1 NATIONAL CAPITOL CONTRACTING

- 2 RPTS AVERETT
- 3 HJU306000
- 4 MARKUP OF H.R. 3249; H.R. 1730;
- 5 H.R. 3317; H.R. 4203
- 6 Thursday, November 2, 2017
- 7 | House of Representatives,
- 8 | Committee on the Judiciary,
- 9 Washington, D.C.

- The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:30 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 | Chabot, Issa, Franks, Gohmert, Jordan, Marino, Labrador,
- 15 | Collins, DeSantis, Buck, Ratcliffe, Gaetz, Johnson of
- 16 Louisiana, Biggs, Rutherford, Handel, Conyers, Nadler,
- 17 Lofgren, Jackson Lee, Cohen, Johnson of Georgia, Deutch,
- 18 Bass, Cicilline, Lieu, Raskin, Jayapal, and Schneider.
- 19 Staff Present: Shelley Husband, Staff Director; Branden
- 20 Ritchie, Deputy Staff Director; Zach Somers, Parliamentarian

and General Counsel; Meg Barr, Counsel, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations; Alley Adcock, Clerk; Rachel Calanni, Minority Professional Staff Member; Danielle Brown, Minority Legislative Counsel; Veronica Eligan, Minority Professional Staff Member; Mauri Gray, Minority Counsel; Joe Graupensperger, Minority Chief Counsel; James Park, Minority Chief Counsel; Wilsar Johnson, Minority Digital Director; Monalisa Dugue, Minority Deputy Chief Counsel; and Perry Apelbaum, Minority Chief Counsel and Staff Director.

Chairman Goodlatte. The Judiciary Committee will come to order. Without objection, the chair is authorized to declare a recess at any time. Pursuant to notice, I now call up H.R. 3249 for purposes of markup, and move that the committee report the bill favorably to the House. The clerk will report the bill.

Ms. Adcock. H.R. 3249, to authorize the Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program and for other purposes.

[The bill follows:]

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

For decades, gangs have been engaging in criminal activity ranging from drug distribution to prostitution to identity theft. As the severity and sophistication of their crimes increases, so does the threat to our Nation's youth. Flagrant acts of violence intended to bolster gangs' reputability is often perpetuated by young recruits. The violence has a ruinous, lasting effect on communities across the United States.

The brave men and women in law enforcement are on the front lines, directly engaging in enforcement, prevention, and educational programs to keep our communities safe from gangs, and it is vitally important that they are fully equipped to address the spike in gang activity. This has been increasingly difficult in recent years. Access to grants is necessary to adequately fund task forces that counter gang activity.

For instance, one of Virginia's regional gang task forces has been reduced from a budget of \$3 million in 2012 to \$325,000 today. During that same time, gangs have accelerated recruitment efforts and the public has experienced more gang-related violent crime.

Working with members of the community, such as

teachers, guidance counselors, and parents, law enforcement personnel are able to recognize at-risk youth and offer guidance on how to avoid getting involved in the first place. Project Safe Neighborhoods was established in 2001 as an initiative within the Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Assistance. It provided a nationwide commitment to reduce gun and gang crime in America by networking existing local programs that target gang and gun crime, and provided these programs with additional tools necessary to be successful.

In recent years, however, funding has dwindled, and Attorney General Sessions recently announced his intent to rejuvenate this program. H.R. 3249 officially authorizes Project Safe Neighborhoods, which was previously only authorized through appropriations of certain other grants.

It permits the Attorney General to authorize a block grant program called the Project Safe Neighborhoods Block Grant Program -- catchy -- for the purpose of combating violent gang crimes by facilitating partnerships between Federal, State, and local agencies, including the United States attorney in each Federal judicial distracts.

It provides the localities receiving grants under this program with control over how the funds are to be used and to the extent practicable. This local control will ensure local law enforcement is able to allocate funds towards

specific problems they have identified. The bill also allocates a percentage of the funds to regional task forces in areas with a significant or increased presence of criminal activity caused by gangs.

