The shocking failure of anyone to report accusations to law enforcement, or even keep track of them internally, made it possible for some of these predators to commit horrific acts at several gyms in several States. For example, a cloud of allegations of abuse surrounded one particular physician as far back as 1997. He was on the faculty, I am sorry to say, of Michigan State University, worked with the Spartan gymnastic team, and provided volunteer services to

USA Gymnastics for many years. Regrettably, allegations against him were not reported to law enforcement until recently. Now, following the first public complaint in 2015, more than 100 women have filed complaints accusing him of sexual abuse, and he faces more than 20 criminal charges in Federal and State courts as well.

While the USA Gymnastics scandal is unfortunate, let it be an example, an incentive to prevent such pervasive abuse elsewhere. And so I thank Chairman Goodlatte for his leadership on this important legislation, which I support and encourage my colleagues to do the same. I thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Conyers follows:]

214 \*\*\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\*\*

	ı
215	Chairman Goodlatte. I thank the gentleman, and I now
216	recognize myself for purposes of offering an amendment. The
217	clerk will report the amendment.
218	Ms. Adcock. Amendment to H.R. 1973, offered by Mr.
219	Goodlatte. Page 2, strike line 15
220	[The amendment of Chairman Goodlatte follows:]
221	****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as read, and I recognize myself to explain the amendment.

This manager's amendment makes a series of small changes in the bill, most of which are intended to merely clarify certain provisions. Substantively, the amendment adds one necessary word to the civil liability portion of the bill.

Currently, the tolling provision in the civil liability provision provides a subjective standard in which a civil lawsuit can be brought within 10 years of a plaintiff's own subjective statement of injury, which could occur decades later, whether or not such injury should have been reasonably discovered earlier and before witnesses died and other relevant evidence was destroyed. And so, under my amendment, at page 5, line 7, the term "reasonably" is inserted before "discovers."

Applying a reasonableness standard to statutes of limitations is fair and commonplace. The official notes that 18 U.S.C. section 2255 itself, which the base bill amends in the U.S. Code, specifically refer to the case of Singleton v. Clash, in which the court made clear that the discovery rule provides that the clock begins to run when the plaintiff has inquiry notice of his injury, namely, when he discovers or reasonably should have discovered the

injury. The court went on to say that, under the discovery rule, the inquiry is when the plaintiff knew or reasonably should have known of the injury.

As the court made clear, statutes of limitations are intended to promote justice by preventing surprises through the revival of claims that have been allowed to slumber until evidence has been lost, memories have faded, and witnesses have disappeared. And as the Supreme Court wrote in United States v. Kubrick, relied on by the court in Singleton, "a plaintiff armed with the facts about the harm done to him can protect himself by seeking advice in the medical and legal community.

To excuse him from promptly doing so by postponing the accrual of his claim would undermine the purpose of the limitation statute." As the court further stated in Singleton v. Clash, the plaintiff's theory would allow section 2255 claims decades beyond when the violation occurred.

The base bill would codify that theory as a matter of statutory law and allow lawsuits to be filed decades after the violations accrued, which would undermine the very purpose of statutes of limitations and deter injured victims from acting promptly to alleviate their injuries, while also subjecting the accused to the unfairness of having to defend oneself perhaps decades after exonerating material evidence

272 has disappeared.

Additionally, the amendment acknowledges that the duties of a national governing organization includes cooperating with an entity designated by the U.S. Olympic Committee. This provision refers to the U.S. Center for SafeSport, a non-profit corporation launched in March, specifically tasked with investigating and resolving abuse allegations for national governing bodies.

The original bill required national governing bodies to impose procedures to prevent one-on-one situations that are not observable and interruptible by another adult. The amendment changes this provision to instruct adults, who are not the parent of the athlete, to avoid one-on-one interactions. This change, while forcefully encouraging national governing bodies to implement these procedures, minimally eases the provision for sports and localities where such a procedure may be overly burdensome.

The original bill called for regular and random audits to make sure national governing bodies are strictly following the rules imposed by the bill. The amendment clarifies the audits should not exceed one per year. The bill allowed national governing bodies to prevent someone with a pending sexual misconduct allegation from continuing to work with kids until there was no risk to the kids. The amendment changes the "no risk" language to "until the

297 resolution of such sexual misconduct allegation." 298 Additionally, if a national governing body, the U.S. 299 Olympic Committee or SafeSport, undertakes an interim 300 measure under this provision, the amendment provides those 301 entities with limited liability in those circumstances. 302 The U.S. Olympic Committee currently may review the 303 certification of national governing bodies under the Ted 304 Stevens Act. The amendment mandates such reviews. This 305 amendment reflects the practice of the U.S. Olympic 306 Committee in reviewing national governing body 307 certifications. These changes are small but important to 308 assuring that our young athletes are protected from abuse 309 and that the newly-established SafeSport is as effective as 310 possible. 311 I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. 312 Mr. Conyers. Mr. Chairman? 313 Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the 314 gentleman from Michigan seek recognition? 315 Mr. Conyers. To support the amendment. 316 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized. 317 Mr. Conyers. I am pleased to support this amendment, 318 which updates the language of the bill to conform with the 319 structure of national governing bodies and their membership, 320 and allows some flexibility and policies required to prevent 321 abuse. And that is my brief support.

1	
322	Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman.
323	For what purpose does the gentleman from New York seek
324	recognition?
325	Mr. Nadler. Mr. Chairman, strike the last word. I
326	suppose I want clarification. Could you please explain,
327	briefly, the change in the statute of limitations? What is
328	the current statute? What would the original bill do? And
329	what would the amendment do? I was a little confused.
330	Chairman Goodlatte. I can read you, again, the lengthy
331	description. But currently, the tolling provision in the
332	civil liability provision provides a subjective standard in
333	which a civil lawsuit can be brought within 10 years of a
334	plaintiff's own subjective statement of injury, which could
335	occur decades later
336	Mr. Nadler. That is the current law.
337	Chairman Goodlatte whether or not such injury
338	should have been it is what is provided for in this bill.
339	Mr. Nadler. That is the bill. Okay.
340	Chairman Goodlatte. Right. And the amendment would
341	change that to add the word "reasonably" in front of
342	"discovers."
343	Mr. Nadler. So it would be 10 years after he
344	reasonably discovers?
345	Chairman Goodlatte. Correct.
346	Mr. Nadler. You mean 10 years after he reasonably

347 could be expected to discover? I do not know what 348 "reasonably discovers" means. 349 Chairman Goodlatte. I think "reasonably discovers" and 350 "reasonably could be expected to discover" would be 351 considered the same language. 352 Mr. Nadler. Okay. I thank the chairman. 353 Ms. Jackson Lee. Mr. Chairman? 354 Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the 355 gentlewoman from Texas seek recognition? 356 Ms. Jackson Lee. I would like to strike the last word. 357 Chairman Goodlatte. Gentlewoman is recognized. 358 Ms. Jackson Lee. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 359 1973, the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act, 360 and I do want to thank Congresswoman Lois Frankel and 361 Congresswoman Susan Brooks for their leadership and will ask 362 them to add me to this legislation as it makes its way to 363 the floor. 364 All of us have, with great expectation and excitement, 365 watched the Olympics, whether it is the winter or summer 366 Olympics, cheering on our national heroes. And so I believe that this is a debt of gratitude in respecting the joy and 367 368 the pride that they give to the American people. 369 This legislation comes on the heels of the allegations 370 of sexual abuse at the hands of coaches and other Olympic 371 professionals over the past 20 years and reports of

negligence of USA Gymnastics to bring these allegations to light.

H.R. 1973 will address this problem by requiring amateur athletic governing bodies to immediately bring reports of abuse to law enforcement, establishing policies and procedures for preventing, reporting, and addressing allegations of sexual abuse, developing mandatory training and oversight practices, and extending the civil statute of limitations for cases. It is substantially similar to legislation introduced by Senator Feinstein.

So I take note of the fact, Mr. Chairman, and I know that we, in the Judiciary Committee, have often made these legislative initiatives fit more aptly to be able to serve those that we are trying to protect. I just want to make sure that, as was asked by my colleague, Mr. Nadler, that we are not denying or shortening the opportunity for an individual to be protected with the terminology "reasonably discovered." So I would like to, in a moment, Mr. Chairman, yield to you for your interpretation of that.

But before I do that, let me also indicate that all of the members of this Congress and the American people have gone through some very difficult days. I think, as I have reflected, I have recognized that this is not Republicans and Democrats; this is really the American people. We have gone through the firing of an FBI director. We have gone

through the frightening revelation of classified information being detailed to a known spy, the ambassador to the United States from Russia. We have gone through the allegations made during a Coast Guard graduation of being treated as the worst treatment that any elected official has ever received. And I know that we are in very difficult times. I note that my colleagues in the Oversight Committee are still seeking to have a number of officials appear before them.

Again, Mr. Chairman, because we must do this as

Americans, I am asking, as my ranking member has done,
several things. One, we asked for a memoranda and documents
at the early part of the year from the Department of
Justice, which have never, as I understand it, at least, I
have not been given notice to review them; those documents
have never, never come. Secondarily, I believe it is
appropriate that we have before us former Director of the
FBI Comey and former Deputy Attorney General and Acting
Attorney General Sally Yates.

Yes, a very fine and capable and well-respected individual has been appointed as a special counsel. Special counsel is under the Department of Justice and can be terminated at any time. And so I wish Director Mueller well. I have worked with him. I have had the privilege, sitting on this committee, of which I admire and respect, for a number of years, and so I have known him during his

422 entire tenure as the FBI director.

That does not relieve us of our responsibilities on behalf of the American people. As other committees in the House have responded to their jurisdictional responsibilities, I would like us to respond to our constitutional and jurisdictional responsibilities. And Mr. Chairman, I say this as an American, as a senior member on this committee, as someone who has watched my ranking member work very hard to be collaborative, who have asked for the memos and memoranda, and who believes that the American people need to see an orderly questioning of the facts that have happened while the prosecutor continues his work.

Mr. Nadler. Would the gentlelady yield?

Ms. Jackson Lee. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Nadler. Thank you. I just wanted to rise in support of what was just said. And I was pleased to see that former FBI Director Mueller has been appointed special counsel, but that does not relieve us of our obligation to investigate these matters ourselves, particularly issues that fall squarely within the jurisdiction of this committee.

Democrats in this committee have sent numerous letters to the chairman calling for hearings, to which we have received no reply. We have filed resolutions of inquiry,

which were rejected by party-line votes. The House and Senate Intelligence Committees and the Senate Judiciary Committee have all found time to look into allegations concerning Russian influence over the 2016 elections. But we have not. And we have an even broader and a unique position as stewards of the Constitution.

It is our duty to see that the President stays within constitutional boundaries, but we have refused to examine a wide range of activities that raise serious constitutional concerns. Whether it is the President's ongoing conflicts of interest and possible violations of the Emoluments Clause, the troubling ties to Russia, or these new allegations of obstruction of justice, this is the committee charged with determining whether there is adherence to the Constitution, and we should pursue an investigation, and certainly hearings, into all of these issues, no matter where they may ultimately lead. The near-daily revelations coming out of this White House demand action now.

It is good to see that there is a special prosecutor, but as we know, the jurisdiction and the providence of a special prosecutor is to investigate possible crimes. And maybe there were crimes committed, maybe not. That will be for him to determine and process afterwards, perhaps. But the American people need a generalized investigation as to what is going on, as to whether there is improper influence

in the FBI, improper influence by a foreign power, as to whether the FBI and the Department of Justice were compromised. And in particular, those latter two are the jurisdiction of this committee.

Now, we know that there are investigations going on within the House and Senate Intelligence Committees, but their jurisdiction is somewhat different. The Senate Judiciary Committee is having investigations. The House Judiciary Committee has a duty to do the same. And I urge that the chairman consider this and that we exercise the jurisdiction of this committee to look into what we should look into.

It is not his job for the special prosecutor to give a report on what was going on to the American people, although he may. He must give a report to the Department of Justice, but that report may very well be secret. We need a report, such as was given in 1973 and again in 1997 and on several other occasions. We need a report within the jurisdiction of this committee, and we need this committee to hold hearings, to call Director Comey and various other people, and to do what we have to do.

We are examining bills here, some worthy, some not, depending on one's opinions, but it seems like we are fiddling while Rome burns because these bills, some of them are very important, but there is an overarching issue before

497 us to which we must react and do our duty. I thank the 498 gentlelady for yielding, and I yield back. 499 Mr. Conyers. Would the gentlelady yield to me? 500 Ms. Jackson Lee. I will be happy to yield to the 501 gentleman. 502 Chairman Goodlatte. The time of the gentlewoman has 503 expired. 504 For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia seek 505 recognition? 506 Mr. Conyers. Could I be recognized? 507 Mr. Johnson of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike 508 the last word. 509 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized. Не 510 can then yield to the gentleman from Michigan. 511 Mr. Johnson of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 512 rise to speak in support of H.R. 1973. I want to yield to 513 the gentleman from Michigan. 514 Mr. Conyers. Thank you very much, my friend from 515 Georgia. I wanted to associate myself with the gentlelady 516 from Texas' previous remarks. And also, the gentleman from 517 New York, Mr. Nadler, have made a very reasonable 518 interpretation of what our responsibilities are. And I 519 think that they should be expanded, as they suggest, not 520 seeking publicity or raising emotions in any way, but in 521 doing a thorough and accurate and appropriate examination of

this issue before us. And I just wanted to thank both of them for it, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Johnson of Georgia. All right. I thank the gentleman. I would yield now to the gentlelady from Texas.

Ms. Jackson Lee. I thank the gentleman as well, and I guess we are building on each other, ranking member John Conyers and Mr. Nadler of New York. And I would really like the chairman to respond whether or not we can have a meeting, but we need to establish something, Mr. Chairman, that you have been a champion of, and that is the jurisdictional standing and credibility of the Judiciary Committee.

As Mr. Nadler said, we are the holder and the protector of the Constitution, and frankly, the American people, without party identification, are seeking answers. The special counsel that it is now called, different from the independent counsel, is a fixture and a product of the Department of Justice. We thank the Deputy Attorney General for appointing Mr. Mueller. But their guidelines will be completely different, and I think there is a singular point.

They can provide a report; they cannot provide a report. This is not a time for cover-up or darkness. It is a time for sunlight and transparency. No suggestion that this committee is trying to cover up, but if we do not do this together, if we do not stand up and acknowledge that

America is more important than we are, the integrity of the government is more important than we are, then I can assure you, this will not set a good standard when we have other jurisdictional fights, when we have not taken our rightful place in these hearings and begin to be able to address them.

I will conclude my remarks, and thank the gentleman for yielding. But I will conclude my remarks by simply saying, at some point, Mr. Chairman, you will respond to the 1973 question that I had on this legislation that I support and want to co-sponsor, and thank Lois Frankel and Susan Brooks. But I do believe that we have a constitutional question and a potential constitutional crisis, and we need to be part of the uncovering and the discussion and the hearing for our members on what the next steps are, how we can prevent — that is our job — what has happened over the last 5 months in the United States through the Oval Office. With that, I yield back to the gentleman.

Chairman Goodlatte. Would the gentleman from Georgia yield, so that I can respond to the gentlewoman from Texas?

Mr. Johnson of Georgia. I would yield to the chairman.

Chairman Goodlatte. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, tomorrow there will be a briefing of the entire membership of the House by the Deputy Attorney

General of the United States on the matter related to the firing of FBI Director Comey.

Secondly, as has been the custom of this committee in the past, we should allow the Department of Justice and the FBI to do their work. And that is why I join you in being pleased that the department has appointed a special counsel to look into the matters that you have described.

But it would be inappropriate, in my opinion, for this committee to, at the same time, conduct a public investigation or fishing expedition into what you think may or may not have happened. We did not do that during the last Congress when there were serious allegations of criminal violations by the Democratic candidate for President of the United States. We waited until after the department had completed their investigation and held a hearing at that time. That may or may not be appropriate when the department completes its investigation into the matter that you are concerned about.

I respect your concern, believe it should be investigated, but I do not believe that it is the appropriate role of this committee to do other than conduct oversight of the Department of Justice to be assured that they are doing their job. And we are doing that, both in terms of the briefing tomorrow and in terms of both Republicans and Democrats approving of the appointment of

597 the special counsel to make sure that that investigation 598 carries forward in a responsible way. 599 Ms. Jackson Lee. Would the gentleman yield? 600 Ms. Lofgren. Mr. Chairman? 601 Chairman Goodlatte. I think it is the gentleman from 602 Georgia's time, which has expired, so I will just go to the 603 gentlewoman from California. 604 For what purpose do you seek recognition? 605 Ms. Lofgren. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to talk just 606 briefly about the bill that we are marking up. 607 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentlewoman is recognized for 608 5 minutes. 609 Ms. Lofgren. Strike the last word. I want to say how 610 important I think it is to adopt this bill. I have had the 611 obligation and responsibility to meet with individuals in my 612 own district who have been abused as swimmers, and we do not 613 have adequate law to deal with their situation. So I think 614 this is an important step, but only a first step. 615 get more information because of the provisions in this bill, 616 and we may need to do more things. 617 Having said that, I want to address the other issue 618 that has been mentioned by the ranking member, my colleague, 619 Ms. Jackson, and others. I think all of us, and I have yet 620 to hear a member who is not actually relieved that the 621 Department of Justice has appointed Mr. Mueller, who we all

respect, to do an investigation. You are exactly right. It is not our job to interfere in that investigation, and we will see what the results are when the investigation is complete.

However, that investigation is unrelated to our obligation, in some ways. His obligation is to find out whether there is reasonable cause to believe that a crime has been committed. It could have been by staffers or other people. Who knows? He may find out that there is nothing that leads him to that belief. We will find out.

But it is possible to damage our Constitution without committing a crime. And in fact, that has happened in the past. I think back to the role this committee played in 1974 to uncover actions that posed a threat to the constitutional system of government. I am not suggesting we are at that point today. However, I do think aggressively receiving information that Mr. Nadler referred to is an important responsibility that we have.

I am mindful that our counterparts in the Senate are stepping forward to accept their responsibility to gather facts, and that is all we are saying at this point. We are in a fact-gathering mode, and I am hopeful that we could work together to make sure that that responsibility is discharged.

So I did not want to stray too far from H.R. 1973,

which I think is an important first step, and by the way, it is important to note, it does not preempt State law that protects individuals from abuse. But I did want to agree with my colleagues that we should work together to obtain this information that we have asked for, on a bipartisan basis in some cases, in others not, just so we can discharge our obligation in fact-finding.

And I see that Mr. Nadler would like me to yield, so I am happy to yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. Nadler. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. I think the gentlelady is exactly right on this point. A special prosecutor's job is to investigate possible crimes, but there can be damage done to the Republic or to the Constitution by actions that are improper but are not crimes, or are not crimes that can be proven. So that is why, in addition to a special prosecutor, we need, ultimately, an independent commission, but at least examination by the relevant committees. And ours is one of the relevant committees.

We have an Intelligence Committee investigation; fine. Some of this impacts the intelligence function. But the functioning of the FBI, the functioning of the Department of Justice, many of the actions of the White House, arguably involve the Constitution and the law, and certainly that is our jurisdiction. And it is completely separate from a

criminal investigation; and not interfering with a criminal investigation, we should look into these matters in terms of damage to the Constitution, adherence to norms.

You know, you can damage the Constitution and constitutional practices by violating norms which have always been adhered to which were taken for granted. And maybe we ought to make some of these norms laws. But these are the areas that this committee ought to be investigating, and the fact that there is a special prosecutor does not absolve us of our responsibility, and to wait until the special prosecutor finishes, which could be several years, for all we know, would be a real abdication of our responsibility and a disservice to the Republic. And I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I yield.

Ms. Lofgren. I thank you, and I see my time has expired, Mr. Chairman, so I yield back.

Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee seek recognition?

Mr. Cohen. Strike the last word.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Cohen. I have listened to much of the discussion,
Mr. Chair, from members of this side of the aisle about the
controversies, and I do not know that anybody has brought up
a fact that I think is relevant, and that is the fact that

the FBI is under our jurisdiction for review, and that the firing of an FBI Director, Mr. Comey, is something that this committee should be the first committee to look into, and to have Mr. Comey here to tell us what happened, and if we can get to the bottom of why he was fired.

The FBI Director gets a 10-year term for specific reasons, so that he is beyond partisan politics and goes over and beyond even two-term Presidents, and there are certain standards by which that person can be fired, and they are not that you are firing a person because they were not your lackey or did not pledge allegiance to you, or fealty. And those are things that I think are relevant and that we should look into, and I would like to ask the chair if he would not consider asking Mr. Comey to come to this committee and looking into the issues surrounding the firing of the Director of the FBI.

Chairman Goodlatte. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. Cohen. Yes, sir.

Chairman Goodlatte. The fact of the matter is, that is the purpose of the special counsel that has been appointed, and I think it would be inappropriate for this committee to interfere with that investigation.

We are going to get a classified briefing tomorrow from the Deputy Attorney General on that matter. That has already been scheduled, prior to the time of the appointment

of the special counsel. We will proceed with that and see what is revealed by that. I trust you will be in attendance tomorrow.

Mr. Cohen. I will be in attendance, Mr. Chair. It is my understanding that the charge given to Mr. Mueller was to investigate leaks or work that the Russians or Russian government or Russian individuals might have been in collusion with Trump or the Trump campaign, and there is a catch-all where they could go to associated activities.

Nothing in the charge directly goes to the firing of the FBI Director. And while the President did, on his second statement on why he fired him, he said he fired him because of Russia, the first statement was that he fired him because he was coming to the defense of Secretary Clinton and the way she was treated by Mr. Comey.

But even if he fired him because of the second reason, which is the one that seems to be the best rule, that he fired him because of Russia and the Russia investigation, that does not mean that the special prosecutor's charge is to look into that firing. He is supposed to look into collusion between the Russians and Trump.

And so I still think it is relevant that we have this, and I do not know that Mr. Rosenstein will testify to that, that while he did give the first explanation, which was then put into the heap of garbage in the White House, saying it

747 was not relevant, that is not why they fired him, Mr. 748 Rosenstein would not know what Mr. Comey's interactions were 749 with the President, if the President pressured him, if the 750 President asked him to give him his total loyalty and 751 fealty, and if the President asked him to back off. So I 752 still think it is relevant that it come to this committee. 753 Chairman Goodlatte. Would the gentleman yield? 754 Mr. Cohen. Yes, sir. 755 Chairman Goodlatte. The widely-held view of those who 756 have read the appointment of Mr. Mueller is that he has very 757 broad jurisdiction to look into matters related to the 758 underlying investigation that was already proceeding in the 759 Department of Justice. 760 Mr. Cohen. Let me ask the chair another question; just 761 curious. I ventured over into your side of the committee 762 room, the anteroom, which I remember fondly, when Mr. 763 Conyers was chair, that we had large masses of food there, 764 and we had lots of room, and TV, and it is a nice spread. 765 We do not have that same spread now. We are kind of --766 occasionally, you send us pizza, but we do not get much. 767 But I have noticed three pictures on the wall that you have chosen, Mr. Chair, and I wish you would edify the members on 768 769 this side of the three pictures, the three Presidents you 770 chose, and why they are there. 771 Chairman Goodlatte. Getting very far afield from the

772 bill that is before this committee, which I think is very 773 popular on both sides of the aisle. But those three 774 Presidents are former members of the Judiciary Committee, 775 and that is why they are hanging on the wall there. 776 Mr. Cohen. Is there a room for Mr. Pence? 777 Mr. Marino. Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman. 778 Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the 779 gentleman from Pennsylvania seek recognition? 780 Mr. Marino. Move to strike the last word. 781 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5 782 minutes. 783 Mr. Marino. If my good friend is concerned about a 784 snack, my wife make a wonderful peanut butter chocolate 785 fudge topping, and I will bring that snack in for you, just 786 out of showing the camaraderie from one side to the other. 787 Mr. Jeffries. Would the gentleman yield? 788 Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York seek recognition? 789 790 Mr. Jeffries. Move to strike the last word. 791 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5 792 minutes. 793 Mr. Jeffries. I just want to associate myself with the 794 comments that have been made by the distinguished ranking 795 member and all of the other members on our side of the aisle 796 who have raised this question of jurisdictional integrity.

It was my understanding -- I have served on this great committee during the entire time that I have been here in the Congress -- that we are the custodians of the United States Constitution; this committee. That we have jurisdiction over the Department of Justice; this committee. That we have jurisdiction over the FBI; this committee. We have jurisdiction over the criminal code, obstruction of justice, abuse of power; this committee. We have jurisdiction over the extraordinary remedy that some Americans are contemplating; this committee.

Now, from the very beginning of this Congress,

Democrats have raised the question of jurisdictional
integrity, urging the chairman to pursue the widest possible
degree of oversight, not as part of a witch hunt, but as
part of our own jurisdictional integrity, Democrats and
Republicans. And every time we have raised the question, 17
different intelligence agencies concluded that the Russians
interfered with the election to hurt Donald Trump, we were
mocked. Communication has taken place between Donald
Trump's campaign and the Russians at the same time they were
hacking into our election, people like Carter Page and
Manafort and Roger Stone and Jeff Sessions and Michael
Flynn, Jared Kushner; we were mocked.

Michael Flynn committed a crime in December of 2016, it appears, when he had a conversation with the Russian

ambassador and then lied to the Vice-President about it. We raised that; we were mocked. Taxes have not been disclosed by the American people; we were mocked. This was just a witch hunt, a fishing expedition; nothing there, Democrats.

And then Sally Yates is fired, the acting Attorney General, shortly after revealing to the White House her belief that Michael Flynn could be a Russian asset. We raised that; we are mocked. The United States Attorney General for the Southern District of New York, Preet Bharara, is fired after Donald Trump promised this U.S. Attorney that he would stay on, shortly after it was publicly revealed that Bharara's office was investigating one of Trump's cabinet secretaries and close allies at Fox News.

We raised that question; we are mocked. James Comey, the FBI Director, acknowledges publicly for the American people that there is a criminal investigation -- I think we have got jurisdiction over the criminal code here on the Judiciary Committee -- criminal investigation of the Trump campaign and possible collusions with the Russians; we are mocked. We are just interested in a fishing expedition.

Donald Trump fires the FBI Director and acknowledges that he was concerned, upset, about this so-called fake Russian collusion issue. We raised that issue; we are mocked. It is all, apparently, a fishing expedition.

It appears that Donald Trump may have attempted to obstruct justice as it relates to his conversation with James Comey on February 14th suggesting that the FBI not vigorously pursue its investigation of Michael Flynn.

Again, we are mocked.

And now, everyone is singing Kumbaya because a special prosecutor was appointed. That is actually fake news. That is not the reality. There was no effort in a bipartisan fashion for us to say, "Let's just get to the bottom of what occurred."

And so all we are saying right now, whether you think something happened or not, notwithstanding the litany, the mountain of evidence that has emerged that something wrong may have occurred, even if you cannot come to that conclusion, even if some folks want to bury their head in the sand for whatever the reason, at least respect the jurisdictional integrity of the Judiciary Committee and not let it be hijacked by other committees in the House or allow the Senate Judiciary Committee to proceed as if there is only one house in the United States Congress. I yield back.

Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the gentleman from California seek recognition?

Mr. Lieu. Move to strike the last word.

870 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Lieu. I would like to talk about two issues. The first is the bill before us today, H.R. 1973, the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act of 2017. This is a good bill. It is an important bill. I fully support it, and I want to thank attorney John Manly for his hard work on this issue, as well as so many others for their work on this legislation.

And then second, I would like to align myself with my colleagues, discussing the need for an oversight hearing. The mission of this committee is to conduct oversight into the Department of Justice. And there has certainly been a lot of chaos in that department, from the firing of FBI Director to the firing of Sally Yates to the firing of Preet Bharara. We need to have a hearing so the American public can get the answers they need to know what happened.

I understand that the chairman disagrees, but it seems to me that there is an issue where all of us, Republican, Democrat, can agree on this, which is we need to make sure the Department of Justice has the resources necessary to conduct the investigations they need to do. There have been reports that FBI Director Comey was unable to get the resources he needed to go forward in a good way with FBI investigation.

Now that we have a special counsel, I think we need to have a hearing to make sure that the FBI, as well as the

special counsel, have the resources they need, the agents and the prosecutors, to conduct a fair and impartial investigation in a speedy way, which is what the White House also wants to do -- an expedited way for the American people to see what happened. And when I am done, I would love for the chairman to address that issue, and I am going to yield the balance of my time to Representative Nadler.

Mr. Nadler. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to point out that the chair has said, obviously, that it would be inappropriate to hold hearings on these matters while the special prosecutor is functioning. But House committees have hosted a wide range of hearings on sensitive matters that were then under criminal investigations. For example, the 1993 hearings in the Waco tragedy, the Whitewater hearings, the 1987 Iran-Contra joint hearings, not to mention the Benghazi investigation.

Under your leadership, we have also held hearings that touched upon the shootings in Orlando, Florida, and San Bernardino, California, the attacks on the U.S. Consulate in Benghazi, the surreptitious recording of conversations with employees of Planned Parenthood, allegations of misconduct in certain Federal law enforcement agencies, and the Boston Marathon bombing. In each of these cases, the related investigations by the relevant agency were still ongoing, and we pressed ahead with oversight hearings anyway.

So there is certainly ample precedent, for this committee and other committees, holding hearings on the public aspects of these matters while criminal investigations were going on. And again, a criminal investigation looks only at that, whether crimes were committed. Our purview is well beyond that. We are not --well, we may be interested, but we are not primarily interested in whether crimes were committed.

We are primarily interested in protecting the Constitution and protecting the public welfare. And that is our job, and it would be a dereliction of duty, in my opinion, to say, no, we should wait years until the special prosecutor issues his report, which may very well be years. Other special prosecutors have taken great lengths of time. We do not know.

And as I said, other committees, the Intelligence

Committees in both houses are investigating this, and the

Senate Judiciary Committee is investigating. They have more

or less the same jurisdiction that we do, and it would be a

public disservice to use the fact or the excuse that there

is a criminal investigation going on to avoid public

hearings and investigation of the public matters that are of

such great public concern.

I thank the gentleman, and I yield back to him; Mr. Lieu. I thank him for yielding, and I yield back.

947 Mr. Lieu. I yield back.

Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the gentleman from California seek recognition?

Mr. Issa. I move to strike the last word.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Issa. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to getting to the markup shortly, but I would like to weigh in in an appropriate, I hope, way to this dialogue. Mr. Jeffries used the word evidence many, many times, and he is an attorney of training and experience. I have got to tell you, I think what we are making a mistake about, as we look at the special prosecutor and his work, is he will be seeking evidence.

We have been following news stories. We hear in a news story that something has occurred. We later find out that the verbatims or the specifics are different, and in some cases there is revisions that go on for a period of time. But at the end of it all, we are following news stories. We are not yet following the evidence.

Director Mueller is going to have the obligation to follow the evidence. I might suggest that this committee's jurisdiction is appropriate to oversee his work, and I urge the chairman and ranking member to assert that jurisdiction, in this case as I would at all times.

But let me go through a few things that I heard some of my Democratic colleagues say that I think is noteworthy and that we should, in fact, include in a dialogue sooner, not later. Does the special prosecutor -- does Director Mueller -- does he, in fact, have the assets he needs, that he believes he needs?

Does he, in fact, have the independence that is required? Which we could get into assets and independence like separate facilities, separate email, the ability to have people that work only for him and are not reportable to others; a whole litany of things that this committee knows the rules and how they work.

What does the director believe the breadth of his investigation is? We have had some dialogue here today about what is or is not. My experience in looking at special prosecutors and working with the Department of Justice is they often expand when they see something, or they come back to a committee or to the appointer and ask for expansions when they think it is appropriate. And I would suspect that the former FBI Director is quite good at doing that, from my experience.

Lastly, I believe the timeline that he expects to at least be prepared to report, in some meaningful way, to committees what he believes is there in the way of evidence, perhaps not evidence of criminal wrongdoing, but evidence

sufficient to know whether or not our election was interfered with, and for several committees, the ability to know what is the plan to prevent it from happening in the future, if in fact techniques were used that could be used again?

So I am going to conclude, Mr. Chairman and ranking member, by saying I know that we will not end dialogue just because I spoke today, and I know there will be calls for commissions and other investigations. But I would urge the chairman and ranking member, as the senior and, if you will, the adults here in the room at all times -- and I commend you both for being that -- that you should look at an appropriate way of corresponding to ask these questions, whether it is in in-camera review, a meeting with the director, or anything that would be appropriate in your decision after consultation, to make sure that Mr. Mueller has the assets, the independence, and an understandable breadth of the initial investigation, and a timeline that he anticipates, based on his decades of experience.

And I would hope all of us, at some point in the hours and days to come, would realize that that is the next step. It is not for us to talk about what we do. It is probably for us to make sure that the assets, the independence, and the breadth of mission is available. And I leave you with that, Mr. Chairman, and I thank you.

1022	Chairman Goodlatte. Would the gentleman yield?
1023	Mr. Issa. Of course I would yield.
1024	Chairman Goodlatte. The chair appreciates the
1025	gentleman's thoughts, and will take his recommendations
1026	under advisement.
1027	Mr. Issa. Thank you. I yield back.
1028	Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the
1029	gentleman from Maryland seek recognition?
1030	Mr. Raskin. I move to strike the last word, Mr.
1031	Chairman.
1032	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5
1033	minutes.
1034	Mr. Raskin. Thank you very much. I wanted to add a
1035	few thoughts to the situation, and I want to begin by
1036	associating myself with the remarks of Mr. Jeffries, because
1037	what we have been asking for from the very first meeting, I
1038	think, has been, precisely, evidence and facts. That has
1039	been our demand from the beginning. We have sought a
1040	comprehensive 9/11-style investigation into the Russian
1041	connection, into Page and Stone and Manafort and Flynn and
1042	Jared Kushner and the whole staph infection which seems to
1043	have overtaken the Trump White House with respect to Russia.
1044	We have been asking for that. We have been asking for a
1045	hearing on it. So now, we, indeed, have a special counsel
1046	that has been named by the Department of Justice, and this

1047 | is progress, indeed.

But I want to also associate myself with the remarks of Mr. Lieu, because our committee has specific jurisdictional responsibility to make sure that this investigation within the Department of Justice is undertaken with efficiency and with institutional respect for the special counsel's own discretionary authority. So I also think that we need to have a hearing to make sure that the newly-appointed special counsel, Mr. Mueller, a distinguished former FBI Director who is someone very well up to the task, is given sufficient resources, and is given sufficient independence within his office.

As everybody knows, the independent counsel statute that was adopted after the Watergate investigation has lapsed, and it came under fire both from Democrats and Republicans. There were various investigations -- the Iran-Contra investigation on one side, the Kenneth Starr investigation into the Clintons on the other side -- which attracted a lot of fire, and the independent counsel statute went down.

So we are depending on the provisions within the Department of Justice's own rules for the establishment of this special counsel. But we need to make sure that that special counsel really has the authority to do the job, and at least I think that the right person has been chosen,

given these circumstances.

But we want to make sure that the Attorney General's recusal is, in fact, implemented, and that his recusal is something that is respected within the Department of Justice, and the special counsel gets to pay attention to the very serious crimes and misdeeds which go to the very question of constitutional democracy in America.

We know from our own intelligence agencies that

American democracy came under attack in 2016. There was a

concerted effort by Vladimir Putin and his paid agents to

commit cyber-espionage and sabotage of America's democratic

institutions, including the Democratic National Committee,

the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, and lots of

other political entities in the country.

And we have seen a repetition of that, most recently in the Netherlands and in France, by the Russians. So we need to get to the bottom of this massive attack on American democratic sovereignty, and we need to determine whether or not there has been collusion by political forces within the United States, specifically within the Trump campaign and around the Trump campaign, to enable this attack on American political democracy.

What we are looking for is precisely the facts and evidence, and that has been our sole object from the very beginning of our discussion of this in this committee. So

1097 we are delighted that now the special counsel, which was 1098 resisted by so many, is being hailed by everyone as the 1099 right move, but that should be just the beginning. And with 1100 that, I will yield the remainder of my time to Mr. Cohen. 1101 Mr. Cohen. Thank you, sir. I appreciate it. Mr. Issa 1102 made a point about the special prosecutor. But, you know, 1103 the special prosecutor is looking at criminal violations and 1104 bringing criminal charges, if they are merited. 1105 committee's responsibility is policy, and we should not stop 1106 our purpose of seeing that we have the right laws based on 1107 the right policy for our country. That includes the term 1108 and the appointment of the FBI Director. Maybe the FBI 1109 Director should be like a judge and be given a 10-year term 1110 and not be subject to firing. Maybe it needs to be 1111 tightened up on the basis of which he or she could be fired. 1112 Maybe the term needs to be longer or lesser. But those 1113 policy decisions are still here, and I think we should have 1114 hearings on the appointment of and the firing of the FBI 1115 Director and any need for change and what occurred. 1116 yield back the balance. 1117 Ms. Jayapal. Mr. Chairman. 1118 Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the 1119 gentlewoman from Washington seek recognition? 1120 Ms. Jayapal. Move to strike the last word. 1121 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentlewoman is recognized for

1122 | 5 minutes.

Ms. Jayapal. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I first want to rise in strong support of the bill under consideration, H.R. 1973. This is an incredibly important bill for sexual abuse victims across the country, and I want to thank the advocates that are in the room and those who have worked to put this before us in a bipartisan way.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to associate myself with the comments of many of my colleagues who have spoken before me, and I want to respectfully submit that I am not sure when this committee would find it appropriate to have hearings into any of the issues that have been mentioned today. We are almost 5 months into this administration, and as Mr. Nadler said, I believe that it really is a dereliction of duty that this committee is ceding authority over any of these extremely important issues to the American people that are before us. With all due respect, saying that we are pursuing things just based on news stories doesn't make any sense.

We are talking about issues where 17 intelligence agencies weighed in on the question. We are talking about issues where an FBI director has a memo that says that he was asked to not pursue an investigation into Michael Flynn. And just now, Michael Flynn actually said that he will not honor the Senate Intelligence Committee subpoena.

So what moment would it be appropriate, Mr. Chairman, for us in the Judiciary Committee to call before us those people who can provide us with facts? We would love to have facts. That is actually what all the members on our side of this committee have been calling for for many months now. If we could actually look at those facts and determine where those facts lead us, I think that would be within the purview of the Judiciary Committee of the House.

I do not know why we are ceding that authority continuously in the name of these issues being spurious. The reality is the American people across the country called for and expressed outrage over and over again, which is why we finally have a special prosecutor. But that is just one piece of what we are looking at. That involves criminal acts. But there is much that is at stake within our democracy that does not have to do just with criminal acts and I think this committee, in particular, should be looking and trying to get to the bottom of where we are at this moment in history.

And the reality is, Mr. Chairman, that history smiles brightly on those who speak out even at the cost, perhaps, of what others in the party might be saying. This is a moment for us to put country before party and I hope that we will be allowed on this committee to weigh in on these issues of critical national importance.

I would like to yield now to my colleague from Texas, Representative Sheila Jackson Lee.

Ms. Jackson Lee. I want to thank the gentlelady for her courtesies and I want to thank my colleagues for their very important dialogue, and I want to capture some of the comments that have been made. But as I do that, let me also say that I enthusiastically support the underlying bill, H.R. 1973, but let me remind my colleagues that there is a responsibility of this committee -- and Mr. Chairman, to be honest, this is not a burden that should be suffered only by yourself.

There are distinguished lawyers in this room,
Republicans and Democrats; there are non-lawyers in this
room. And so, the members of the committee, Republicans and
Democrats, have an equal responsibility, and I hope my
colleagues who are Republicans who are scholars, former
prosecutors as well, they really hear the truth of what we
are saying.

And the truth of what we are saying is that we cannot advocate and be derelict in the responsibilities of showing the American people that the Constitution is rules, that rules. And so, when you find that Flynn has spoken -- and other operatives have spoken -- to Russians 18 times in the last seven months of the campaign, that is soiling the election and soiling the presidency.

When you find out that Flynn was sitting in a meeting, advising against an operation or a collaboration with others because he was being paid by Turkey and they did not want that operation, that is soiling the presidency.

And it is crucial that not only do we deal with the questions of how we stop this from happening again, that is what the Judiciary Committee's responsibility is, and I ask my colleagues -- Republicans -- you cannot yield that responsibility, nor can you yield the responsibility that the American people look to this committee, rightly so, over the years to be the arbiter of truth and the arbiter of the Constitution.

And we cannot reject that there has been an abuse of power and there has been a doubting or damaging of the public trust.

Chairman Goodlatte. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. Jackson Lee. I would offer to say I thank the gentlelady that we, Mr. Chairman, in spite of all the arguments, we must do our job.

Chairman Goodlatte. Time of the gentlewoman has expired.

1219 Ms. Jackson Lee. And it is not being done. I yield 1220 back.

1221 Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the

1222 gentleman from Florida seek recognition?

1223 Mr. Gaetz. I move to strike the last word.

1224 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5
1225 minutes.

Mr. Gaetz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I wanted to take just a moment to respond to the accusation that the Judiciary Committee is somehow ceding our authority. We are the Judiciary Committee. We are not the HR department at the Department of Justice. We are also not FBI investigators.