We must continue to combat gang violence, whether that violence is classic street violence, trafficking, or transnational crime. And I urge my colleagues to support the authorization of these funds to protect our youth and to keep our communities safe. It is a worthwhile investment with invaluable returns.

[The prepared statement of Chairman Goodlatte follows:]

102 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

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

Mr. Conyers. Thank you, Chairman Goodlatte. Top of the morning to the whole committee. Before we begin our pending legislative business, I want to briefly reference the horrific act of terrorism that occurred in New York City in Mr. Nadler's district on Tuesday. Our prayers and condolences go out to the victims and their families and friends. I very much appreciate the lifesaving heroism of New York's brave first responders and the quick and professional actions of the FBI and the Justice Department.

I would also like to take a point of privilege to comment on the inquiry announced last week by Chairmen Goodlatte and Gowdy into the Justice Department's handling of the investigation into Secretary Clinton's emails. The effort to reinvestigate former FBI Director Comey, and with him Hillary Clinton, seems to me, with all due respect, shortsighted, given the special counsel's actions earlier this week.

There is an active threat to our democratic institutions, but it does not belong to Mr. Comey or Secretary Clinton. Nevertheless, I have written to my good friend the chairman, Mr. Goodlatte, stating my view that if we must reinvestigate the handling of the emails, we must

also expand the inquiry to include critical issues at the current Justice Department. As I stated in the letter, the circumstances our Nation finds itself in today call for extraordinary bipartisan cooperation, and if we are to help reassure the American public regarding the credibility of our political, legal, and electoral processes.

Now, on the matter pending, keeping our neighborhoods safe is essential to the well-being and success of those who live and work in them, particularly young people. H.R. 3249, the Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant and Authorization Act, would formally authorize a program currently implemented by the Department of Justice, and it would direct a portion of the program funding to address gang crime.

Certainly, we need to support programs that help address violent crime in our communities, and I appreciate that Project Safe Neighborhoods has been implemented in various ways in my State of Michigan over the years.

Therefore, I support passage of this bill as introduced as a way of continuing to continue this program as a part of a comprehensive strategy.

However, since its inception in 2001, Project Safe
Neighborhoods has been but one facet of the Justice
Department's efforts to address gun and gang violence at the
State and local level. We should view it from that

perspective, but also other programs that assist communities to address crime from a local perspective, and some of these may be better tailored for communities with different needs in terms of assistance and resources. And because of this, I intend to raise concerns about an amendment I believe that will be offered shortly to provide funding for this bill by eliminating some of these other different but also valuable programs.

Lastly, I note that a substantial portion of the funding under this bill is to be dedicated to antigang task forces. I support preventing and fighting crime, no matter who a perpetrator may be, but we must be careful to avoid targeting groups of young people who are not engaged in crime and do not use law enforcement as a means to target anyone because of their ethnicity or national origin.

Too often, now and in the past, the rhetoric of fighting gangs has been laced with racial bias. We cannot ignore the unfortunate reality of current times; therefore, in considering legislation to enhance the effort to fight violent gangs, we must also be vigilant in protecting against such possible abuse.

And so, with these reservations, I support the formal authorization of this program as a part of a comprehensive strategy to prevent and fight crime. I thank the chairman. I yield back the balance of my time.

178	[The p	prepared a	statement	of Mr.	Conyers	follows:]
179	*****	COMMITTE	E INSERT	*****	***	

Chairman Goodlatte. I thank the gentleman, and I would now like to recognize the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security Investigations, Ms. Jackson Lee of Texas, for her opening statement.

Ms. Jackson Lee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my support for H.R. 3249, the Project Safe Neighborhoods
Grant Program. It is imperative that we do all that we can to keep our neighborhoods safe and protect our vulnerable young people. This program authorizes a program that is currently implemented by the Department of Justice to address gang and gun crime. Programs such as this and others have proven to be effective and are essential to the success of fighting the violence that plagues our streets and neighborhoods.

I know that this is a valuable program, Mr. Chairman.