Our job is to make sure that investigators have the resources and authority to accomplish their work. Democrats on this committee and throughout the Congress have called for a special and independent counsel. That has now occurred, and it would seem to me to be premature to call in Director Mueller, disrupt the beginning of his investigation as he plans out the days and weeks to come.

There will be a time, surely, where this committee will accept reports, whether in open hearing or in camera, on the work that is going on at the Department of Justice, and we will make sure that that investigation is unhindered and well-resourced. But rather than living in the melodrama of news stories and rumors and anonymous reports, let's allow Director Muller to do his work. Let's ensure that we remain consistent with our oversight plan.

1247

1248

1249

1250

1251

1252

1253

1254

1255

1256

1257

1258

1259

1260

1261

1262

1263

1264

1265

1266

1267

I think it is noteworthy that when the Judiciary Committee first came together we had an oversight plan, we had a document that laid out our intent to ensure that if there was meddling in the election, if there were inappropriate acts, that we would follow up on those things. And so, as Director Mueller does his work, let's do our work. Before us now is legislation that would allow the Judiciary Committee and the Congress to speak with a unified voice against horrific acts of sexual violence, human trafficking, and the devastating consequences of illegal immigration. And so I am hopeful, Mr. Chairman, that we will exercise our oversight function appropriately consistent with the oversight plan and the work plan that the chairman laid out at our very first gathering, and that we will continue to work on the things that can actually improve quality of life for Americans by stopping sexual violence,

1268 commencing. I yield back.
 1269 Mr. Jeffries. Will the gentleman yield?
 1270 Mr. Gaetz. Sure.
 1271 Mr. Jeffries. I had a question. The FBI was

by ensuring that we have got the systems in place for

advantage of young people, and I look forward to that work

reporting and consequences for those who would take

1272 conducting a criminal investigation into the possibility of 1273 collusion between the Trump campaign and Russia. Is that 1274 right? Is that a fact or is that speculation? 1275 Mr. Gaetz. Mr. Jeffries, it has been well documented 1276 that there is an ongoing investigation of Russian activity 1277 relative to the election. The Judiciary Committee, in fact, 1278 acknowledged that in our oversight plan. 1279 Mr. Jeffries. And James Comey was leading that 1280 investigation, true? 1281 Mr. Gaetz. Yes. 1282 Mr. Jeffries. And Donald Trump made the decision to 1283 fire the person who was leading the investigation into 1284 possible illegal collusion between his campaign and Russia. 1285 Is that right? 1286 Mr. Gaetz. Well, Mr. Jeffries, you impute upon the 1287 President that motive which has not been established. 1288 Mr. Jeffries. No, no, no. 1289 Mr. Gaetz. That is the very reason, Mr. Jeffries --1290 Mr. Jeffries. No, I did not say anything about motive. 1291 Mr. Gaetz. No, but the premise of your question to was 1292 that somehow this was driven by a desire to be disruptive to 1293 an investigation when there is in fact no evidence that that 1294 is true. 1295 Mr. Jeffries. Not at all. 1296 Mr. Gaetz. Now, my belief is that we should in fact

1297 allow that investigation to persist. We should allow 1298 Director Mueller to do his work. You have called, both in 1299 this committee and on the floor of the House, for a special 1300 and independent review. You have gotten your way in that 1301 respect and so why would we now want to go and, sort of, 1302 inject more politics, have less independence? My belief is 1303 that we ought to allow that investigation to persist. 1304 There will of course be a time where the Judiciary 1305 Committee has be obligation to ensure that that 1306 investigation is independent and well-resourced and 1307 consistent with our oversight plan that we have adopted in a 1308 bipartisan fashion. I am entirely confident that we will do 1309 that without ceding any jurisdiction of the committee. 1310 Mr. Jeffries. But did Trump make the decision to fire 1311 the FBI director, yes or no? 1312 Mr. Gaetz. Yes. 1313 Mr. Jeffries. And is that an HR issue, as you 1314 suggested, to fire the head of the FBI who was leading a 1315 criminal investigation into possible collusion of the Trump 1316 campaign, or was that possibly something more than falls 1317 within the jurisdiction of this committee, like obstruction 1318 of justice, abuse of power, or something worse? 1319 I am just getting clarification. Is your position that 1320 that is an HR issue that we should dismiss? 1321 Mr. Gaetz. Mr. Jeffries, my position is that we should

1322 allow that investigation to persist without injecting more 1323 partisan politics and without sort of feeding the fervor 1324 around that review. Why not just allow the activity to 1325 persist which you have called for, which is an 1326 uninterrupted, uninfluenced, independent investigation? 1327 That is what is ongoing. 1328 And what is a little bizarre for me is that now 1329 Democrats on the committee are calling for us to further 1330 inject ourselves as a Congress when, weeks ago, you were 1331 calling for more independence. So let's allow that 1332 independence to go forward. 1333 Mr. Jeffries. I do thank you for yielding. I would 1334 just suggest it is not an HR issue, it is a possible 1335 constitutional crisis, which is squarely within our 1336 jurisdiction. Thank you. 1337 Chairman Goodlatte. Are there any amendments to H.R. 1338 1973? For what purpose does the gentleman from Louisiana 1339 seek recognition? 1340 Mr. Richmond. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last 1341 word. 1342 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5 1343 minutes. 1344 Mr. Richmond. Mr. Chairman, I would concur with all of 1345 what I have heard from my colleagues today raising grave 1346 concerns and just would -- again, I can engage in party

politics probably with the best of them and I am sure that anyone on your side can.

But at some point, we have to put patriotism over party and I would just say that this is one of those times where our democracy is so fragile and has been attacked by a foreign country, and we need to know how, when, where, and the entire extent.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I would yield time to my colleague from Georgia, Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Johnson of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Chairman, as I said, I rise in support of H.R. 1973. It is an important piece of legislation. I look forward to this committee passing it out of this committee onto the full House. And we have a lot of work such as these kinds of measures to do as a judiciary committee, but Mr. Chairman, we are facing a time of great challenge now.

The Nation is challenged. The people are watching.

The people smell and see and hear a cover-up unfolding.

They see an abuse of executive power. They are troubled by the, perhaps, treasonous activity of Russians in the Oval

Office the day after the firing of the FBI director. They are hearing that this Oval Office meeting with top Russian spies was requested by Putin himself.

They are wondering what is the connection between Putin and our President, because the President has a pattern and

practice of yielding to Putin and it is almost as if Putin has a special hold on our President.

And so, the people are looking at this; they understand that the FBI Director is on top of a counterterrorism and criminal investigation about possible collusion between the Trump campaign and the Russians after 17 intelligence agencies have concluded that there was an attempt by Russia to influence the most recent presidential election.

So, this is something that the American people know.

They have been following this and they are getting more and more suspicious of a cover-up. And so, citizens of the Fourth Congressional District in Georgia have been bombarding my phone lines with requests that I, as a member of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, take action to help the public become more confident that Congress is exercising its responsibilities to provide oversight.

And what they want, Mr. Chairman, are hearings, because they realize that the special counsel appointed yesterday as a criminal investigation and a counterterrorism investigation that may or may not yield a final report, and that may take years to get to the bottom of the investigation. The public is demanding that Congress take action now to assure them that we are doing our job, providing oversight, and it is this committee's

1397 responsibility to provide oversight over the Department of 1398 Justice.

We have seen abuse of presidential power that is directed towards that very Department of Justice that is eroding justice, and so I would implore this committee to take this matter up and to hold hearings, to investigate how abuse of power erodes public confidence in our Department of Justice, how we can bolster the American people into knowing that our republic is still safe, treason will not trump patriotism. And with that, I will yield back.

1407 Chairman Goodlatte. Are there any amendments --

1408 Mr. Cicilline. Mr. Chairman?

1409 Chairman Goodlatte. -- to the manager's amendment to
1410 H.R. 1973? For what purpose does the gentleman from Rhode
1411 Island seek recognition?

1412 Mr. Cicilline. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Cicilline. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I offer my strong support to H.R. 1973 and look forward to its passage, but I feel compelled to join my colleagues this morning to highlight the dereliction of duties of this committee to not begin in a serious way to conduct oversight hearings in light of recent events.

The Judiciary Committee has a special responsibility to uphold the rule of law and to provide oversight to the administration of justice in this country. We have seen in the last week reports of disclosure of classified information by the President of the United States in a meeting in the Oval Office not covered by the American press because the American press was excluded from that. You heard that, right?

The American press was excluded from a meeting in the Oval Office between the President of the Unite States, the Russian Foreign Minister, and the Russian Ambassador, in which he shared classified information, it has been reported, that will undermine the national security interests of the United States.

And on the heels of that, we heard shortly after that that the President of the United States fired the Director of the FBI, admitted that he was thinking about his handling of the Russia investigation when he made that decision, and it would happen shortly after the person charged with conducting this investigation asked for additional resources to conduct this investigation.

We also learned in the last week that there was a -- it has been reported -- that there was a conversation between Director Comey and the President of the United States in which, first, the President asked the Vice President of the

United States and the Director -- I am sorry, the Director of the FBI to remain and asked the Vice President of the United States and the Attorney General to leave the meeting, to leave the Oval Office.

One has to ask, why would you ask the Attorney General of the United States and the Vice President to leave the office? And then we learn, according to reports, that in that conversation the President of the United States asked or suggested to Director Comey that he should "just leave Michael Flynn alone, let this go." It has just been reported that Michael Flynn's lawyers have now acknowledged they will not honor a subpoena from the Senate Intelligence Committee and that Mr. Flynn will refuse to come before the United States Senate.

So, there are a number of issues here that strike at the very heart of our democracy and we have a responsibility. This should not be a partisan issue.

We have a responsibility as the Judiciary Committee to conduct proper oversight, to help to do our part. There is now a special prosecutor, a special counsel, their intelligence committees. We play a role as well. We should not look to other committees to do our work. This is in our oversight plan. Some of my colleagues have referenced that. The oversight plan is not an excuse not to do our job; it in fact compels us to do our job. It is an agreement that we

1472 | will do it.

And so, we have a responsibility to conduct serious hearings, to do our part to generate information so that we can really find the facts and see where they lead and hold the individuals accountable for their behavior. And what we have not had in this committee is a serious hearing to address these issues. It is our responsibility. The American people are watching this and they expect us to do our job. These raise very serious questions and we have to be certain that we are getting to the facts.

I do not think anyone should celebrate or be overly anxious to get to a place where we think grounds may exist for the removal of the President from office. That is a serious, serious charge and it will have very serious consequences for our country. But we have a responsibility to confront this, this moment in our history, so that we can look back and know with confidence we have done our job, that we have done what is necessary to fulfill our responsibility as the members of the Judiciary Committee.

And so, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to understand that this is a moment where we need to put our country before political party and I ask my colleagues, particularly on the other side of the aisle, to join us in our call for hearings to be done in a responsible and serious way that will help us get to the bottom of this, to

1497 see where these facts ultimately lead, and to be sure that 1498 we are demonstrating that as members of this Judiciary 1499 Committee, that we understand that no one in America is 1500 above the law and that we will honor our responsibilities as 1501 members of this committee to ensure that that principle is 1502 vindicated and that we bring before this committee 1503 individuals to testify, to help us find the truth and hold 1504 those accountable and protect the integrity of our 1505 democracy. 1506 Mr. Raskin. Will the gentleman yield? 1507 Mr. Cicilline. And with that, I yield to Mr. Raskin. 1508 Mr. Raskin. Thank you, Mr. Cicilline. I just wanted 1509 to state my very strong support for H.R. 1973, the 1510 Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act of 2017 and I 1511 want to salute all of the advocates who have come to work on 1512 it. I yield back. 1513 Ms. Jackson Lee. Will the gentleman yield? I am right 1514 here. 1515 Chairman Goodlatte. The time of the gentleman has 1516 expired. 1517 Ms. Jackson Lee. I had an inquiry for the gentleman --1518 Chairman Goodlatte. All time has expired. 1519 Ms. Jackson Lee. -- on 1973 about the modification 1520 that you had. Is that going to weaken the ability for the 1521 victims to be able to receive --

1522	Chairman Goodlatte. If the gentlewoman would suspend -
1523	_
1524	Ms. Jackson Lee. I will be happy to suspend.
1525	Chairman Goodlatte. I have already answered this
1526	question for the gentleman from New York and we are happy to
1527	consider further amendments or to consider further
1528	discussion before this bill goes to the floor.
1529	Ms. Jackson Lee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1530	Chairman Goodlatte. But we think that the bill is good
1531	condition the way that it is written now and I would now ask
1532	the members to vote on the manager's amendment.
1533	All those in favor, respond by saying aye.
1534	Those opposed, no.
1535	In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it and the
1536	manager's amendment is agreed to.
1537	A reporting quorum being present, the question is on
1538	the motion to report the bill H.R. 1973 as amended favorably
1539	to the House.
1540	Those in favor will say aye.
1541	Those opposed, no.
1542	The ayes have it and the bill is ordered reported
1543	favorably. Members will have 2 days to submit views and
1544	without objection the bill will be reported as a single
1545	amendment in the nature of a substitute incorporating all
1546	adopted amendments, and staff is authorized to make

1547	technical and conforming changes.
1548	Pursuant to notice, I now call up H.R. 2473 for
1549	purposes of markup and move that the committee report the
1550	bill favorably to the House. The clerk will report the
1551	bill.
1552	Ms. Adcock. H.R. 2473, to ensure compliance with the
1553	Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 to make
1554	strides toward eradicating human trafficking and for other
1555	purposes.
1556	[The bill follows:]
1557	******** INSERT 2 *******

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the bill is considered as read and open for amendment at any time, and I will begin by recognizing myself for an opening statement.

Human trafficking has permeated communities and neighborhoods across America. It is currently one of the most profitable crimes in the world after the drug trade and its victims have endured horrific trauma, violence, and abuse. That is why it is particularly egregious that victims of trafficking across the United States continue to be overlooked and underserved.

There is a tremendous need, domestically, for improved victim services, trauma-informed support, better data on the prevalence and trends of human trafficking, and effective mechanisms to identify and rescue trafficking victims.

H.R. 2473, the Putting Trafficking Victims First Act of 2017, introduced by Congresswoman Ann Wagner, is an important step toward addressing these critical needs. This legislation will help provide stakeholders from law enforcement to prosecutors to service providers to government officials with the guidance and information they need to better serve victims of trafficking.

One important place to start is in the courtroom, where victims can benefit greatly from victim-centered approaches oriented toward victim recovery. The Trafficking Victims

Protection Act provided mandatory restitution mechanisms for

victims of trafficking, but there are still many obstacles in Federal courtrooms that prevent victims from accessing this restitution.

H.R. 2473 will thus direct the Attorney General to report on efforts to increase mandatory restitution to improve victim-centered practices in criminal proceedings and to understand how access to appropriate victim services can encourage victims to participate in the criminal process.

In addition, H.R. 2473 will advance U.S. responsiveness to trafficking victims by improving data collection. The bill instructs the National Institute of Justice to develop robust, comprehensive methodologies to determine the prevalence and trends of human trafficking in the United States, and evaluate the effectiveness of policies and procedures to identify victims and address their needs.

Importantly, the Put Trafficking Victims First Act will direct the Attorney General to provide training and technical assistance to government agencies, prosecutors, and law enforcement on how to implement victim-centered approaches to investigating, prosecuting, and preventing human trafficking. The bill promotes evidence-based trauma-informed care and physical and mental health services for victims, and ensures that all victims have access to services.

Moreover, the bill encourages law enforcement officers and prosecutors across the country to make every attempt to determine whether an individual's participation in trafficking is free from force, fraud, or coercion before arresting or prosecuting them.

Lastly, the Put Trafficking Victims First Act of 2017 expresses the sense of Congress that States across the nation should implement trauma-informed victim-centered care for trafficking victims. All victims of trafficking should be afforded the same justice, dignity, and respect that other victims of crime receive.

The bill likewise encourages states to develop vacatur provisions -- vacatur provisions -- that would ensure victims of trafficking are not criminalized for offenses that were direct results of being trafficked.

I would like to thank Congresswoman Wagner, the sponsor of this important legislation, for her commitment and tireless efforts on behalf of trafficking victims, as we look forward to a day when the United States is no longer plagued by the horrific crime of human trafficking.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation and it is now my pleasure to recognize the ranking member of the committee, Mr. Conyers, for his opening statement.

Mr. Conyers. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of the

committee, this measure, H.R. 2473, is intended to improve the implementation of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015. The 2015 act expanded the Federal response to trafficking concerning services and benefits for victims, criminal justice, domestic sex trafficking of children, and interagency coordination and training. So, I support this measure for several reasons.

To begin with, this measure will strengthen the effectiveness of the 2015 act in various ways. For example, H.R. 2473 requires the training be provided for prosecutions of traffickers and support for State services for trafficking victims. When children have fallen prey to sex trade and are treated as criminals rather than victims, their injuries are merely compounded. As such, this training is critical to ensuring that human trafficking victims are treated as victims and afforded justice and dignity.

Secondly, H.R. 2473 establishes a working group to develop best methods to assess the prevalence of human trafficking. We know that there is a growing epidemic of the abhorrent practice of sex trafficking and we must consider all methods to help law enforcement stop these crimes.

The working group will identify methodological barriers and bring data collection on human trafficking, ascertain

the information that should be collected, and identify current practices being used by different agencies and organizations that can be standardized into best practices.

As a result, H.R. 2473 will help ensure the most effective prevention practices are standardized so that perpetrators of sex trafficking are ultimately brought to justice.

And lastly, the legislation encourages States to adopt protections for victims of trafficking. Victims of sex trafficking are often very afraid to seek help, particularly from law enforcement, because of the risk that they will be treated as criminals rather than victims.

H.R. 2473 recognizes the critical fact that children involved in sex trafficking are victims, not criminals. They absolutely should not be treated as criminals. Importantly, the bill identifies a broad range of initiatives that the States should undertake, including upholding basic rights and dignity of human trafficking survivors, facilitating ways to identify child trafficking victims and connect them with appropriate services, such as child welfare services, and providing emergency and long-term housing, as well as education, vocational, and job assistance and training assistance, among other services. For these various reasons, it is my pleasure to urge support for this bill. I thank the chairman and yield back the

balance of my time.
Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman and now
recognizes himself for purposes of offering an amendment.
The clerk will report the amendment.
Ms. Adcock. Amendment to H.R. 2473, offered by Mr.
Goodlatte. Page 1, beginning
[The amendment of Chairman Goodlatte follows:]
******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as read, and I will recognize myself to explain the amendment.

This amendment to the Put Trafficking Victims First Act of 2017 includes technical and substantive changes to the base bill that will help advance a victim-centered approach to human trafficking at all levels of government.

Protecting children from the human trafficking industry is a critical component of this legislation. The amendment adds a section to the bill directing the Department of Justice to study the impact of State safe harbor laws on the re-victimization of child trafficking victims, the recovery of these victims, and victim outcomes. This report must include best practices and recommendations on the development and implementation of effective State safe harbor laws that promote full recovery of child trafficking victims.

Ensuring that child trafficking victims are treated the same as other child victims of rape, sexual assault, or incest is a major theme of this bill. No child should be criminalized for the evil committed against them, and our government has a duty to protect all children from abuse, especially including the vulnerable children who are in the child welfare system.

The amendment, therefore, directs the Department of

Justice to look at State safe harbor laws and determine how these laws are helping children avoid re-victimization. The amendment also ensures that survivors of human trafficking, experts on human trafficking, and representatives of organizations collecting data on human trafficking will be included in the expert working group on data collection that the bill establishes.

In addition, the amendment provides clarification on the purposes of the nationwide survey to collect better data on the prevalence and trends of human trafficking in the U.S. The survey will also be used to assess how victims of trafficking are accessing services, how they are referred to services, how assessment tools work to identify victims of trafficking, and to help estimate the prevalence of human trafficking identification in the United States. The amendment also provides further instruction on the required report on mandatory restitution.

The amendment asks the Attorney General to provide the annual number and percentage of Federal cases related to human trafficking in which restitution was ordered and the amount of restitution ordered in each case. The report must also include data on the participation and nonparticipation of victims of trafficking in criminal proceedings and recommendations for encouraging such participation.

Importantly, the amendment instructs States to adopt a

1741 survivor-centered approach to addressing human trafficking 1742 that ensures the safety and well-being of victims, while 1743 recognizing the symptoms of trauma and coping mechanisms that may impact victims' interactions with law enforcement, 1744 1745 the justice system, and service providers. Lastly, the 1746 amendment encourages States to make attempts to identify 1747 foreign nationals who may be victims of trafficking. 1748 Labor trafficking victims, especially those from 1749 outside the country, are very difficult to identify and are 1750 not always informed of their rights under U.S. law. 1751 efforts to improve screening in this area would be hugely 1752 This amendment adds important provisions that will helpful. 1753 help advance better victim services in the United States, 1754 and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. 1755 Mr. Conyers. Mr. Chairman? 1756 Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the 1757 gentleman from Michigan seek recognition? 1758 Mr. Conyers. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment and 1759 1760 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized. 1761 Mr. Conyers. -- would like to congratulate you on the 1762 clarifications that are included in your amendment, and I 1763 urge the support of the bill and yield back. 1764 Ms. Lofgren. Mr. Chairman? 1765 Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the

1766 gentlewoman from California seek recognition? 1767 Ms. Lofgren. To strike the last word. 1768 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentlewoman is recognized for 1769 5 minutes. 1770 Ms. Lofgren. Mr. Chairman, I do support this bill, but 1771 I do have some regrets that we are not doing more in this 1772 area than this bill would provide. 1773 Before I get into that, I want to congratulate the 1774 chairman and thank him for the amendment, ensuring that all 1775 the victims of trafficking, whether they are legal 1776 residents, citizens, or undocumented foreigners, are going 1777 to receive services if they are victims of trafficking. 1778 That is very much in keeping with our past efforts, which 1779 were always bipartisan, to make sure that trafficking 1780 victims, no matter what their legal status, receive 1781 protection. And so, I am glad that the chairman has 1782 outlined that specifically. It is important, and I agree. 1783 However, and as I say, I will vote for this bill, but 1784 Mrs. Wagner's bill, introduced in January of this year, 1785 actually goes farther than this bill, meritorious as it may 1786 be. Mrs. Wagner's bill, which was a bipartisan bill, 1787 including cosponsors on this committee, actually would have 1788 allowed trafficking victims to have their convictions 1789 expunged, providing a structure that would guide a court 1790 review for that expungement.

I do think that, ultimately, we need to do that, I am sure we have all, in our work in our districts, had occasion to meet individuals who were victims of trafficking. I know that I have in a forum that was held, sponsored by the County of Santa Clara, women who had been viciously abused and who, if you have got a conviction, a criminal conviction, because you were actually the victim, it prevents you from moving on with your life. It is a barrier to getting a job. And so, while, as I say, I agree that we should approve this bill, and I support the bill, I am hoping that, at some point, we can go one step further.

Now, I realize our jurisdiction is Federal only, but we take our obligation to provide protections under the Federal law seriously, and there is a secondary benefit when we amend Federal law, and that is to provide models for the States. We did that when we did the Rape Victims Bill of Rights in the last Congress. Understanding that most rape convictions are not in the Federal court, we nevertheless stepped forward with that bill because it would provide protection for those few instances where the matters were in Federal court, but it also would serve as a model for States all over the United States. And in fact, as we know, State legislatures have looked to that bill, and they have taken it up, and they have changed their State laws, and I think this is the same kind of situation.

1816 So, as I say, you know, the damage done to people who 1817 have been trafficked and then convicted of an offense 1818 because they were the victim, it is a double victimization, 1819 first by the crime that was done to you, and second, the 1820 fact that you have got a criminal conviction that prevents 1821 you from actually moving on with your life. 1822 I wanted to mention H.R. 459, Mrs. Wagner's original 1823 bill, hoping that, at some point, we can move that forward 1824 for the reasons that I have outlined here today. And with 1825 that, Mr. Chairman, I would yield back. 1826 Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentlewoman. 1827 Are there any amendments to the manager's amendment? 1828 Ms. Jackson Lee. Let me --1829 Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the 1830 gentlewoman from Texas seek recognition? 1831 Ms. Jackson Lee. I would like to strike the last word. 1832 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentlewoman is recognized for 1833 5 minutes. 1834 Ms. Jackson Lee. I want to thank the gentlelady from 1835 California for her comments. I want to make a general 1836 statement about 2473. 1837 As you well know, much work has been done on human 1838 trafficking and those of us from Houston and, in particular, 1839 Judge Poe, our colleague, have been working on this issue 1840 through the Judiciary Committee, and I have been working on

it through the Homeland Security Committee. And we came together for a committee hearing about 2 years ago in Houston, the first congressional hearing on human trafficking.

Houston has been called the epicenter of human trafficking, and Mr. Chairman, ranking member, when we went to the Harris County Jail during the police working group meeting, we heard from women who had actually been trafficked. It is real. It is visible. And I believe that the underpinnings or the premise of this legislation is important, which, in particular, requires the training for prosecutions of traffickers, develops methodology to assess prevalence of human trafficking, and a report on prosecutors seeking mandatory restitution. The bill appears to be a victim-centered proposal, and I am pleased that it includes foreign nationals, as well as legal permanent residents and citizens.

Taking into account the comments of the gentlelady from California, I at least want to move this legislation forward because I have seen firsthand that victim assistance is paramount, as many of these victims have suffered sexual abuse and are forced into the black market to engage in unlawful acts that are detrimental to their mental and physical health, and it is done over and over again, and also damaging to their ability to regain a sense of

1866 normalcy. It is essential that we address the issue of 1867 trafficking in a broader scope if the goal is to help these 1868 victims reclaim their identity, dignity, and their ability 1869 to move forward with a productive and healthy life as new 1870 members of our society. 1871 With the spike in T visa issuance since its enactment 1872 in 2000 by Congress, it is clear that there is a great need 1873 to expand protections for victims of this modern-day 1874 slavery, and I hope that this will be one bright light 1875 today, including the previous bill that we are engaging in 1876 in the Judiciary Committee. These victims need as much help 1877 as they can get, and I certainly ask my colleagues to 1878 support the legislation. I yield back. 1879 Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the 1880 gentleman from Georgia seek recognition? 1881 Mr. Johnson of Georgia. I move to strike the last 1882 word. 1883 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5 1884 minutes. 1885 Mr. Johnson of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to 1886 support H.R. 2473, and I hope my colleagues on this 1887 committee will give this bill our full support. This bill 1888 modifies the 2015 Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act and 1889 empowers victims of trafficking. 1890 Specifically, the bill amends the JVTA to provide

training to prosecutors and investigators toward the processing of cases with trauma-informed and victim-centered approaches, and the bill offers encouragement to states to provide appropriate services to victims of trafficking.

This is a thoughtful bill and one that considers how we implement the remedies we secure for victims of these crimes, so I applaud my colleague, Mrs. Wagner, for this bill, and I intend to support it. And with that, I yield back.

Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas seek recognition?

Mr. Poe. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Poe. To speak on the legislation, as we all know,

Mr. Poe. To speak on the legislation, as we all know, human trafficking, human sex trafficking, is a scourge on our society. Congress, 2 years ago, in a very bipartisan way, overwhelmingly approved legislation out of the House, went to the Senate, changed a little bit, and the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act is now the law of the land, and this legislation by Congresswoman Wagner helps the country understand that this scourge of sex trafficking is going to be addressed.

The training portion in here is very good. I met with some prosecutors in Texas last week and discussed the

1916

1917

1918

1919

1920

1921

1922

1923

1924

1925

1926

1927

1928

1929

1930

1931

1932

1933

1934

1935

1936

1937

1938

1939

1940

trafficking, human trafficking, and one of the issues that they mentioned was that there needs to be more training of those people in the business of prosecuting these traffickers and the buyers and rescuing and restoring victims. There needs to be training, training for law enforcement and training for those who prosecute these devils, if I can use that phrase, and also help understand more about victims because of their unique type of victim, because of the tremendous harm that has already been inflicted on them, not only physically, but emotionally. And those folks have to have someone, and that is us, rescue, restore, and treat them like the dignity that they need. So, I applaud the legislation, and I hope that we see that it pass and keep the awareness by Congress on the forefront that we are going to deal with this scourge of human trafficking. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back. Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman. For what purpose does the gentlewoman from California seek recognition? Ms. Bass. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. Chairman Goodlatte. The clerk advises that we do not yet have the amendment, and it is also our understanding that you have two amendments.

Ms. Bass. I do. I think you have the amendment now.

1941	Chairman Goodlatte. One is an amendment to the
1942	manager's amendment, and one is an amendment to the
1943	underlying bill. So, we would like to take up the amendment
1944	to the manager's amendment first, and we are on a search for
1945	finding it.
1946	Ms. Adcock. Amendment to the Goodlatte amendment to
1947	H.R. 2473, offered by Ms. Bass of California. On page 2,
1948	strike the amendment
1949	[The amendment of Ms. Bass follows:]
1950	******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as read, and the gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes on her amendment.

Ms. Bass. Thank you, Mr. Chair. The purpose of my amendment is to better identify and screen the characteristics of children and youth involved in the child welfare and justice system and to provide greater access to appropriate housing and services from trained, traumainformed care service providers.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues, especially my colleague Ann Wagner of Missouri, and efforts of all of those who have come together to put forth legislation and policy solutions that will eliminate barriers of relief and justice for victims of trafficking and strengthen systems of accountability for perpetrators. Traditional, bipartisan support on critical issues and efforts to combat human trafficking cannot be overstated or diminished. The progress we have made working together over the past few years has been vital, but the work is far from over and must continue.

In particular, we must continue to draw awareness and find solutions to eradicate the devastating impact of young children, who are in the U.S. child welfare system, from becoming victims of sex trafficking. And I want to mention to my colleagues that the purpose of the child welfare

system is to protect children who are abused or neglected. When we take custody of these children, then we, meaning the local county or State government, we, in effect, become the parents, so if our own child shows up missing and we do not do anything about it, then we are responsible, and this is exactly what is happening with child sex trafficking in the United States.

A large percentage of the children, predominantly girls, but some boys, as well, are kids that fall through the cracks of our child welfare system. I support H.R. 2473 because this bill calls for the necessary training and data collection assessments to help identify and implement effective and responsive models of justice and relief services.

Specifically, my amendment would strengthen these efforts by including, in the agency report to Congress, detailed characteristics of victims of trafficking in the child welfare and justice systems, including factors such as the age, which we know anecdotally, the average age is 12 years old, race, and gender of the victim; whether the victim has involvement in the child welfare or justice system; the number of foster care or congregate care placements; and whether the individual is a victim of sex or labor trafficking; and the effectiveness of current policies and procedures in meeting victims' needs for appropriate

2001 housing.

We have been told repeatedly that one of the reasons why the girls will go back to their pimps is because they basically have no place to live. So, given that these are girls that we are responsible for, we need to look at the appropriate housing and services from trained traumainformed care services providers. And in developing this report, we want additional input from sex and labor trafficking service providers.

My amendment would further encourage States to implement screening mechanisms for all children entering child welfare services and the criminal and juvenile justice systems to better identify child trafficking victims and connect them with appropriate services, especially appropriate housing and services from trained, traumainformed care service providers. And lastly, my amendment would include, as part of the training provided to prosecutors of traffickers, an emphasis on training for prosecutors to effectively prosecute traffickers and buyers of child sex trafficking.

I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of the amendment. Thank you, and I yield back.

2023 Chairman Goodlatte. Would the gentlewoman yield?
2024 Ms. Bass. Yes.

2025 Chairman Goodlatte. I thank the gentlewoman for

2026	yielding. And I want to thank her for her work on this
2027	amendment and for working with the committee staff and for
2028	working with Ms. Wagner. And I support your amendment.
2029	Ms. Bass. Thank you.
2030	Chairman Goodlatte. And I urge my colleagues to do the
2031	same.
2032	Ms. Bass. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2033	Mr. Marino. Mr. Chairman?
2034	Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the
2035	gentleman from Pennsylvania seek recognition?
2036	Mr. Marino. I move to strike the last word.
2037	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5
2038	minutes.
2039	Mr. Marino. Thank you. I wholeheartedly support this
2040	amendment from my colleague. We both do a great deal of
2041	work; we co-chair the Foster Youth/adoption Caucus, and
2042	there is no one in this country that knows more about foster
2043	care, what these children need, how they are abused; there
2044	is no one that knows what my good, dear friend from
2045	California, Karen Bass, realizes and has been a leader in
2046	not only legislation, but promoting foster care. So, I urge
2047	my colleagues to support this, and I want to thank my good
2048	friend for this amendment. I yield back.
2049	Mr. Conyers. Mr. Chairman?
2050	Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the

	·
2051	gentleman from Michigan seek recognition?
2052	Mr. Conyers. To support the amendment.
2053	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5
2054	minutes.
2055	Mr. Conyers. And I join in with the accolades that are
2056	coming toward the gentlelady from California because I think
2057	it provides helpful additions to the chairman's own
2058	proposal. I thank her so much.
2059	Ms. Jackson Lee. Mr. Chairman?
2060	Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the
2061	gentlewoman from Texas seek recognition?
2062	Ms. Jackson Lee. I rise to strike the last word.
2063	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentlewoman is recognized for
2064	5 minutes.
2065	Ms. Jackson Lee. Let me, as well, congratulate the
2066	gentlelady from California and add a congratulation for her
2067	persistent contributions to the care of foster care
2068	children, particularly when they are, in fact, as she said,
2069	we or the State or the government becomes their guardian,
2070	becomes their caretaker. Next week, she will allow many of
2071	us to have a foster care student or foster care young person
2072	follow us. I have done it for a number of years. And so, I
2073	want to thank she and both Mr. Marino for the Foster Care
2074	Caucus. I hope that we will have a time in Houston for them
2075	to be there.

ī	
2076	Again, Houston is a great city with great
2077	opportunities, but we also see a high number of runaways,
2078	who are either in the system or get into the system, and
2079	they are very vulnerable to human trafficking. They are,
2080	sadly, being hunted, if you will, because they have no place
2081	to go. They may have left the foster care setting, but they
2082	are still under the jurisdiction.
2083	I might add that Congresswoman Bass has been very
2084	effective in noting for those who age out, so her amendment
2085	will be very helpful to focus and pointedly respond to these
2086	youngsters who are particularly vulnerable, and I rise to
2087	support the gentlelady's amendment. With that, I yield
2088	back.
2089	Chairman Goodlatte. The questions occurs on the
2090	amendment to the amendment.
2091	All those in favor, respond by saying aye.
2092	Those opposed, no.
2093	The amendment is agreed to.
2094	The gentlewoman from California is recognized for her
2095	other amendment.
2096	Oh, correct. Are there further amendments to the
2097	manager's amendment?
2098	Being none, the question occurs on the manager's
2099	amendment.
2100	All those in favor, respond by saying aye.

	<b>.</b>
2101	Those opposed, no.
2102	The ayes have it, and the manager's amendment is
2103	adopted.
2104	Now, I will turn back to the gentlewoman from
2105	California for her other amendment.
2106	Ms. Bass. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have another
2107	amendment at the desk, and it makes several minor revisions
2108	to include the training of prosecutors
2109	Chairman Goodlatte. If the gentlewoman would suspend,
2110	we first need to report the amendment, and I think there may
2111	be a delay here.
2112	The clerk will report the amendment.
2113	Ms. Adcock. Amendment to H.R. 2473, offered by Ms.
2114	Bass of California. Page 3, line 1
2115	[The amendment of Ms. Bass follows:]
2116	****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

2117	Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the amendment
2118	is considered as read, and the gentlewoman is recognized for
2119	5 minutes on her amendment.
2120	Ms. Bass. Mr. Chair, I understand that there are some
2121	technical revisions that need to be made, and I will agree
2122	to withdraw my amendment.
2123	Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentlewoman
2124	and will be happy to work with you on fixing this on the way
2125	to the floor.
2126	Ms. Bass. Thank you.
2127	Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the amendment
2128	is withdrawn.
2129	And are there further amendments to H.R. 2473?
2130	A reporting quorum being present, the question is on
2131	the motion to report the bill, H.R. 2473, as amended,
2132	favorably to the House.
2133	Those in favor, respond by saying aye.
2134	Those opposed, no.
2135	The ayes have it. The bill is ordered reported
2136	favorably.
2137	Members will have 2 days to submit views. Without
2138	objection, the bill will be reported as a single amendment
2139	in the nature of a substitute, incorporating all adopted
2140	amendments, and staff is authorized to make technical and
2141	conforming changes.

2142	Pursuant to notice, I now call up H.R. 2431 for
2143	purposes of markup and move that the committee report the
2144	bill favorably to the House.
2145	The clerk will report the bill.
2146	Ms. Adcock. H.R. 2431, to amend the Immigration and
2147	Nationality Act to improve immigration law enforcement
2148	within the interior of the United States and for other
2149	purposes.
2150	[The bill follows:]
2151	******* INSERT 3 ******

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the bill is considered read and open for amendment at any time. I will begin by recognizing myself for an opening statement.

In the 100 days since President Trump signed executive orders making sense of our Nation's immigration enforcement priorities, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement has increased immigration arrests 38 percent over the same period last year. Nearly 75 percent of the arrests were of convicted criminals. A combination of revised enforcement priorities and actual enforcement has had significant results.

In February, the border patrol recorded a 40 percent drop in unlawful entrance along our borders. After 8 years of neglect by the Obama administration, the realization that the Department of Homeland Security will actually enforce our immigration laws has made aliens think twice about violating our borders and our immigration laws. And it was said that trying to control our borders was simply tilting at windmills. These promising signs must be accompanied by Congress giving immigration officers the additional tools they vitally need to do their jobs and keep themselves safe.

If we act responsibly, we will conclusively demonstrate that this country will not tolerate the flagrant disregard of our laws and our hospitality, especially by those who

threaten our safety and security. For too long, the administration has viewed immigration enforcement with disdain and its own immigration officers with contempt.

Under the Obama administration, the number of removals from the interior of the United States declined precipitously, as did the number of removals of criminal aliens, despite everincreasing resources and inexplicable reports to the contrary.

Under the guise of prosecutorial discretion and socalled enforcement priorities, removable aliens were essentially free to roam our country, unless they had been convicted of an ever-narrowing list of offenses.

Through the use of unconstitutional executive orders to create a Congress of one, President Obama substantially hobbled ICE's enforcement capabilities and prevented its dedicated public servants from carrying out their critical mission. We are still feeling the effects of years of non-enforcement.

In March, in my own district, a Lynchburg teenager was murdered by gang members believed to be in this country illegally. Even more disturbing, one of the alleged killers had an outstanding warrant in connection with a previous murder in Maryland. As killers and other dangerous individuals walk free, sanctuary jurisdictions that were encouraged to obstruct immigration enforcement by the

previous administration hold resolute in their conviction that immigration enforcement is wrong.

This country is in desperate need of new statutory tools to enforce our immigration laws. H.R. 2431, the Michael Davis, Jr., and Danny Oliver in Support of State and Local Law Enforcement Act was introduced by Immigration and Border Security Subcommittee Vice Chairman Raul Labrador.

The bill decisively delivers the immigration enforcement tools that ICE, its officers, and all of us need in order to show the obstructionists, the criminal aliens, and all those who benefit from a culture of lawlessness that breaking our immigration laws will no longer be tolerated.

It is named after two law enforcement officers who were murdered by an illegal alien. I know we were all deeply honored to have their widows attend the state of the Union address as guests of President Trump. Mr. Labrador's bill provides the Department of Homeland Security and, specifically, ICE with the tools it needs to protect our communities and enforce our immigration laws in the way Congress always intended. In addition, it reverses disastrous policies by the previous administration and ensures they are never again instituted by another administration.

Mr. Labrador's bill gives States and localities the explicit congressional authorization the Supreme Court

requires for them to enact and enforce their own immigration laws, provided they are consistent with Federal law and robustly assist in the enforcement of Federal law. Real immigration reform needs to have a mechanism to prevent any President acting alone from simply turning off the switch on enforcement.

This bill ensures that, when the Federal government fails to act, States can, if they so choose, pick up the slack. H.R. 2431 takes giant steps in protecting jurisdictions that comply with detainers so that ICE can take custody of removable aliens they have arrested, such as by protecting them from abusive lawsuits.

And it makes clear that sanctuary jurisdictions will face the consequences of their irresponsible and unlawful actions such as by losing Federal law enforcement and Homeland Security grants and by becoming liable for damages to the victims of crimes committed by the aliens they have released.

By expanding the types of serious criminal activity for which we can remove aliens, including drunk driving, failure to register as a sex offender, and criminal gang membership, the bill sends a strong message that criminal aliens will not get a free pass.