I associate myself with the remarks made by the ranking member. I am very concerned about the offsets of this particular bill that is coming before us. While I do believe Project Safe Neighborhoods is an effective program, there are many others as well, as indicated by the Department of Justice.

I also believe that I have been waiting in line for a very, very long time to move again the Juvenile Block Grant, which does provide a whole litany of activities that intervene into juveniles' lives. I hope that we can work

together so that we can put forward the Juvenile Block Grant bill, and that it will go to the floor of the House. There are those of us on both sides of the aisle that would like to work in a bipartisan manner. This bill has been waiting and waiting and waiting and waiting and waiting.

And I assume if we pass this bill, our Project Safe
Neighborhoods Grant Program Authorization Act, it will be
going to the floor before the Juvenile Block Grant. And I
would really solicit and elicit and encourage the chairman
and the members on the other side for us to move democratic
bills and to move this bill to the floor, which is in fact a
bill that provides opportunities for many different groups
in many different ways to provide intervention into the
lives of young people. With that, I yield back my time.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Jackson Lee follows:]

220 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

Chairman Goodlatte. Would the gentlewoman yield?Ms. Jackson Lee. I would be happy to yield.

Chairman Goodlatte. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments and for her championing juvenile justice reform legislation. And as she knows, I have worked with her in the past.

Ms. Jackson Lee. Yes, you have.

Chairman Goodlatte. And I share her desire to move expeditiously on those bills, and we look forward to working in a bipartisan way to accomplish that. So, I thank the gentlewoman for mentioning that.

Ms. Jackson Lee. And Mr. Chairman, if you would yield for just a second, in response, thank you. And I would like to begin setting up meetings for us to, even though we are at the end of the first year of this Congress, to be prepared to discuss these and even possibly have action before the end of the year on some of these vital bills. I look forward to our vital discussions with the ranking member.

Chairman Goodlatte. If the gentlewoman would yield further, I think it is never too soon to start those meetings, so I will ask my staff to coordinate with the ranking member of the full committee and subcommittee staff to accomplish that, and we can begin discussions on how to move forward.

246	Ms. Jackson Lee. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I
247	yield back.
248	Chairman Goodlatte. Are there any amendments to H.R.
249	3249?
250	Ms. Jackson Lee. I have an amendment at the desk.
251	Chairman Goodlatte. The chair recognizes himself for
252	the purpose of offering an amendment and the clerk will
253	report the amendment.
254	Ms. Adcock. Amendment to H.R. 3249, offered by Mr.
255	Goodlatte. Strike page 2, line
256	[The amendment of Chairman Goodlatte follows:]
257	******* INSERT 2 ******

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read, and I recognized myself for an explanation of the amendment. This amendment accomplishes three important goals.

First, it clarifies the purpose of the Project Safe
Neighborhoods Grant Program to expressly include prevention
programs and community outreach, necessary components for
the successful implementation of the program. Second, the
amendment provides additional support to the task forces
working diligently to reduce gang violence. This provision
increases the percentage of funds allocated to regional task
forces from 20 percent to 30 percent.

Finally, this amendment lowers the authorization level and lists programs that are to be subsumed into this grant program. I want to make special note of Congresswoman Barbara Comstock of my home State of Virginia, who introduced this legislation, and I appreciate her longstanding commitment to this issue.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan seek recognition?

Mr. Conyers. Strike the requisite number of words.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

282 Mr. Conyers. Thank you, Chairman Goodlatte. Members

of the committee, I am sorry to say I have serious reservations about this amendment, and although I support the formal authorization of the Project Safe Neighborhoods initiative, I am concerned about the cutting of funding to other programs and initiatives in this amendment, which could result in the bill actually harming our anticrime and antiviolence efforts overall.

I understand that the majority operates under a socalled "CUTGO rule," with respect to authorizing new funding. Accordingly, this amendment would prevent funding for a list of other worthy programs in order to clear funding for Project Safe Neighborhoods.

These would include competitive and evidence-based programs to reduce gun crime and gang violence. It would also include the Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation Program. It would also include community-based violence prevention initiatives, and, finally, it would also include gang and youth violence education, prevention, and intervention, and related activities.