H.R. 2431 is a comprehensive enforcement package that provides ICE and our States with the tools and the

2252	congressional blessing to bolster current immigration
2253	enforcement efforts and reverse the non-enforcement of the
2254	past. I thank Representative Labrador for championing this
2255	issue, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.
2256	It is now my pleasure to recognize the ranking member
2257	of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr.
2258	Conyers, for his opening statement.
2259	[The prepared statement of Chairman Goodlatte follows:]
2260	****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Mr. Conyers. Thank you, Chairman Goodlatte. Members of the committee, this is a troubling matter that we have in the form of this amendment. And I have seen a lot of things that I have disagreed on. But this has been a proposal before us now that is, to put it very simply, an anti-immigrant bill. It expands an already massive Federal agency. It threatens local governments to do the Federal government's bidding, and it intrudes on the privacy rights of average Americans. It also violates our values as a Nation of immigrants and harms communities across the

Now, among the shortcomings of this measure, it makes it a crime to be undocumented in this country, and this is not the kind of solution our Nation needs. I have also noticed that, by granting local officers unprecedented and unchecked authority to enforce Federal immigration laws, the bill will actually make our communities less safe.

Studies show that, when police officers become immigration agents, crime victims and witnesses fear coming forward. Crime goes unreported, and public safety suffers. And if States and localities decide the best way to promote public safety and community policing is to adopt policies regarding the immigration enforcement action of police, this bill denies those jurisdictions Cops on the Beat grants. It denies them. Those are grants specifically designed to

2286 promote public safety and enhance community policing.

And so, that is why the proposal that is now before us, my colleagues, has been opposed by the Major Cities Police Chiefs Association and the Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force. It has also been opposed by the National Conference of State Legislatures, the United States Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities.

This legislation will result in widespread racial profiling and unconstitutional arrests of United States citizens and immigrants alike. How do we know this?

Because this is what happened in jurisdictions across this country that entered into 287(g) agreements with the Department of Homeland Security.

We saw it in Maricopa County where a Federal judge found that Sheriff Joe Arpaio engaged in a pattern of racially profiling Latinos. We also saw, in Alamance County, North Carolina, which had its 287(g) agreement terminated based on findings of abuse by the Department of Justice. According to the Department of Justice's complaint, the Alamance County sheriff explicitly ordered his staff to "go out there and catch me some Mexicans," and directed deputies to arrest Hispanics, but not others, for minor infractions.

So, what does this bill do? Well, rather than improve

2311 on current practice and require more oversight over 287(g) 2312 agreements, it grants total enforcement authority with no 2313 checks at all. So this legislation represents a significant 2314 down payment on Donald Trump's mass deportation plan. 2315 It is singularly focused on the widespread location, 2316 detention, and deportation of millions of immigrants and 2317 would cause untold harm to American communities. And so, for those reasons my colleagues, I urge that we reject this 2318 2319 mean-spirited and dangerous legislation. I thank the 2320 chairman. 2321 [The prepared statement of Mr. Conyers follows:] 2322 \*\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\*

2323	Chairman Goodlatte. Thank you, Mr. Conyers. I would
2324	now like to recognize the sponsor of the bill, Mr. Labrador
2325	of Idaho, for his opening statement.
2326	Mr. Labrador. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you
2327	for holding this important markup today.
2328	The United States of America is the greatest Nation in
2329	history. We are the greatest Nation because we are the
2330	Nation of laws. In America, it is a foundational principle
2331	that all individuals are treated equally under the law,
2332	whether you are rich or poor, famous or unknown.
2333	Unfortunately, for 8 years, President Obama's refusal
2334	to enforce our immigration laws undermine the rule of law.
2335	And by undermining the rule of law, he diminished the
2336	strength of the United States. Fortunately, President Trump
2337	has reversed those directions, and law enforcement is, once
2338	again, enforcing our immigration laws. In fact, President
2339	Trump owes his position to the promise he made to the
2340	American people to get serious about enforcing our laws.
2341	America is our home, and the American people expect us, as
2342	their elected representatives, to do all that we can to keep
2343	our community safe and secure.
2344	For too long, we have allowed individuals to enter our

For too long, we have allowed individuals to enter our country illegally, and too many cases do us harm. In fact, maybe this is news to people on the other side, but it is already a crime to be in the United States illegally. It

2345

2346

2347

has already been set in law. This bill, the Davis-Oliver
Act, will ensure that the law will be enforced no matter who
is in the White House. The bill is named after two
California officers: Placer County detective Michael Davis,
Jr. and Sacramento County Deputy Sheriff Danny Oliver.

Davis and Oliver were murdered by an illegal immigrant in October 2014. This bill is intended to ensure that other families do not suffer as victims of crimes committed by individuals who should not have been allowed to enter or remain in the country in the first place.

Since being elected to Congress in 2010, I have made it a priority to work towards modernizing our immigration system, but the first and most crucial step in that process is ensuring enforcement of our current laws. The Davis-Oliver Act takes that first and necessary step. While other reforms are needed, this bill is vital to a long-term fix. That is why I am honored to introduce the Davis-Oliver Act.

This bill authorizes State and local law enforcement to work together with our Federal immigration officers to provide meaningful enforcement of the law. This is not a new concept. In fact, we currently allow State and local law enforcement to assist Federal law enforcement in many areas. And the record shows that we can achieve remarkable results when State, local, and Federal law enforcement work together. This is a critical first step to ensuring the

American people feel confident that our laws are being enforced.

Allowing State and local law enforcement to assist in the enforcement of our immigration laws will ensure that, no matter who is in the White House, our immigration laws will be followed. To help State and local law enforcement assist Federal law enforcement, this bill provides grants to allow State and local police agencies in procuring equipment, technology, facilities, and other products that facilitate and are directly related to investigating, apprehending, arresting, detaining, or transporting aliens who have violated our immigration laws.

Additionally, the legislation requires DHS to create training manuals and guides for the training of State and local officials to ensure that the laws are being enforced uniformly across jurisdictions.

The Davis-Oliver Act also takes steps to end the harmful practice of States and localities refusing to comply with Federal detainers and encourages States and localities not to adopt dangerous sanctuary policies by predicating receipt of funding cooperation with immigration officials. The Davis-Oliver Act improves Visa security by expanding the Visa Security Program to all U.S. embassies and consular posts. This will ensure that all Visa applications receive the screening that they deserve.

Finally, the bill provides ICE officers with the equipment and training they need to safely and effectively enforce our immigration laws in this dangerous world. I am proud of this legislation and pleased that this committee has started the process of reforming and modernizing our immigration system. Once we have taken the

necessary steps to ensure that our immigration laws are

2405 enforced, I look forward to completing the next steps in the immigration reform process. And with that, I yield back.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Labrador follows:]

2408 

2398

2399

2400

2401

2402

2403

2404

2406

2407

2409 Ms. Lofgren. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Goodlatte. Thank you, Mr. Labrador. At this time, I would like to recognize the ranking member of the Immigration and Border Security Subcommittee, the gentlewoman from California, Ms. Lofgren, for her opening statement.

Ms. Lofgren. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Proponents of this bill say that it is necessary to keep us safe. But what the bill really does is pander to the noxious notion that immigrants are criminals and should be dealt with harshly.

As we know, the truth is that immigrants commit crime at a far lower rate than native born. They add greatly to the country's wealth, both by working in agriculture, technology, medical care, housing, and other critical sectors of the Nation's economy, and by operating small businesses in every corner of this country. But in Trump's America, we are told not to trust the news, that climate change is a hoax, less healthcare coverage is better health coverage, and that immigrants are dangerous.

The real danger, of course, is making policy based on alternative facts. Based on alternative facts, this bill would turn all undocumented immigrants, including DREAMers, parents, and children, into criminals overnight, and it would empower local law enforcement, with little training in

the area, to engage in overreaching witch hunts replete with racial profiling and violations of civil rights.

It is no surprise that this bill was on Steve Bannon's whiteboard as a priority for the Trump administration. This bill gives Trump and Bannon the legislative authority to establish their massive deportation force and would turn our communities into police states overnight. This bill should really be called the Trump Mass Deportation Act, because that is what it is.

This bill will make us neither safer, nor more prosperous. Since Trump's inauguration and the issuance of his executive orders, we have seen a sharp decline in international visitors, fewer foreign students seeking to study here, and ripple effects in our technology sector.

Whether intended or not, Trump has sent the international message: the United States is closed for business, and our economy is paying the price. After the executive orders, we have also seen decreasing levels of crime reporting within Latino communities. This is not a good thing. Law enforcement officers and prosecutors all over the country know that, if residents are too afraid to come forward to report crime or testify against criminal activity, their communities, our communities, will be less safe.

If this bill is enacted into law, criminal activity in

our communities will only escalate, as criminals will be allowed to commit crime with impunity.

The bill simply casts aside these inconvenient truths in the rush to target and expel immigrants. The Constitution fares no better. Despite my colleague's professed adoration for the Constitution and limited government, this bill raises severe constitutional concerns.

There are provisions that turn immigration law on its head by allowing States and localities to enact their own immigration laws and penalties and to independently enforce them. These include the authority for local officials to investigate, arrest, and even detain individuals they suspect have violated civil immigration laws, all without any coordination with Federal authorities.

Perhaps more pointedly, the bill puts States and localities in de facto control of Federal enforcement by giving them the power to order Federal officials, without exception, to arrest and detain individuals suspected of local officers of violating immigration laws. Giving local officers the authority to commandeer Federal enforcement resources intrudes on core executive powers and raises significant separation of powers and federalism concerns.

There are also provisions authorizing the indefinite, and possibly permanent, detention of persons who cannot be removed, despite their cooperation with removal efforts.

This provision would overturn the Supreme Court's decision in Zadvydas v. Davis, where the court strongly suggested the such detention would violate bedrock constitutional protections.

Again, I ask why we feel compelled to violate the Constitution despite a professed loyalty to our Constitution. I am left wondering whether anti-immigrant rhetoric has so invaded some of us that we are no longer to embrace fundamental ideals embodied in our Constitution. It was not too long ago that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and I were able to have reasonable conversations about immigration policy. While we disagreed on many things, we shared certain core beliefs that allowed us to work on common-sense, bipartisan solutions.

This bill is not a solution. It is the wrong direction for our country, and I hope that we can at least make some of it better through a series of amendments that we will offer, Mr. Chairman. I would also, if I may now, ask unanimous consent to enter into the record several statements: a statement by the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, a letter signed by 85 law professors and scholars of constitutional immigration law; a letter from the Leadership Council on Civil and Human Rights; a statement by America's Voice; a statement from the American Immigration Lawyers Association; a letter from the National Center for

2509

2510

2511

2512

2513

2514

2515

2516

2517

2518

2519

2520

2521

2522

2523

2524

2525

2526

2527

2528

2529

2530

2531

2532

2533

Transgender Equality; a statement from the ACLU; a statement from Church World Services; a statement from the Friends Committee on National Legislation; a statement signed by 27 members of the Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force; a statement on behalf of 22 child advocate organizations; a statement on behalf of 25 refugee advocate organizations; a letter signed by 192 national, State, and local religious, civil rights, ethnic, and immigration organizations; a statement from the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops; a statement from the Cato Institute; a letter from the Coalition for Humane Immigration Rights; a letter of opposition from the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence; a letter of opposition from the NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; a Letter of opposition from the Franciscan Action Network; a letter of opposition from Disciples Home Missions; a statement of opposition from Jim Wallace, the president and founder of Sojourners; a statement of opposition from the National Justice for our Neighbors; a statement from Global Jewish Advocacy; and finally, a report setting the record straight on local involvement in Federal civil immigration enforcement, May 2007, from the New York State Office of the AG, the AG of California, the District of Columbia, Oregon, Rhode Island, and the State of Washington. Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, these documents

2534	will be made part of the record.	
2535	[The information follows:]	
2536	****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******	

2537	Chairman Goodlatte. Are there any amendments to H.R.
2538	2431?
2539	For what purpose does the gentlewoman seek recognition?
2540	Ms. Jackson Lee. Strike the last word.
2541	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentlewoman is recognized for
2542	5 minutes.
2543	Ms. Jackson Lee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to
2544	this legislation, and I make a particular point of
2545	acknowledging the tragedy surrounding the naming of the
2546	legislation and believe that we can collectively honor
2547	individuals in a way that will address, as Mr. Conyers has
2548	said, the immigration reform process that enhances
2549	eliminating criminal activity or criminal acts that would
2550	generate in tragic incidences. But this is not this
2551	legislation, and I think it is very honest to say this is a
2552	campaign pledge, and it is the one of Mr. Trump for a
2553	deportation task force.
2554	More importantly, it is a reinstatement of mass
2555	incarceration. It is a promoting of where the Federal
2556	prison system has been so effective in safely diminishing or
2557	increasing the number of incarcerated persons. This one,
2558	this legislation, steps in to cure those empty beds and to
2559	increase the amount of money the American people will pay
2560	and to divide families and to endanger children.
2561	And so, just for an example, if I take section 314 and

I look at a number of sections in 314, you will see one section adds 10 years; another section adds 15 years; another section adds 20 years. And this may be on top of, Mr. Conyers, the sentencing that has already occurred.

And so, this will be the new fodder and raw material for the Nation's private prisons and the Federal prison system. It also violates the known principle and division of work, if you will, of now giving over, to the States and local governments, immigration duties of enforcement. There is nothing that will create more hostility in a community than to engage local law enforcement unwillingly into immigration enforcement. And my chief and others have indicated that is not their job. And the way to keep the city and counties safe is that everyone is free to point out the criminal and the crime.

In addition, let me add another great concern. And I want to put the Houston detention center on notice of my concern. And that is a number of deaths that have occurred, and we have discussed this in this committee, in the detention centers around the Nation, deaths that were unwarranted and occurred because of negligence. Some of these are private detention centers. Far be it from me to challenge someone's economic opportunity or the employees. Many of them are ex-Federal of Prison Bureau employees. I know their intentions may be good. But intentions cannot

2587 bring back the dead or good intentions.

And so, it is very clear. Medical experts evaluated 18 deaths from May 2012 to June 2015. During those 3 years, at least 21 people died in ICE custody. But ICE released investigations only on half of those cases after a Freedom of Information court battle.

And so, it is clear that this bill is wracked with large, gaping holes of responsibility and the right way to look. Now, let me just say, there is some who have advocated for this bill who have joined us on comprehensive immigration reform in times past. I am sorry that it has come to this, that this is now the offering. No one can accept this bill. This will not be acceptable. And frankly, the numbers of those coming across the border are down, and the only people that we will be attacking in this bill are the 11 million-plus that have been sitting and waiting, working, and praying that we would have comprehensive immigration reform, so they could continue to

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

own homes, pay taxes, and, yes, follow the law.

Ms. Jackson Lee. All this bill does is increase mass incarceration. I yield back.

2610 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentlelady yields back. Time
2611 has expired.

2612	Does any other member seek recognition?
2613	The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.
2614	Mr. Johnson of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
2615	must strenuously object to this Steve Bannon/Donald trump
2616	deportation bill. This bill is the culmination of every
2617	hyperbolic and despicable thing that Steve Bannon and
2618	President Trump have said about immigrants, both during and
2619	after the recent campaign.
2620	This piece of legislation does absolutely nothing to
2621	address the problem of individuals and families living in
2622	the shadows. It criminalizes undocumented status. It goes
2623	after so-called sanctuary cities. It expands detention
2624	policies. And it ramps up the militarization of local
2625	police departments.
2626	Mr. Gaetz. Will the gentleman yield?
2627	Mr. Johnson of Georgia. I will when I finish.
2628	Additionally, this bill and the mean-spiritedness about
2629	it perpetuates what we know are alternative facts. The fact
2630	is, immigrants commit crimes at lower rates than their
2631	natural-born counterparts.
2632	Lastly, this bill hurts all Americans. The fact is
2633	that since this President took office, travel to America has
2634	declined, educational visas have declined, and Americans are
2635	being caught up and ensnared in immigration dragnets, which
2636	are terrorizing communities across this Nation. Whether it

is federalism or morality, this is a bad bill. This bill should be known as something that is a panacea to the private prison industrial complex, the for-profit private prison industrial complex where detainees are held for months awaiting proceedings because of the bottleneck created by the lack of immigration judges.

So you create a bottleneck down at the bottom and then you create a wide funnel at the top, and you drag people into these detention centers, hold them for months under conditions that have been described as being brutal and inhumane. In fact, there have been two deaths in ICE custody just over the last few days and just in Georgia; two inmates have died in ICE custody.

And what this bill does is tries to open up more floodgates to bring more detainees into the system because, what did Congress do? Upped the number of beds that it pays for, that it pays these private prison companies for.

Thirty-nine thousand beds are now being paid for by the U.S. taxpayers. And those beds are paid for regardless of whether or not anyone is in them or not.

So the move is to put more bodies in those beds, if you could call them beds. And so this bill, like I said, is a panacea for the private prison industrial complex. And I urge my colleagues to reject this bill not just on fiscal grounds, but on morality and humanity grounds. With that, I

2662	will
2663	Mr. Gaetz. Will the gentleman yield?
2664	Mr. Johnson of Georgia. I will.
2665	Mr. Gaetz. I am trying to better understand the
2666	gentleman's comments when he says the legislation
2667	criminalizes undocumented status. Is there anyone with
2668	undocumented status that is not an illegal immigrant?
2669	Mr. Johnson of Georgia. Well, you can characterize
2670	them how you like, but people who are attracted to this
2671	country have been exploited for labor.
2672	Mr. Nadler. Will the gentleman yield? Will the
2673	gentleman yield?
2674	Mr. Johnson of Georgia. Yes, I will.
2675	Mr. Nadler. Thank you. I just want to say
2676	undocumented aliens, unless they have committed criminal
2677	offenses of various natures, their undocumented status is a
2678	civil, not a criminal defense. This bill would change that
2679	and that is the answer to your question. I yield back.
2680	Mr. Chabot. [Presiding.] Will the gentleman yield?
2681	Mr. Johnson of Georgia. And with that, my time is
2682	about to run. Someone else can yield. I yield back.
2683	Mr. Chabot. The gentleman's time has expired. Does
2684	anyone seek recognition?
2685	Ms. Jayapal. Mr. Chairman?
2686	Mr. Chabot. the gentlelady from Washington is

2687 | recognized.

Ms. Jayapal. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This bill, we have to call it Trump's mass deportation act. That is what it is. It is a harsh, anti-immigrant enforcement only proposal that would criminalize all undocumented immigrants, undermine public safety, and harm the American people and waste millions of dollars.

Here is the true statement in regards to some of the discussion before. It is not a true statement that being in the country illegally is a crime. Here is what is true. Illegal entry is a misdemeanor offense, but it is not a continuing offense. What that means is that if you are not charged within 5 years, the government cannot prosecute you for this offense. And this has been the law for decades. The majority of undocumented people in this country would not be able to be prosecuted and could not be convicted of any immigration related crime because most of them have been here for a very long time.

So let us be very clear on what the facts are. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a play to prejudice. It is a welcome mat to racism, and it is a repudiation of the very values that have defined our great Nation since inception; values that are inscribed on the statue of liberty, values that brought the ancestors of every person in this chamber to this country unless you are Native American. And I am not

sure what we have forgotten in this country when we put a bill like this forward that would literally be a mass deportation force and a criminalization of undocumented immigrants that would ensnare dreamers, some DACA recipients, and permanent residents even into this drag net.

ICE's first 100 days under the Trump administration have been a disaster for families and communities all across the country without any attempt to prioritize those who are a true threat to communities. ICE has significantly increased the numbers of people swept up by Trump's deportation force including dreamers, parents of U.S. citizens, and survivors of domestic abuse. Even while they claim to be targeting "bad hombres," ICE's own statistics show a significant worrying jump in people with no criminal records being put into the enforcement machinery. And what is worse, Trump and some of my Republican colleagues want to supercharge this deportation force with more money, more funding, and more weaponry.

Mr. Chairman, I really believe that this country is desperately in need of something, but it is not statutory tools for mass deportations. That is not what we are in great need of. What this country is in great need of is true, comprehensive, human immigration reform. That is what many of us have been working on for a very long time. And the idea that we would put forward a bill like this when we

have so much to do on this committee and the Immigration Subcommittee on real responses to what is happening across this country that is creating crises in our schools, in our homes, for our families, across the country, to me is a travesty.

Now, even if you did not believe in the morality of this issue, let me just say what the economics would show. Deporting just 7 million undocumented workers out of the 12 million total would result in a 2.6 percent reduction in GDP, taking \$4.7 trillion out of the economy. If all undocumented workers were deported, we would lose nearly \$5 trillion in economic growth over 10 years. And increased enforcement of the nature proposed in this bill would increase the price for a gallon of milk up to \$8. It would increase food prices by 5 to 6 percent. It would decrease domestic food production by 30 to 61 percent. Agricultural output would fall by \$30 billion to \$6 billion. And lost production and livestock sector would drop by 13 to 27 percent.

Why is that? It is because undocumented immigrants and immigrants across this country serve our country every single day. They put food on the table, they allow us to do the work we need to do, and it is a travesty that we would put forward a bill that would somehow make it seem like undocumented immigrants and immigrants in general to this

2762

2763

2764

2765

2766

2767

2768

2769

2770

2771

2772

2773

2774

2775

2776

2777

2778

2779

country are doing us harm. That is not what the statistics show, and Mr. Chairman, I would like the opportunity to submit for the record two letters: one from the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office that specifically talks about the harm that would be done to domestic violence victims, sexual assault victims, those who we proposed bills to support earlier in this session; and also, a letter from the U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops, the Committee on Migration, and specifically it says, "We believe that together these bills would constitute an unacceptable expansion in immigration enforcement that would contravene the principle of treating all individuals with human dignity regardless of their immigration status. Mr. Chairman, I yield back. Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, so ordered, and the gentlelady's time has expired. [The information follows:] \*\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. Chabot. The gentleman from Florida, Mr. Gaetz is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Gaetz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I object to the categorization of illegal aliens as undocumented.

Undocumented just sort of makes it sound like some people lost some paperwork or did not cross some T's or dot I's.

This is illegal immigration and it is preposterous on this committee that Democrats take the position that illegal immigration is not illegal; it is something else. Or that a misdemeanor is not a crime; it, in fact, is. And the only reason that we are unable to prosecute people 5 years after they break the law to get in the country is because the statute of limitations is run. That does not mean that they are here legally. That does not mean that they have not committed a crime.

It just means that during the Obama presidency there was such abandonment of a focus on enforcement that we allowed these opportunities to enforce the law to lapse. And so I associate myself with the comments of the bill sponsor, Mr. Labrador, when he says that this is about the rule of law. And if the very first thing people do to get into this country is break the law, we have substantially eroded that which is special about the United States of America. And so I strongly support the legislation on those grounds.

There are also strong economic bases to reject illegal immigration as an economic development tool. The comment was made that well, we have got all these undocumented people who are working and if we lose them as workers that has an impact on the economy. Well, if they are undocumented, how did they get the documents to work?

In most circumstances, they have stolen them, they are fabricated them, they have acquired them through improper means. And so it seems to be quite the double bind for democrats who simply want to invite illegal immigration in this country to say that, "Well, it is this great economic additive," while at the same time referring to illegal immigrants as undocumented. There is substantial evidence that indicates that the economic cost of illegal immigration is significant. Conservative estimates indicate that it could be well over \$100 billion a year. Illegal immigrants show up in our schools, our hospitals, they utilize social services.

This is not to say that immigration is not a great source of good for the country. It is. And I think that Mr. Labrador's legislation acknowledges the fact that if people come to the country legally, make a contribution, the United States will always be the most welcoming country on earth towards those objectives and goals and values.

But what we will not value is breaking the law. And

2830 what we should not do is create euphemisms for lawbreakers 2831 and that is why I support this legislature. I yield back. 2832 Mr. Deutch. Will the gentleman yield for a question? 2833 Mr. Gaetz. Certainly. 2834 Mr. Deutch. I would just ask my friend from Florida a 2835 simple question. And I listened to the speech and I will 2836 refrain from commenting until I move to strike the last 2837 word. But, I am trying to understand. I would like to 2838 distill this all down to where I think you are going, but I 2839 cannot imagine you are really going, which is there are 11 2840 million people, human beings in this country, who are 2841 undocumented. You do not like the phrase. You can call 2842 them whatever you want. They are human beings. Is the goal 2843 of my friend from Florida to round up 11 million people who 2844 are living in our communities, so many of them contributing 2845 for years in our communities -- including kids who have 2846 grown up in this country, who have known no other country 2847 other than America -- is the goal to round up those people 2848 who you describe as illegal and to deport those 11 million 2849 people? And if that is the goal, is the goal to accomplish 2850 it all at once? 2851 Or will you be satisfied doing it in tranches of, 2852 perhaps, 50,000 at a time. 2853 Mr. Gaetz. I do not call these people illegal. 2854 are illegal. They are here illegally, which was the point

2855	of my remarks.
2856	Mr. Deutch. Then should they be deported all 11
2857	million all at one time?
2858	MR. Gaetz. Well, I think the focus of Mr. Labrador's
2859	legislation is to ensure that the resources are available
2860	for our local law enforcement, State law enforcement, to
2861	ensure that those who are the most dangerous draw our focus.
2862	So no, this legislation is not intended to deport 11 million
2863	people, but it certainly draws in to sharp relief the need
2864	to enforce the rule of law in this country.
2865	Mr. Deutch. If we had the resources to do it, would
2866	you support deporting 11 million people?
2867	Mr. Gaetz. Well, I tell you what, I always enjoy
2868	bipartisan work with my dear colleague from Florida. And so
2869	if you would like to work together on a mechanism to better
2870	enforce the rule of law and direct resources to get people
2871	who are not here legally back to their home countries I
2872	would be eager to work with you on that.
2873	Mr. Chabot. Does the gentleman yield back?
2874	Mr. Gaetz. I yield back.
2875	Mr. Chabot. the gentleman yields back his time. The
2876	other gentleman from Florida, Mr. Deutch, is recognized for
2877	5 minutes.
2878	Mr. Deutch. Thank you. I move to strike the last
2879	word. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just say to my

friend from Florida, I will never -- as much as I enjoy working with him -- I will never spend a moment's time trying to figure out how to put in place a policy that is inhumane and un-American that calls for rounding up 11 million people and shipping them out of our country. No, on that one, I will not work with my friend.

Mr. Chairman, this bill that we have before us is an enforcement-only immigration bill. The bill would make it a crime to be in the United States as an undocumented immigrant. It would expand the ability to revoke non-immigrant visas without judicial review. It would make detention facilities less safe for families and small children. It would significantly increase the number of ICE officers and militarize them with assault weapons. It would have local law enforcement officers enforce our Nation's immigrations laws. It would impose strict limitations on temporary protected status, a humanitarian program by which the U.S. helps other countries devastated by war or natural disasters. And the list goes on.

This is Trump's mass deportation act. It is designed to cleanse the United States of undocumented immigrants.

This bill will do nothing to address the existing backlogs for green cards. The bill does nothing to resolve the status of people who were undocumented in our country. The bill does nothing to resolve the daily limbo of DACA

recipients who do not know when they too might be rounded up.

This bill is a massive buildup and militarization of deportation forces and detention facilities. This bill will split families apart. It will undermine community safety. It will make our communities less safe. It will undermine our humanitarian leadership in the world, and it will force Congress to spend billions and billions of dollars on immigration enforcement and detention. I hope that this committee will scrap this bill and get to work on a bipartisan solution to resolve the problems in our Nation's immigration system. But I hope that when we do it, we move forward on one that respects immigrants, not a deportation bill that demonizes them. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chabot. Thank you, the gentleman yields back. Do any other members seek recognition? If not, are there any amendments? Anyone seeking an amendment? The ranking member is recognized for purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. Conyers. I have an amendment at the desk.

Mr. Chabot. Excuse me just one moment. They do not have any amendments at the desk. The gentleman will withhold for a moment. Here come the amendments.

Mr. Labrador. Mr. Chair? Mr. Chair?

2929 Mr. Chabot. I am not sure where that is coming from.

	1
2930	Yeah, the gentleman.
2931	Mr. Labrador. I reserve a point of order. We have not
2932	seen these amendments.
2933	Mr. Chabot. All right. The gentleman reserves a point
2934	of order. The clerk will report the amendment.
2935	Ms. Adcock. Amendment to H.R. 2431 offered by Mr.
2936	Conyers. Strike Title I and re-designate provisions and
2937	amend the table of contents accordingly.
2938	[The amendment of Mr. Conyers follows:]
2939	****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

2940	Mr. Chabot. the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.
2941	Mr. Conyers. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is strike
2942	Title I.
2943	Mr. Labrador. Mr. Chairman, I
2944	Mr. Chabot. the gentleman already reserved a point of
2945	order.
2946	Mr. Labrador. And I withdraw my point or order at this
2947	time.
2948	Mr. Chabot. Point of order withdrawn. The gentleman
2949	can proceed.
2950	Mr. Conyers. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, this
2951	amendment would simply strike Title I of the legislation.
2952	Because H.R. 2431 represents a step backwards in our
2953	Nation's effort to reform our immigration system. And title
2954	1 is one of the most troubling parts of the bill. First
2955	of all, Title I repeats a history of failed policy
2956	proposals. Past history has taught us that an enforcement-
2957	only approach will not fix our Nation's broken immigration
2958	system. It never has. Despite this, Title I ignores common
2959	sense immigration reforms and simply seeks to expand the
2960	unnecessary arrest, detention, and deportation of millions
2961	of immigrants at an enormous cost to our Nation.
2962	This same title also imposes an anti-immigrant agenda
2963	on States and localities across the country. The hallmark
2964	of our great Nation is the belief that States have the right

to make decisions for their own communities particularly as it relates to decisions of public safety. Title I, however, overrides the good judgment of local officials and penalizes those communities that have decided to implement community trust policies.

By imposing an anti-immigrant agenda on States and localities, this legislation completely ignores the judgment of chiefs and associations around the country who have long opposed turning police into immigration agents. As Riverside Police Chief Diaz said about a former version of this bill, "You might have noticed that these kinds of laws like 2278 and Arizona's 1070 do not originate with police chiefs. We are not asking for this kind of direction from legislators. We know that these laws will make crime worse and not better."

So finally, Title I requires the Federal government to expend billions of dollars unnecessarily detaining individuals such as DREAMers and veterans who pose no threat to public safety. Under these provisions, the Federal Government would be forced upon request to assume custody of every person who a State or locality identifies as inadmissible or deportable. As a result, the government would be forced to expend billions more constructing more detention facilities to imprison individuals who post no public safety threat.

While I oppose this bill in its entirety, it is Title I that is particularly egregious. It threatens public safety, runs contrary to the basic principles of community policing, and would encourage racial profiling and unconstitutional arrests and detentions around the country. And so for these reasons, I urge my fellow members of this committee to support my amendment. I thank the chair and yield back the balance of my time if any.

Mr. Chabot. Thank you. The gentleman yields back. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. Labrador. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment as it seeks to strike the most crucial provision of the bill, Title I, which ensures that State and local law enforcement can participate. I want to make this clear, because we are going to hear this again and again and again. Nothing in this bill requires localities to do anything. It just gives them the authority to do something about immigration enforcement. It ensures that the State and local law enforcement can participate in the enforcement of our immigration laws. It is designed to ensure that our immigration laws not go largely unenforced at the whim of any President.

The bill adheres to the Supreme Court's requirements in Arizona v. U.S. and grants States and localities specific congressional authorization to enact and enforce their own

3015 | immigration laws.

They may enact criminal and civil penalties that penalize conduct prohibited by criminal and civil provisions of Federal immigration laws as long as the penalties do not exceed the relevant Federal penalties. The bill also provides that law enforcement personnel of States and localities may investigate, identify, apprehend, detain, or transfer to Federal custody aliens in the United States for the purpose of assisting in the enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States.

Without the assistance of State and local law enforcement we have no mechanism to ensure that the immigration laws will be enforced despite another unwilling administration.

This amendment also strikes other important provisions in this bill. It was strike the provision that DHS may not refuse absent a compelling reason to enter into 287(g) cooperative agreements at the requests of States and localities who want to assist in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws. It would strike the provision providing grants to local law enforcement agencies that assist in immigration law enforcement. It would also strike the provision aimed at ensuring that sanctuary cities may not take into custody and subsequently release removable aliens already in DHS custody. And it would also strike provisions

creating a Federal cause of action for the victims of crimes committed by aliens who were only on the streets because State or a locality refused to honor a detainer.

minutes.

I want you to listen closely to the opposition of this bill. They believe that enforcing the law threatens public safety. That is the most preposterous and outrageous argument that I have ever heard and I think it is time that we start enforcing immigration laws. If we want a comprehensive approach to immigration, the number one step has to be that every American -- that 300 million-plus Americans feel safe and secure. So we should put them first ahead of the 11 million that are here illegally. And I think that is the only way that we are going to have a true modern immigration system. And I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. And I yield back.

Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York seek recognition?

Mr. Nadler. Strike the last word on the amendment.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5

Mr. Nadler. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the amendment. There are many, many problems with Title I of the bill, some of which the distinguished ranking member has listed. But let me mention a couple of clear constitutional problems. Section 108 of the bill turns the immigration

system on its head by requiring the Federal government to assume custody upon request upon a State or locality over persons suspected by State or local officers to be a removable alien. So the Federal government must imprison people suspected of being removable aliens. What ever happened to due process? How can you detain people suspected of being undocumented people? The government, upon request, would be forced to assume custody of every person whom a State or locality identifies as inadmissible or reportable.

With what due process? With what process at all? That is problem number one. That is clearly unconstitutional.

And just to take another unconstitutional provision of the title, section 114 attempts to commandeer State and local governments to comply with immigration detainer requests and threatens to withhold critical law enforcement funding to any locality that fails to comply with such requests. So in other words, the Federal government could request through immigration detainers that State and local governments detain people. That seems a violation of any number of Supreme Court decisions that have said the Federal government may not commandeer the resources of a local government. If the Federal government wants to detain someone, it can, providing it has the proper evidence and goes through due process.

But it cannot tell the State to do so. It cannot tell the State you must devote your resources. You may think it is more important to spend your money on fire protection or on police protection against domestic violence or against armed robbery or whatever. But we are telling you no. You have to spend this money not on your priorities, but on enforcing Federal detainers because we do not want to spend Federal money -- or not Federal money on enforcing a Federal detainer.

Now, in the Affordable Care Act case, Justice Roberts, for instance threw out -- not Justice Roberts, the majority of the court -- said that the mandatory expansion of Medicaid in all 50 States to people not covered by it -- even though the Federal Government was going to pay the cost of it, 90 percent of the cost of it -- was unconstitutional because the Federal government could not commandeer, among other reasons -- that was one of the reasons -- could not commandeer the resources of the State. And therefore it became voluntary upon the States agreeing.

Here you are commandeering the resources of the State for a purpose the Federal government determines to be more important than every other purpose of the State. So just in these two provisions, in addition to most of the bill and certainly most of this title being obnoxious on the merits, it is clearly unconstitutional. So I support the

3115 gentleman's amendment to strike the title. And if, in fact, 3116 this title is the heart of the bill, be sure to strike the 3117 bill, too. I yield back. 3118 Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the 3119 gentlewoman from California seek recognition? 3120 Ms. Lofgren. To strike the last word. 3121 Chairman Goodlatte. the gentlewoman is recognized for 3122 5 minutes. 3123 Ms. Lofgren. I very much support Mr. Conyers' 3124 amendment. There are defects in other parts of the bill. 3125 But Title I has many, many defects. And I will just direct 3126 your attention to Page 5, line 5. Actually, line 1 through 3127 6, which basically authorizes the enactment of immigration 3128 laws by States and localities provided that they are 3129 consistent with section 101(a)17 of the Immigration and 3130 Nationality Act. What does that section say? It basically 3131 says immigration laws includes this chapter, which is the 3132 whole thing, plus all conventions and treaties of the United 3133 States. So, we are actually inviting cities to enact their 3134 own immigration laws so long as they think they are 3135 consistent with an enormous body of law. This is directly 3136 contrary, really, to what the Supreme Court found was 3137 reasonable in Arizona v. The United States. 3138 Where in that case, the court explained that Federal 3139 control over immigration law is crucial because it is

fundamental that foreign countries concerned about the status, safety, and security of their nationals in the United States must be able to confer and communicate on this subject with one national sovereign, not 50 separate States. By allowing every State of locality to enact their own immigration laws, foreign countries would be forced to confer and communicate not just with 50 States, but with thousands of cities and counties. It is a problematic provision and probably unconstitutional.

I would like to note also -- and I put into the record a really very thoughtful analysis of this bill by the Cato Institute. In fact, it was written by Mr. Labrador's former assistant who we worked with when we had our working group doing immigration reform.

The Cato Institute points out that although the bill purports to make us safer and to be consistent with Federal/State relations to empower State and localities, the main thrust of the bill is actually the opposite. Section 114 says unequivocally that the States and municipalities cannot create policies that decline to cooperate fully with the Federal enforcement. But it goes on to ban policies that restrict State and local authorities from reporting unauthorized immigrants. And the weird thing is, it would essentially allow individual officers to make determinations as pointed out in some very arcane areas of the law

including obscure areas of labor law, and then act upon them. And State legislatures would have no capacity to actually control the officer within their own States to make sure that State policies were being adhered to.

The immunization of a local officer who chooses to make arrests if they state they are acting under Federal authority really does a very weird thing. We have a whole line of cases essentially stating -- and Mr. Nadler referred to it most recently -- the threat to force commandeering through the threat of withholding funds. You cannot commandeer State and local government to enforce Federal law or to do the Federal Government's job. Nor can you threaten to withhold funds to force States and localities to do what you could not otherwise force them to do directly.

What this bill does, is actually force the Federal Government to do what States want to do or what localities want to do. So if a law enforcement officer has a belief that an individual has violated an obscure area of immigration law or labor law related to immigration law and make an arrest, they got to require the Federal Government to come and take that person. It is a very weird mix up of the relationships between Federal and State law. And I believe that there are many provisions in this act that are obviously unconstitutional. So, in addition to my objection to this bill based on the impact it would have on people who

have been here for many years who have contributed to our economy, children brought here as infants who have done nothing but go to school and become as good of people as they possibly can. It also has serious legal deficits and Mr. Conyers' amendment should be approved. And with that I see my time is expired. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman Goodlatte. The time of the gentlewoman has expired. For what purposes does the gentleman from Arizona seek recognition?

Mr. Biggs. Strike the last word.

Chairman Goodlatte. Gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Biggs. Thank you. I rise in opposition to the proposed amendment and I want to just make a comment on some of the things I have heard, because I am in support of the bill as it is without this particular amendment. The first thing that comes to my mind that in that period of a year and a half before I was elected to this position, in Maricopa County where I am from, Maricopa County, Arizona, more than 10,000 criminal aliens were released onto the streets of that county. Four and a half million people, but releasing known criminals onto the streets who are in this country illegally. Of those, more than 3,000 of them were known to be criminally violent it was reported. That is to say they had been charged with rape, with murder, with

felonious assault or aggravated assault in Arizona.

That does not mean everybody that crosses the border illegally is a violent criminal, but in this instance those violent criminals were released onto the streets of Phoenix and the Valley of the Sun.

One of those who was released, who had been deported twice and made his way back into the country wandered into the QT Market in Mesa; my district. And on that particular early morning decided he wanted a pack of cigarettes and did not want to pay for it. And he, who otherwise should not have been in this country, pulled his gun out and shot this young man, Grant Ronnebeck, at point blank range between the eyes and killed him. That is devastating. This bill would have required him to be held in custody.

Brandon Mendoza, a little over a year ago, a Mesa City police officer driving on the freeway was hit by someone else who was in this country illegally who was drunk and hit him head on going wrong way on the freeway.

So, these are just a couple of these incidents that have happened in my district over the last couple of years. And so I bring the support of millions of Arizonans who have watched for decades the impact of illegal aliens' presence who are here committing crimes. I bring the support of the family of Rob Krentz, and Arizona border rancher who was killed by illegal aliens. And I point out that in section

105D, section 108C, and section 109C of this bill there is reimbursement provisions for local jurisdictions. I oppose this amendment and I support the underlying bill without amendment. And I yield back.

Chairman Goodlatte. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. Biggs. Yes, I yield.

Chairman Goodlatte. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate very much his remarks. And I know as a representative from Arizona, you are familiar with Arizona v. the U.S. In that case, the Supreme Court ruled very clearly that States could enact immigration enforcement provisions provided that they were in compliance with the immigration laws of the United States and also made it clear that they could participate in the 287(g) program, which the Obama administration then -- I think the very next day -- kicked Arizona out of.

If we are trying to get better cooperation between State and local law enforcement and Federal law enforcement to properly have respect for the rule of law and enforce our immigration laws it would seem to me that that would be a good thing to require that the Federal government have to show good cause for eliminating an entire State from an important program that adds considerable resources and manpower to supporting the law.

Mr. Biggs. Yes, I will reclaim my time. Yes, Mr.

3265 Chairman. And in fact, the law enforcement agencies -- not 3266 necessarily the chiefs of police, but the law enforcement 3267 agencies wanted to continue participation in the 287(q) 3268 programs but without cause, had that opportunity taken away 3269 and stripped away from them by the Obama administration; 3270 that is correct. 3271 Chairman Goodlatte. I thank the gentleman for 3272 yielding. For what purpose does he gentleman from Rhode 3273 Island seek recognition? 3274 Mr. Cicilline. I move to strike the last word. 3275 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5 3276 minutes. 3277 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would first Mr. Cicilline. 3278 say I strongly support the gentleman's amendment. But I 3279 have to say, Mr. Chairman, I asked to be on the Immigration 3280 Subcommittee because I hoped that we would have an 3281 opportunity to actually address our broken immigration 3282 system and to have hearings on a proposal to do that. We 3283 are now taking up for markup a 184-page bill that we have 3284 never had a hearing on before the Immigration Subcommittee 3285 or this full committee. That is really not a good way to do 3286 business and not a way to tackle such a complicated issue. 3287 The sponsor of this bill said that at the opening of this 3288 hearing that we are the greatest Nation in the world. There 3289 is no question about that.