Now, my friends, we have not had a meaningful opportunity to review these proposed cuts, including the opportunity to solicit input from constituents and crime prevention advocates. I appreciate that the amendment also adjusts the allowed purposes for the Project Safe Neighborhoods funding, in part to fill the gap between what

is being eliminated and the scope of the newly authorized program in the bill as introduced.

However, we have not had a chance to properly consider these changes. Neither have those who would be directly impacted by what is being proposed today. For instance, the amendment would eliminate the Byrne Criminal Justice Intervention Program, which helps local governments develop crime reduction strategies to address crime hotspots that generate a significant amount of crime within the larger community or jurisdiction.

I do not think we should simply eliminate the possibility of funding this program, which may employ approaches and resources that are not provided by the Project Safe Neighborhoods.

In addition, the amendment seems to focus the program on efforts to be coordinate by the U.S. attorney in each district. I believe our United States attorneys have an important role to play in fighting violent crime, but I am concerned that the approach encourage by this amendment is one that replaces funding that would be focused on the judgment of local officials in their efforts to fight local crime problems with one that is under greater Federal influence and control.

To conclude, I appreciate efforts to expand our tools to fight crime in our communities, but I oppose eliminating

333 or restricting funding for the other programs as listed in 334 this amendment. And therefore, reluctantly, I must oppose 335 the amendment and ask that those that agree with me on the 336 committee do the same. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 337 Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman. 338 Mr. Cicilline. Mr. Chairman. 339 Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the 340 gentleman from Rhode Island seek recognition? 341 Mr. Cicilline. I move to strike the last word. 342 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5 343 minutes. 344 Mr. Cicilline. Mr. Chairman, I really have to ask if 345 you would yield to a question, because I am sort of 346 struggling to understand the implications of the amendment. 347 Does this committee have the ability to effectively prevent 348 the Congress from authorizing funds for competitive- and 349 evidence-based programs to reduce gun crime and gang 350 violence, the Byrne Program, community-based violence prevention initiatives, or gang and youth violence? 351 352 It seems to be the Appropriations Committee rather 353 would be allowed to do that anyway. Can the Judiciary 354 Committee actually limit the ability of Congress to 355 appropriate funding --356 Chairman Goodlatte. Will the gentleman yield? 357 the process is supposed to work -- it does not always work

that way in the Appropriations Committee -- but they are supposed to appropriate on programs that are authorized by the authorizing committees.

This committee is the committee of primary jurisdiction for this legislation, so, the answer is yes. We can alter what programs that are authorized for the appropriators to appropriate money on. We do get into instances where they attempt to legislate on appropriations bills and we attempt to protect the committee's jurisdiction and primacy on the issue.

Mr. Cicilline. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess this is the moment where I hope that we will not be successful in asserting that. I share the ranking member's grave concern. The Project Safe Neighborhoods is a very important program. It is very effective. I engage with the U.S. Attorney's Office when I was mayor of the city of Providence, and these were really important resources that helped us reduce crime significantly to the lowest levels in the city of Providence in 40 years. So, this is a really important program. It is important that we authorize it.

But I think it is a big mistake as a part of this to limit funds being devoted to competitive and evidence-based programs to reduce gun crime and gang violence, the Edward Byrne Memorial Criminal Justice Innovation Program, another extraordinarily effective program, and to community-based

violence prevention initiatives, or gang and youth violence education, prevention, and intervention, and related activities.

It seems to me, we ought to be ensuring that we have flexibility to appropriate, as necessary, additional resources for all of those very important initiatives and programs that have not only been evidence-based but successful. And so, I would strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment that really ties the hands of the Congress of the United States to make these very important investments as Congress deems necessary and to support the underlying bill.

Chairman Goodlatte. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Cicilline. Of course.

Chairman Goodlatte. I thank the gentleman for yielding. First of all, funds are tight, and so we are trying to use those funds as efficiently as possible. My amendment appropriately consolidates the underlying programs in accordance with the Department of Justice, which administers all these programs' recommendation.