3290

3291

3292

3293

3294

3295

3296

3297

3298

3299

3300

3301

3302

3303

3304

3305

3306

3307

3308

3309

3310

3311

3312

3313

3314

that support those.

But this legislation, I would suggest to you, undermines that claim. It reverses long settled law. threatens civil liberties. It undermines our Nation's history as a land of immigrants. It violates our constitution, and it criminalizes human beings. Let's call it what it is. This is President Trump's mass deportation act. And it is based on a notion that immigrants endanger our lives. And I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I know from my own experience in my great State that immigrants have added so much to Rhode Island. Entrepreneurs, educators, elected officials, police officers, and on and on and on. Made enormous contributions to our State. And I understand, as all members of this committee do, that we have no more sacred responsibility than to keep the American people safe. And this legislation undermines that responsibility because it is based on a faulty premise, that immigrants are more dangerous and, in fact, the presence of immigrants endangers our lives. And I would like to submit for the record a compilation of 11 studies that directly contradict that assertion that, in fact, show there is either no link between immigration status and criminality, or in fact, less likelihood that those who are, in fact, non-citizens are

less likely to commit crimes and the accompanying reports

3315	Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection. Would the
3316	gentleman yield?
3317	[The information follows:]
3318	****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Mr. Cicilline. I will not, Mr. Chairman, because I do not have very much time.

Chairman Goodlatte. All right.

Mr. Cicilline. This is based on a faulty premise. You cannot make stuff up to support a bill. And the notion that people who are undocumented are more dangerous is simply not true. This bill criminalizes all undocumented immigrants including the DREAMers. It undermines public safety and it will waste millions of dollars of taxpayer money. It allows States and local communities to enact their own immigration laws and the chaos that will ensue from that. And it also will turn everyday police officers into the immigration police. It overturns Supreme Court precedent by allowing the Department of Homeland Security to detain immigrants permanently if they are unable to be removed to their home country.

Think about what that does to the founding values and the important principles of our country. And of course it triples the number of ICE deportation officers and arms all of those officers with military grade equipment.

It is not hard to see how this was on Steve Bannon's white board. But it is hard to see how it came before this committee without a hearing and with such a faulty premise. It is the reason, in fact, that so many law enforcement officers have come out against this bill, because those

3344 individuals charged with keeping communities safe recognize 3345 it undermines their ability to do that. This bill not only 3346 makes our communities less safe, but it really does change 3347 and will change the very character of our country. 3348 better than this. 3349 We ought to be enacting comprehensive immigration 3350 reform that will honor our responsibility to the 3351 constitution, that will, in fact, keep our communities safe, 3352 and that will respect the great tradition of our country to 3353 welcome immigrants from all over the world and to recognize 3354 that immigrants have made us more prosperous and stronger 3355 and a better country. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, the presence 3356 of this bill before this committee makes me very sad. 3357 are better than this. I urge all my colleagues to support 3358 Mr. Conyers' amendment to defeat the underlying bill. 3359 yield the balance of my time to the Chairman. Mr. Chairman, 3360 I am yielding to you. 3361 Chairman Goodlatte. I am actually going to recognize 3362 the gentlewoman from Alabama. For what purpose do you seek 3363 recognition? 3364 Mrs. Roby. I move to strike the last word. 3365 Chairman Goodlatte. Gentlewoman is recognized for 5 3366 minutes. 3367 Mrs. Roby. I would like to yield my time to the

3368

Chairman.

Chairman Goodlatte. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I just want to say in the response to the gentleman from Rhode Island, we are a Nation of immigrants. There is not a person here sitting on this committee who cannot go back a few generations or several generations and find someone in their family who immigrated to the United States. But we are also a Nation of laws. And when we go for years and years and years without enforcing those laws, the lack of respect for the rule of law only grows. This is simply a bill that gives any administration — the current one and future ones — the authority to enforce our laws properly and gives to State and local governments that are heavily impacted by illegal immigration the ability to participate in that enforcement.

There is nothing other than a dignified approach to making sure that law enforcement has the tools to enforce these laws. And the underlying purpose of this bill is not to disrespect immigrants, most of whom have entered the United States legally, because the United States has the most generous legal immigration programs in the world, but it is to make sure that we respect the rule of law.

Yes, many people who are here illegally do not commit additional crimes, but the very act of entering the country illegally is a crime. And when you enter the country legally and overstay, well, guess what? You cannot be

3394 detained under current law because you have not committed a 3395 So we add a misdemeanor provision to make sure that 3396 those individuals can be properly detained until they are 3397 safely removed to their home country where they belong. 3398 I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and who seeks 3399 recognition? 3400 Mrs. Roby. Well, I would like to yield the remainder 3401 of my time to Mr. Labrador. 3402 Mr. Labrador. I was really actually pleased to hear 3403 Ms. Lofgren mention my talented former staffer David Bier. 3404 He was one of my favorite staffers and one of the smartest 3405 people that I have worked with in the past. But he and I 3406 often disagreed on immigration policy and we had some really 3407 fun debates about that. 3408 I should also mention that Ms. Jackson Lee's former 3409 staffer Nolan Rappaport has published a number of pieces 3410 recently defending the constitutionality of President 3411 Trump's actions to protect our Nation and enforce our 3412 immigration laws. Nolan is also a very talented attorney 3413 and I would like to ask unanimous consent that his articles 3414 be placed in the markup for the record. 3415 Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, they will be 3416 made a part of the record. 3417 [The information follows:]

3418	*****	COMMITTEE	INSERT	*****	

Mr. Labrador. Okay. And I just want to take this opportunity to address our broken immigration system. It is ironic to hear the people from the other side continue to say that they wish we could do something on our broken immigration system. I have been here for seven years. We pass legislation out of the House, some of it with support from our friends on the other side, that the Senate would never take up because it was not the comprehensive approach that they wanted. These were good pieces of legislation that address specific parts of the immigration system, specific parts that we all know are broken. And I commend my friends on the other side who joined us in passing that legislation.

But because the previous President and the Senate

Democrats did not want to have a step-by-step approach they refused to even fix those small parts of the immigration system. And that is why we continue to have a broken immigration system. Because some people choose to use immigration as a political tool instead of fixing the problems that we have. One of the main problems that we have is the enforcement of immigration laws. I think it is the first step in making sure that we fix that entire immigration system.

I remember sitting down with countless people who were here without documentation when I was an immigration lawyer.

3444 And I would ask them a simple question. "Why did you want 3445 to come to the United States? What forced you? 3446 compelled you to make the move to come to the United 3447 States?" And they all said, universally the same thing. 3448 "I lived in a country where the laws were not enforced 3449 adequately, fairly, or honorably. And I want to live in the 3450 United States because I want to live in a country where the 3451 laws are enforced." And yet, we want -- the people on the 3452 other side do not want that tradition that we have in the 3453 United States to continue. They want some laws to be 3454 enforced and other laws not to be enforced. That is why I 3455 am a strong proponent of this bill and that is why I believe 3456 that if we pass legislation like this where the 300 million-3457 plus Americans feel safe and secure in their land, in their 3458 homes, in their communities, then we will have the guts to 3459 actually do what is necessary to fix the immigration system 3460 that we have and to modernize it. And for that reason I 3461 think we should all actually be voting for this and not have 3462 the debate that we are having right now, whether we should 3463 or should not enforce the immigration laws or our land. 3464 Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman. 3465 The question occurs on the amendment offered by the 3466 gentleman from Michigan. 3467 All those in favor respond by saying aye. 3468 Those opposed, no.

2460	
3469	In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it. The
3470	amendment is not agreed to.
3471	Mr. Conyers. Record vote, please.
3472	Chairman Goodlatte. Recorded vote is requested and the
3473	clerk will call the roll.
3474	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Goodlatte?
3475	Chairman Goodlatte. No.
3476	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Goodlatte votes no.
3477	Mr. Sensenbrenner?
3478	[No response.]
3479	Mr. Smith?
3480	[No response.]
3481	Mr. Chabot?
3482	Mr. Chabot. No.
3483	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Chabot votes no.
3484	Mr. Issa?
3485	[No response.]
3486	Mr. King?
3487	[No response.]
3488	Mr. Franks?
3489	[No response.]
3490	Mr. Gohmert?
3491	[No response.]
3492	Mr. Jordan?
3493	[No response.]

3494	Mr. Poe?
3495	[No response.]
3496	Mr. Chaffetz?
3497	[No response.]
3498	Mr. Marino?
3499	[No response.]
3500	Mr. Gowdy?
3501	Mr. Gowdy. No.
3502	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Gowdy votes no.
3503	Mr. Labrador?
3504	Mr. Labrador. No.
3505	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Labrador votes no.
3506	Mr. Farenthold?
3507	[No response.]
3508	Mr. Collins?
3509	[No response.]
3510	Mr. DeSantis?
3511	Mr. DeSantis. No.
3512	Ms. Adcock. Mr. DeSantis votes no.
3513	Mr. Buck?
3514	[No response.]
3515	Mr. Ratcliffe?
3516	Mr. Ratcliffe. No.
3517	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Ratcliffe votes no.
3518	Mrs. Roby?

3519	Mrs. Roby. No.
3520	Ms. Adcock. Mrs. Roby votes no.
3521	Mr. Gaetz?
3522	Mr. Gaetz. No.
3523	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Gaetz votes no.
3524	Mr. Johnson of Louisiana?
3525	Mr. Johnson of Louisiana. No.
3526	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Johnson votes no.
3527	Mr. Biggs?
3528	Mr. Biggs. No.
3529	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Biggs votes no.
3530	Mr. Conyers?
3531	Mr. Conyers. Aye.
3532	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Conyers votes aye.
3533	Mr. Nadler?
3534	Mr. Nadler. Aye.
3535	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Nadler votes aye.
3536	Ms. Lofgren?
3537	Ms. Lofgren. Aye.
3538	Ms. Adcock. Ms. Lofgren votes aye.
3539	Ms. Jackson Lee?
3540	Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.
3541	Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jackson Lee votes aye.
3542	Mr. Cohen?
3543	[No response.]

3544	Mr. Johnson of Georgia?
3545	[No response.]
3546	Mr. Deutch?
3547	[No response.]
3548	Mr. Gutierrez?
3549	[No response.]
3550	Ms. Bass?
3551	[No response.]
3552	Mr. Richmond?
3553	[No response.]
3554	Mr. Jeffries?
3555	[No response.]
3556	Mr. Cicilline?
3557	Mr. Cicilline. Aye.
3558	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Cicilline votes aye.
3559	Mr. Swalwell?
3560	[No response.]
3561	Mr. Lieu?
3562	[No response.]
3563	Mr. Raskin?
3564	Mr. Raskin. Aye.
3565	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Raskin votes aye.
3566	Ms. Jayapal?
3567	Ms. Jayapal. Aye.
3568	Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jayapal votes aye.

3569	Mr. Schneider?
3570	Mr. Schneider. Aye.
3571	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Schneider votes aye.
3572	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from Arizona, Mr.
3573	Franks?
3574	Mr. Franks. No.
3575	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Franks votes no.
3576	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Poe?
3577	Mr. Poe. No.
3578	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Poe votes no.
3579	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from Texas, Mr.
3580	Gohmert?
3581	Mr. Gohmert. No.
3582	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Gohmert votes no.
3583	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from Pennsylvania,
3584	Mr. Marino?
3585	Mr. Marino. No.
3586	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Marino votes no.
3587	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from Iowa, Mr. King?
3588	Mr. King. No.
3589	Ms. Adcock. Mr. King votes no.
3590	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from Colorado, Mr.
3591	Buck?
3592	Mr. Buck. No.
3593	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Buck votes no.

3594	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from California, Mr.
3595	Issa?
3596	Mr. Issa. No.
3597	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Issa votes no.
3598	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from Texas, Mr.
3599	Smith?
3600	Mr. Smith. No.
3601	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Smith votes no.
3602	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from Georgia, Mr.
3603	Johnson?
3604	Mr. Johnson of Georgia. Yes.
3605	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Johnson votes yes.
3606	Chairman Goodlatte. Has every member voted who wishes
3607	to vote? The clerk will report.
3608	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Chairman, 9 members voted aye, 18
3609	members voted no.
3610	Chairman Goodlatte. And the amendment is not agreed
3611	to. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York seek
3612	recognition?
3613	Mr. Nadler. I have an amendment at the desk.
3614	Chairman Goodlatte. The clerk will report the
3615	amendment.
3616	Ms. Adcock. Amendment to H.R. 2431 offered by Mr.
3617	Nadler. Strike section 314 and re-designate provisions
3618	Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection the amendment is

3619	considered as read and the gentleman is recognized for 5
3620	minutes on his amendment.
3621	[The amendment of Mr. Nadler follows:]
3622	****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Mr. Nadler. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike section 314 of the bill, which makes it a crime to be unlawfully present in this country. Under current law, the act of being unlawfully present is a civil violation, not a criminal one, and it is not punishable by imprisonment. This bill, however, would turn millions of Americans into criminals overnight.

Under this bill, if you overstay your visa for one day you could go to prison for six months. For a second violation you could face a 2-year sentence. A lot of tourists, a lot of people whose airplane flights got canceled would suddenly be criminals. And if you have a prior felony conviction on your record, even a non-violent drug offense, you could serve as many as 20 years in prison.

This provision even applies to DREAMers who were brought to this country as children through no fault of their own, and who once they turn 18 would now be considered criminals facing imprisonment if they know they are here unlawfully. This is both inhumane and counterproductive.

Unfortunately, it follows directly from the underlying assumptions that purvey this entire legislation: that immigrants are dangerous, that they are to be feared, that their lives must be made as miserable as possible, and that they must be removed from this country no matter who they are or how long they have been here.

This bill is straight out of the Donald Trump mass deportation playbook. First, you demonize immigrants. You blame them for crimes even though they commit crimes at a lower rate than native-born Americans. Then you demonize them. Then you label them all as criminals, all of which helps you build public support for removing them all from the country.

Americans are rightly resistant to deporting their neighbor, their co-worker, a member of their church, or someone who has been a member of their community for years. Most people recognize the cruelty involved in ripping families apart and they see no reason to remove people who have been here for years and who are pillars of society. But if you label undocumented immigrants as dangerous criminals, if you throw them into prison, and if you turn them into felons merely because of their presence in this country you can then argue with somewhat more apparent plausibility that they are a danger to society and they must be removed regardless of the facts.

When you combine this provision with the mass deportation force of this bill and the Trump administration and vision creating, we would force millions of immigrants further into the shadows. And in doing so, we would become less safe since no undocumented immigrant would ever consider cooperating with law enforcement if they risked

Even victims of domestic violence who need protection from their abusers, or witnesses to serious crimes or even murder would stay silent out of fear that they could be deported if they came forward with their testimony. Study after study shows that immigrants are less likely to commit serious crimes than native-born Americans.

In fact, the 2017 study by the Sentencing Project found that higher levels of immigration in recent decades may have contributed to the historic drop in crime rates. But this bill ignores those facts in favor of its own alternative facts. And I want to say, I think one of the most shameful things that this President has done was to take victims of crimes and have them in the gallery during the State of the Union Address to pretend -- victims of crimes committed by undocumented immigrants -- to pretend that undocumented immigrants were a particular menace to Americans to commit violent crimes when all the information we have says just the opposite. But this bill ignores those facts in favor of its alternative facts. If you cannot argue that immigrants commit more crimes you can just turn all undocumented immigrants into criminals.

That is what this bill does. I urge my colleagues to oppose the politics of fear and to support my amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

3698	Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the
3699	gentleman from Idaho seek recognition?
3700	Mr. Labrador. Mr. Chairman, to strongly oppose this
3701	amendment.
3702	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5
3703	minutes.
3704	Mr. Labrador. This provision address the civil
3705	penalties addresses the issue that we need to have a
3706	deterrent on what is happening with immigration. Forty
3707	percent of the unlawful aliens in the United States are
3708	overstay. And we have heard that figure again and again and
3709	again. This is a crucial provision to ensure that ICE can
3710	arrest, prosecute, and actually deter illegal immigration.
3711	Illegal entry to the United States has long been a
3712	Federal misdemeanor offense. This act simply provides that
3713	illegal presence in the U.S. is also a misdemeanor. The
3714	majority of unlawfully present aliens in the U.S. enter the
3715	U.S. illegally and therefore have already violated Federal
3716	criminal law. The minority of unlawful aliens who have
3717	abused our hospitality and overstayed their visas are just
3718	as culpable as aliens who have entered the U.S. illegally.
3719	Why are we treating people differently? If you entered
3720	illegally or just overstayed your visa, you should be
3721	treated the same. If we want to over empower State and
3722	local law enforcement, this provision is a necessity. A

3723 Federal court has ruled that State and local law enforcement 3724 officers cannot detain persons on the basis of being 3725 unlawfully present in the U.S. and we are just giving them 3726 the tools that are necessary for them to enforce our 3727 immigration laws. And with that, I yield back. 3728 Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the gentlewoman 3729 from California seek recognition? 3730 Ms. Lofgren. Mr. Chairman, I very strongly --3731 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentlewoman is recognized for 3732 5 minutes. 3733 Ms. Lofgren. Strike the last word. I very strongly 3734 support Mr. Nadler's amendment. As Ms. Jayapal explained, I 3735 thought very cogently, it is not a violation of criminal law 3736 to just simply be alive in the United States without your 3737 visa papers being in order. This would change that and make 3738 that status a crime. 3739 The author suggests that the rationale is to also deal 3740 with overstays who the entry of which is not a criminal 3741 offense. But the truth is that this would have far reaching 3742 implications. I remember years ago when the House took up a 3743 bill to make it a felony to be alive without your papers, 3744 and there was tremendous disagreement all over the United 3745 States. It was later a discussion of making it a 3746 misdemeanor. There is no time limit. As mentioned, I 3747 think, by Mr. Nadler, if you are here on a temporary visa

and you have a minor overstay, really even your plane is late, theoretically you would be in commission of a misdemeanor.

Now, the argument could be that that would not be prosecuted. In fact, we have seen a recent instance where an individual who missed their plane was arrested for visa overstay. So I do not want to be comforted by the idea that law enforcement people would not go crazy.

But committing an offense also precludes certain other immigration benefits. So that if you marry an American citizen, but you have committed an offense, you are excludable and may not be able to gain the status that your marriage to an American citizen would otherwise grant. I do not know that that is the intent of the author, but I think that would be the result.

It is worth pointing out we just took up a bill earlier in the day about trafficking victims. And we have always had a very strong effort to work on a bipartisan basis with trafficking victims. But if you look at the way this is crafted, people who are victims of trafficking but who have not yet obtained a visa, that we provided for earlier in the trafficking victim's laws, would also be in a criminal law status. That cannot be what we have in mind here. I think it is important to know that asylum applicants and American law provides for asylum. International law provides for

asylum. If you were unlawfully present even for one day and then applied for asylum, you would have a misdemeanor bar.

Possibly you could be prosecuted. I do not think that is what we want to do.

And finally, as has been mentioned, this bill would criminalize current DACA recipients over the age of 18 who has a lapse in DACA benefits. I think that is a terrible mistake. I know that not everyone agrees that people who were brought here as babies who did not intend to enter unlawfully or to stay beyond the visa should be protected, but certainly those individuals as young adults are in a different situation than other people who in many cases do not even find out that they are not American citizens until they go to apply for a loan or some other thing as their friends in high school are doing.

I am sorry that Mr. Gaetz is not here, because I remember years ago we had a hearing about how did people end up in an undocumented status in the United States. We have had a system that does not work for a long, long time. And I always remember the president of the Southern Baptist Convention testifying that for many years we had two signs at the Southern border and one sign said, "no trespassing" and the other side said, "help wanted." And a lot of people responded to that "help wanted" sign. In fact, most of the farm workers in the United States responded to that "help

wanted" sign. We have 5,000 visas allocated a year to people who are supposedly in the unskilled labor category. We have 2 million farm workers. Clearly, we set this situation up, and to tell those farm workers that they are now also criminals, I think is well beneath our dignity as a Congress and this amendment would fix that. And I yield back.

Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does he gentleman from California seek recognition?

Mr. Raskin. Maryland.

Chairman Goodlatte. I was looking at California. He was seeking recognition, too. Oh, I am sorry. You are right. Well, since I was wrong on both of you I will go to the gentleman with seniority, that is the gentleman from Maryland. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Raskin. Move to strike the last word. I should start just by saying that I am influenced by my own personal experience in discussing this, because very briefly I was an illegal immigrant or an undocumented immigrant in France. I went over on a sabbatical to teach there and I was instructed to go immediately to pick up my academic visa on a Friday. And when I got there, it turned out that the people at the immigration office were on strike. So I could not get my credentials, my academic visa over the course of the weekend. And then when I showed up the next week there

was such a huge crowd I could not even get a ticket, much less get my ticket called. This went on for about 2 or 3 weeks, during the period of which I was growing increasingly anxious about my status because I was there with my whole family and I did not have the proper academic visa credentials. And that was without knowing or learning or suspecting that I was a criminal at the same time as opposed to just running afoul of the civil immigration provisions.

So, I think we have got to think very seriously before we do this what it means to tell people -- and we are talking about millions of people whose immigration status could change on a diplomatic visa, an academic visa, a tourist visa, or what have you, that suddenly they are a criminal in the United States. Remember, America was created as the country for the whole world. Tom Paine called it a haven of refuge for people seeking political or religious refuge from tyrants and from oppressors all over the world.

And this is who we are as a country. This is why our symbol is the Statue of Liberty. It is not a wall surround by barbed wire and a moat and alligators. This amendment would alter a proposal to turn every person who is unwillingly and ever so briefly outside of the regulatory demands of the immigration system into a criminal. And this creates what the Supreme Court has called a status offense.

The supreme court has rejected numerous status offenses as a violation of due process, like statutes that say someone is guilty of a crime by being a habitual drunkard or someone is a criminal because they are a drug addict or a vagrant or a loiterer; under our system of laws, people are guilty of committing crimes, having an actus reus, a real criminal act, and a mens rea, a criminal intent, evil intent.

And the proposal in the bill would turn someone into a criminal without either a criminal act or a criminal consciousness; a mens rea to do something criminal. It creates a pure status offense that is based in many cases, not all of them concededly, but in many cases, simply on inaction, or someone else's action completely out of the control of the person who becomes the criminal defendant.

So, I would think that this goes way too far in terms of the basic principles of due process and legality and criminal notice in our system of laws. And people should think about it. This could happen to anyone. And I am sure that every person in this room -- and I am following our distinguished chairman here in saying that all of us come from families that originally were immigrants, I also believe that we could find in all of our genealogy, in all of our family, somebody whose immigration status was not documented at some point.

It would be almost difficult to find that. Let's at

least not brand those people criminals and let's not brand
people in America as criminals who do not meet in any
commonsense interpretation our definition of what a criminal
is.

3877 Mr. Nadler. Will the gentleman yield?

3878 Mr. Raskin. Yes, by all means.

Mr. Nadler. You made the point, and I think the valid point that this establishes a crime of status because you are here illegally. In effect, the crime occurred 10 years ago when you came here illegally, or if you were a DREAMER, when you hit your 18th birthday. Would this implicate the ex post facto provision of the constitution, because it is saying you are a criminal now for an act that you did years ago when you overstayed your visa?

Mr. Raskin. Well, let's distinguish a couple different cases. One case would be where someone originally had legal status, someone had a visa and it lapsed and the office was closed. There was a blizzard or something and they were not able to get it renewed on that day. That would clearly be a status offense. In the case you are talking about, where something is turned into a crime retroactively, that also arguably runs afoul of the ex post facto clause.

Mr. Nadler. Thank you.

Chairman Goodlatte. The time of the gentleman has expired. For what does the gentleman from Pennsylvania seek

3898	recognition?
3899	Mr. Marino. Strike the last word, but I am going to
3900	yield to my colleague, Mr. Labrador.
3901	Mr. Labrador. Thank you, Mr. Marino. Thank you for
3902	yielding your time. I want everybody to read section 314
3903	because that was a compelling argument unless you read the
3904	actual statute. And the actual statute says that "knowingly
3905	enters, knowingly eludes, knowingly enters or crosses the
3906	border, knowingly violates the terms or conditions of the
3907	alien." So what you did in France, was not a crime under
3908	this bill. Because what you did in France is you actually
3909	had the intention of being legal. You went again and again
3910	and again to try to become legal. So you would have never
3911	violated this statute. That is number one.
3912	Now, that was also a great disposition of ex post facto
3913	law, but that would only be true if it is applied
3914	retroactively. What we are trying to do is prevent future
3915	illegal immigration and future exposure of our immigration
3916	laws.
3917	Mr. Nadler. Would the gentleman yield?
3918	Mr. Raskin. Could I get one question first?
3919	Mr. Labrador. It is not my time, so if he will yield
3920	to you?
3921	Mr. Raskin. Yeah, would the gentleman yield just for a
3922	quick question? Is that okay?

3923 Mr. Nadler. He said it is not his time.

Mr. Raskin. Thank you. As I am reading it, "knowingly violate" would describe the situation of somebody in the same situation I was in in France. Because I was aware that I did not have my documents. I desperately wanted to get my documents I was not there to be committing crimes obviously, except for my students because they had to hear my broken French. But other than that, I was there for lawful purposes. But I knew I was on the outside of the law. If what you are saying is that one should have to knowingly try to subvert the laws, that is great. But this is knowingly violate the laws and I assume that I knew I was in violation of the laws and I was desperately trying to get out of that situation.

Mr. Labrador. And I think if we have any other person who is desperately trying to become legal, and trying to keep the law they are not going to be prosecuted under the statute.

Mr. Raskin. I think most of them are.

Mr. Labrador. Yes, most of them are trying to become legal, but they do not have a right to be in the United States.

But I do want to address something that the gentlelady from California said. I think she made some good points.

We do not want anybody to be found to violate the law

3948 because just all of a sudden, they had an oversight, or they 3949 just had a couple of days of overstay. So I am going to be 3950 looking, as we continue with this bill, to fix this section 3951 of the bill to make sure that we do not have just somebody 3952 that had a couple of days overstay violate the law. 3953 will be working on that. 3954 Mr. Nadler. Will the gentleman yield? 3955 Mr. Labrador. Well, it is not my time. 3956 Mr. Nadler. Thank you. I thank the gentleman for his 3957 second derivative yielding. What you said a moment ago, 3958 which is that you have to knowingly elude, et cetera, et 3959 cetera, that is subparagraph B. But if you read subparagraph E, it says, one, an alien should be subject to 3960 3961 the penalties set forth in paragraph 2 if the alien, E, 3962 knowingly is unlawfully present in the United States subject 3963 to the exceptions set forth, et cetera. Knowingly is 3964 unlawfully present. Now, he is present in the United States 3965 because 10 years ago he overstayed his visa. And he 3966 suddenly becomes a criminal by ex post facto application of 3967 this bill. 3968 Mr. Labrador. I think the ex post facto aspect of this 3969 will be determined by the court. We all know what ex post 3970 facto law is. 3971 Mr. Nadler. And this seems to be a clear case of it.

Mr. Labrador. I just completely disagree with you on

3972

3973 this matter. But we will continue to try to enforce our 3974 immigration laws and I yield back my time. 3975 Ms. Jayapal. Mr. Chairman? 3976 Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the 3977 gentlewoman from Washington seek recognition? 3978 Ms. Jayapal. Move to strike the last word. 3979 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentlewoman is recognized for 3980 5 minutes. 3981 Ms. Jayapal. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise in 3982 strong support of this amendment and I thank Mr. Nadler for 3983 putting forward, I think, and extremely important amendment 3984 that would strike one of the most disturbing parts of this 3985 bill. What is proposed in this bill is really no minor 3986 adjustment. It represents a radical transformation of 3987 United States immigration law. For over a century, unlawful 3988 presence in the United States has been, as Mr. Nadler said, 3989 a civil infraction of immigration law meriting at most 3990 removal. And if enacted, this act would turn that civil 3991 infraction into a crime punishable by as much as 20 years of 3992 imprisonment. It is impossible to know how many of the 11 3993 million or so people who are currently in the United States 3994 without the Federal Government's permission could be 3995 prosecuted, but it is safe to assume it would be an enormous 3996 number of people. And I think that we have to also think about why law 3997

enforcement has come out consistently against these kinds of proposals. Because it would actually draw resources away from really focusing on the most needed criminals who -- and the work that local law enforcement should do.

But I wanted to back up a little bit because there have been a lot of things said on this committee about this Nation as a Nation of laws and certainly that is true. We all want to make sure that we continue to be a Nation of laws. But I must also say, in the words of Dr. King, from the Birmingham jail, that an unjust law is no law at all. Slavery was also the law of the land, but there were many people who sought to change what were, at that time, extremely unjust laws. And that, in my opinion, is the case in terms of immigration law.

The reality is that the number of immigrants that are allowed into the United States is set by Congress. But the last time that Congress asked to adjust that system was in 1990. So we have a legal immigration system that is broken. And I am one of the people that knows exactly what that means because it actually took me 18 years to become a citizen of this country. I went through a whole alphabet soup of immigrant visas and I believe there are about a dozen, or maybe a little bit more, members of Congress who were actually born outside of the United States. We understand what the immigration system is about. I believe

that almost every single immigrant that is in this country has really tried to follow a system that allows them to be here because nobody wants to be here without papers. Nobody wants to be in the shadows. Nobody wants to be doing the work or providing for their family knowing that every day poses a threat to their children or to their families.

So, the legal system is broken, and that is why we have sought consistently, for decades, to have a comprehensive reform of the immigration system. It is not enough just to pass one small piece of reform, because in fact, everything is tied in together within the immigration system. And what we need is a comprehensive reform, because when the legal system is broken, we have to think about what choices we give to a mother who must wait sometimes for 20 years to get her child into the country. What choices do we give to a worker who is being sought after by companies and industries in this country because they are performing essential work that often others will not perform? What choices do we give to them to actually be able to do that work with dignity?

And so, that is why the U.S. Senate, in 2013, did pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill with 67 bipartisan votes. And that bill, unfortunately, was never allowed to the floor by Speaker John Boehner at the time. And had we had that bill, then we could have focused resources on just those immigrants who have committed the most serious, most

4048 heinous of crimes. We could have encouraged and recognized 4049 the dignity and the work of immigrants across this country who are doing the work that we need to do, and we could have 4050 4051 made sure that families were reunified with a legal 4052 immigration system that actually encouraged people to be 4053 together with their children, with their parents, with their 4054 spouses. 4055 And that, Mr. Chairman, I think is the basis of what we 4056 need to be doing instead of putting forward bills that seek 4057 to simply otherize, vilify certain immigrants without 4058 recognizing that the underlying system is broken. So, 4059 criminalizing 11 million undocumented immigrants across this 4060 country is not just inhumane, it does not solve any problem. 4061 And we need to find a real solution for our broken 4062 immigration system in this country. And I hope that our 4063 committee will actually take that on with the seriousness 4064 that it deserves. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 4065 Mr. Schneider. Mr. Chairman? 4066 Chairman Goodlatte. The time of the gentlewoman has 4067 expired. For what does the gentleman from Illinois seek 4068 recognition? 4069 Mr. Schneider. Thank you. I move to strike the last 4070 word. 4071 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5 4072 minutes.

Mr. Schneider. Thank you. And I want to join with my colleagues in emphasizing, I think, the need to address this issue as was noted earlier. That knowingly in this country in violation would consume essentially every DREAMer who reaches the age of 18. The cruel legislation would criminalize nearly all undocumented people. There are no exceptions included in the bill, not even for these DACA recipients. This makes their presence in the country a misdemeanor or felony offense, exposing DACA recipients to criminal prosecution and possible imprisonment. Let me repeat that. This legislation makes the very presence of DACA recipients a criminal offense. Putting these young people -- young men and women literally pursuing the American Dream -- at very real risk of criminal prosecution and possible imprisonment.

This is not a theoretical discussion. This legislation will have real, profoundly negative consequences for the communities we all represent. Let me share just one story, the case of one of my constituents, Erika. Erika works as a public health community liaison in schools throughout my district. After graduating high school, she worked to pay her way through college and graduated with honors. Now, while working full-time she is also pursuing an MBA. She is very proud that she recently became a homeowner and enjoys volunteering with community groups. By any measure, Erika

is an exemplary member of our community, a leader, and a role model. Erika also happens to be a DACA recipient. She was just 13 years old when she was brought to the United States and has lived here for 23 years.

4098

4099

4100

4101

4102

4103

4104

4105

4106

4107

4108

4109

4110

4111

4112

4113

4114

4115

4116

4117

4118

4119

4120

4121

4122

The United States is now unquestionably her home. dreams and aspirations are American dreams. He success strengthens our community and advances our Nation. In 2013, Erika first applied for and received DACA. She describes the effect that this program had on her life saying, "I have had two lives: before and after DACA." I met Erika when she contacted our office after a clerical error at USCIS delayed her renewal application for work reauthorization. Her HR representative at her employer informed her that she would lose her job if she could not get the reauthorization. was but a brief glimpse into what her life would be like without DACA. She, and I quote here, "Realized how much is at risk." Erika would lose her job, her home, her driver's license, her health insurance, her ability to pay for her schooling and earn a living.

In short, she and all others like her would lose everything. Erika is a tremendous asset to our community, but this bill would label her a criminal. No one like Erika who came here as a child and has lived her entire adult life in the United States should have to live in constant fear of deportation. This is not just a matter of right and wrong;

4123 | it is a matter of economics.

The recent estimate by the Cato Institute found that deporting DACA recipients could deprive the United States of over 280 billion with a B -- 280 billion in economic growth over the next 10 years. In other words, this bill will hurt DACA recipients and American workers alike. A 2016 survey found 6 percent of DACA recipients, more than 40,000 young people, had started their own small business in the United States. That is a rate of entrepreneurship twice as high as native-born Americans.

Our immigration system is broken. I agree and let's work together to address it. But this draconian bill is absolutely wrong and the wrong way to go about fixing it.

What we need is comprehensive immigration reform, not a mass deportation approach. Real bipartisan reform including increased responsible border security and a path to citizenship for those like Erika will grow our economy, reduce our debt, and strengthen our communities. DACA recipients are not criminals. They are the products of our schools, part of the fabric of our communities, and important to the future growth and success of our country. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment. And I yield back.

4146 Mr. Cicilline. Mr. Chairman?

4147 Chairman Goodlatte. There are 8 minutes and 25 seconds

4148 remaining in the vote on the floor. We will not be 4149 returning. The markup will continue next week. I would 4150 like to get to a vote, but if the gentleman --4151 Mr. Cicilline. If I could be recognized, I would just 4152 like to yield briefly to Mr. Nadler. 4153 Thank you. And I will be very brief. I Mr. Nadler. 4154 would like to say that following my argument before, Page 4155 103 of the bill, subsection 4, duration of offense: An 4156 offense under this subsection continues until the alien is 4157 discovered within the United States by an Immigration, 4158 Customs, or Agriculture officer. In other words, it is a 4159 status offense. There is no statute of limitations unlike 4160 any other crime that I know of except for murder. Someone 4161 who overstayed the visa 10 years ago now becomes a criminal, 4162 ex post facto, and remains a criminal and there is no 4163 statute of limitations. A little excessive and I will yield 4164 to the gentlelady from California. 4165 Ms. Lofgren. I would like to note -- and I know that we all want to get to the floor -- but the problems on this 4166 4167 are severe. And if you take a look at Page 101 of the bill, 4168 line 20, the exceptions do not include individuals who are 4169 victims of domestic violence but have not yet applied for 4170 their visa. They do not include individuals who are 4171 trafficking victims but who have not yet applied for a visa 4172 because of that victimhood. That cannot be what we want in

	1		
4173	addition to all the other arguments that have been made.		
4174	That makes this really fatally flawed. And I thank the		
4175	gentleman for yielding and yield back.		
4176	Mr. Nadler. I yield back.		
4177	Chairman Goodlatte. Question occurs on the amendment		
4178	offered by the gentleman for New York.		
4179	All in favor respond by saying aye.		
4180	Those opposed, no.		
4181	In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.		
4182	Recorded vote is requested. The clerk will call the role.		
4183	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Goodlatte?		
4184	Chairman Goodlatte. No.		
4185	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Goodlatte votes no.		
4186	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Sensenbrenner?		
4187	[No response.]		
4188	Mr. Smith?		
4189	[No response.]		
4190	Mr. Chabot?		
4191	Mr. Chabot. No.		
4192	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Chabot votes no.		
4193	Mr. Issa?		
4194	Mr. Issa. No.		
4195	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Issa votes no.		
4196	Mr. King?		
4197	[No response.]		

4198	Mr. Franks?
4199	[No response.]
4200	Mr. Gohmert?
4201	Mr. King. No.
4202	Ms. Adcock. Mr. King votes no.
4203	Mr. Franks?
4204	[No response.]
4205	Mr. Gohmert?
4206	[No response.]
4207	Mr. Jordan?
4208	Mr. Jordan. No.
4209	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Jordan votes no.
4210	Mr. Poe?
4211	Mr. Poe. No.
4212	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Poe votes no.
4213	Mr. Chaffetz?
4214	[No response.]
4215	Mr. Marino?
4216	Mr. Marino. No.
4217	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Marino votes no.
4218	Mr. Gowdy?
4219	[No response.]
4220	Mr. Labrador?
4221	Mr. Labrador. No.
4222	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Labrador votes no.

4223	Mr. Farenthold?
4224	[No response.]
4225	Mr. Collins?
4226	[No response.]
4227	Mr. DeSantis?
4228	Mr. DeSantis. No.
4229	Ms. Adcock. Mr. DeSantis votes no.
4230	Mr. Buck?
4231	[No response.]
4232	Mr. Ratcliffe?
4233	Mr. Ratcliffe. No.
4234	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Ratcliffe votes no.
4235	Mrs. Roby?
4236	Mrs. Roby. No.
4237	Ms. Adcock. Mrs. Roby votes no.
4238	Mr. Gaetz?
4239	[No response.]
4240	Mr. Johnson of Louisiana?
4241	Mr. Johnson of Louisiana. No.
4242	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Johnson votes no.
4243	Mr. Biggs?
4244	Mr. Biggs. No.
4245	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Biggs votes no.
4246	Mr. Conyers?
4247	[No response.]

4248	Mr. Nadler?
4249	Mr. Nadler. No. I mean, yes, yes, yes.
4250	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Nadler votes yes.
4251	Ms. Lofgren?
4252	Ms. Lofgren. Aye.
4253	Ms. Adcock. Ms. Lofgren votes aye.
4254	Ms. Jackson Lee?
4255	Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.
4256	Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jackson Lee votes aye.
4257	Mr. Cohen?
4258	Mr. Cohen. Aye.
4259	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Cohen votes aye.
4260	Mr. Johnson of Georgia?
4261	Mr. Johnson of Georgia. Aye.
4262	Mr. Johnson votes aye.
4263	Mr. Deutch?
4264	[No response.]
4265	Mr. Gutierrez?
4266	[No response.]
4267	Ms. Bass?
4268	[No response.]
4269	Mr. Richmond?
4270	[No response.]
4271	Mr. Jeffries?
4272	[No response.]

4273	Mr. Cicilline?
4274	Mr. Cicilline. Aye.
4275	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Cicilline votes aye.
4276	Mr. Swalwell?
4277	[No response.]
4278	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Lieu?
4279	[No response.]
4280	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Raskin?
4281	[No response.]
4282	Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jayapal?
4283	Ms. Jayapal. Aye.
4284	Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jayapal votes aye.
4285	Mr. Schneider?
4286	[No response.]
4287	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from Arizona?
4288	Mr. Franks. No.
4289	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Franks votes no.
4290	Chairman Goodlatte. the gentleman from Texas?
4291	Mr. Gohmert. No.
4292	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Gohmert votes no.
4293	Chairman Goodlatte. The other gentleman from Texas?
4294	Mr. Smith. No.
4295	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Smith votes no.
4296	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from Colorado?
4297	Mr. Buck. No.

4298	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Buck votes no.
4299	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from Michigan?
4300	Mr. Conyers Aye.
4301	Mr. Conyers. Aye.
4302	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Conyers votes aye.
4303	Chairman Goodlatte. the gentleman from Illinois?
4304	Mr. Schneider. Aye.
4305	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Schneider votes aye.
4306	Chairman Goodlatte. Has every member voted who wishes
4307	to vote? The clerk will report.
4308	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Chairman, 8 members voted aye, 17
4309	members voted no.
4310	Chairman Goodlatte. And the amendment is not agreed
4311	to. The committee will stand in recess and we will resume
4312	Tuesday.
4313	[Whereupon, at 2:29 p.m., the committee recessed, to
4314	reconvene at 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, May 23, 2017.]