Streamlining overlapping and duplicative programs is a goal this committee has been pursuing for many years. And, rather than spending \$30 million each year on these four overlapping programs, this bill consolidates the programs into a single program and frontloads the authorization for

408 appropriations.

The bill complies with the House's CUTGO requirements, and I think that, rather than hurting the efforts that these four programs pursue, it will actually help it because it is going to make it more efficient and direct the funds in a manner that will reach more people than the current four overlapping.

Mr. Cicilline. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time. If it were simply that we were trying to avoid duplication, I would certainly not object to that. I think no one would. I think the problem is the broad terms of this amendment cover much more than any duplication, cover additional programs as well that focus on very, very important issues. We have a responsibility to properly resource them to help keep our communities safe and free from gun violence and important prevention work.

I do have to say, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, it is sort of ironic to hear you utter the words "funds are tight" on the very day that Republicans would release a tax plan to give a \$1.5 trillion tax cut to the richest people in this country that will significantly allow huge tax cuts for people who do not need them, have not asked for them.

And to pay for those will require deep cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, Pell Grants, transportation, funding, all the things that are necessary to keep our communities

433 prosperous, safe. 434 And so, the notion that we should nickel-and-dime 435 public safety initiatives and gang prevention work and work 436 that is critical to keeping our communities safe because 437 "funds are tight." The cruel irony of that today feels 438 particularly obvious to me, and I urge my colleagues to 439 reject this amendment and support the underlying bill 440 without the amendment. With that, I yield back. 441 Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the 442 gentlewoman from Texas seek recognition? 443 Ms. Jackson Lee. I have an amendment to the amendment. 444 Chairman Goodlatte. The clerk will report the 445 amendment to the amendment, although I am not sure they have 446 it. All right. The clerk will report the amendment to the 447 amendment. 448 Ms. Adcock. Amendment to the amendment to H.R. 3249, 449 offered by Ms. Jackson Lee of Texas. Page 2 --450 [The amendment of Ms. Jackson Lee follows:] 451 ****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

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

Ms. Jackson Lee. Mr. Chairman, I know there are good intentions at this table, and we have worked collaboratively on issues dealing with criminal justice and the diminishing of the mandatory minimums, which we hope that we will reach on conclusion, the reform of the Federal Prison System, and the whole litany of responsibilities for the juvenile justice system.

As you well know, I have engaged with this system. I have visited juvenile detention centers, and I do believe that our best investment is where we can intervene to prevent actions by juveniles and others. And so, there is value in training that Project Safe Neighborhoods engages in of training 400 law enforcement and prevention personnel in four separate tracks of instructions, which my Southern District of Texas participated in, cohosted by antigang training in Houston.

But at the same time, as I heard you explain, the consolidation still is a diminishing of funding for very viable programs, involving the competitive- and evidence-based programs to reduce gun crimes and gang violence. The heinous acts of the perpetrator in Las Vegas, 58 innocent citizens dead, that is gun crime. And I have heard my

republican friends say, "Let's enforce the gun laws!" Well, consolidating these programs even though we got our back against the wall is not constructive. My amendment eliminates this provision.

I am often listening to law enforcement advocating, "Do not cut the Edward Byrne Memorial Criminal Justice Program," which in fact generates innovation and helps with hotspots that generate a significant amount of crime within the larger community. And the innovations of the Edward Byrne Program use community-based strategies that aim to prevent and control violent crime, drug abuse, and gang activity in designated high-crime neighborhoods. And I can assure you that many of us represent a vast number of wonderful areas and neighborhoods, but some do have a higher level of crime.

Equally, community-based violence prevention initiatives are likewise programs that adopt a comprehensive public health approach that investigates the causes of youth violence and implements a community-based strategy to prevent youth violence. Children's brains are not developed until they are 25. They are most susceptible to intervention and programs and role models, and people telling them there is a different way to lead their life. They look forward to those institutions that can substitute for gangs and gang-violent neighborhoods.

And so, I would ask my colleagues to recognize that,

even though we support this particular legislation, Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program, I would argue that our back should not be against the wall when it comes to dealing with our young people. They are our todays and our tomorrows.

And I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee

Amendment, for us to support the underlying legislation,

without the diminishing of four very vital that have

involved reducing gun violence, the Edward Byrne Memorial

Program, community-based violence prevent, and gang and you

violence education, prevention, and intervention and related

activities.

This clearly is a roadmap for the lack of success of our young people as opposed to the success. Let's put them first, not the approach of nickel-and-diming their lives. I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee Amendment. I yield back.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentlewoman and recognizes himself in opposition to the amendment to the amendment.

I thank the gentlewoman for her concern about this, but what her amendment accomplishes is to eliminate the offsets to this program, and we have to have offsets if we are going to proceed to reauthorize a program. Secondly, this amendment does not touch the Byrne Memorial Justice

527 | Assistance Grant Program.

And finally, I know that the gentlewoman is concerned about making sure that the purpose areas in the areas that we are offsetting are allowed under the new program, and we share her interest in that, and we are happy to work with her to make sure that language is clarifying in that regard. But I cannot support this amendment because it defeats the purpose of the legislation. 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. If the chair would yield, in the papers we have got, it says "outreach," and it says, "Project Safe Neighborhoods includes both national and local outreach," and it goes on to say, "conduct a public service advertising campaign against gun violence, whereas locally districts were encouraged to send a deterrent message to would-be criminals stressing 'hard time for gun crime.'" Is there any place we can see that that has shown to be an effective deterrent, to tell criminals they are going to get "hard time for gun crime?"

Chairman Goodlatte. Yeah, absolutely. Project Exile, which is a program that was utilized in Richmond, Virginia, had a dramatic impact on using guns in the commission of

552 crimes.

Mr. Cohen. Well, was it just an advertisement that said, "hard time for gun crime," or was it more than that?

Chairman Goodlatte. No. No, it was more than that, but letting people know that that is the consequence of their actions is an important part of effectively stopping people from using weapons in crimes. I would be happy to yield to the -- well, you have the time.

Mr. Cohen. Yeah. Maybe, but I find it --

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from Florida, who is a former sheriff --

Mr. Cohen. We had this program in Memphis, and what it had basically was an advertisement for the D.A. They had their name on it, and it said, you know -- he is telling you, "hard time for gun crime." I do not believe criminals, particularly criminals that are going to use guns and maybe kill somebody, are concerned about hard time for gun crime, because they are committing a capital offense, often. And I would yield to the gentleman from Florida for his expertise and how he thinks this is really going to be effective.

Mr. Rutherford. I thank the gentleman for yielding. In Jacksonville, Florida, we had Project Safe Streets, which was a "see it, say it, and stop it" initiative for gun crime. And specifically it was a lot of outreach to educate the public on gun crime in general, and to get the public to

partner with local law enforcement to go after those who were carrying guns illegally.

And I can tell you, we had tremendous success, which was then followed up by both State and Federal prosecutors. We could decide who would get the most time for the individual carrying a gun, and we would prosecute it either through the State or through the U.S. Attorney's Office. And it had tremendous impact in getting those folks off the street. And our violent crime went down significantly.

Mr. Cohen. I am somewhat aware of that, that the U.S. Attorney and the District Attorney General worked together on gun crime, and I think that is good, but does the simple advertisement that they had billboards and then the stickers that they put up everywhere to say, "hard time for gun crime," is there any way that that shows that that is effective to criminals? I mean, I do not think that people who use guns go to my cleaners, and they have got that on the wall there.

Mr. Rutherford. If the gentleman will yield, I do agree with you. I do not think that the target was the criminal carrying the gun; it was the individuals around that individual that we were trying to get to see it, say it, and stop it by reporting their criminal activity to us. And that was the advertisement. I yield back.

Mr. Cohen. Thank you. Mr. Chair, would you consider a

602 friendly amendment to just say that any of these funds that 603 you could not have the picture or the name of an elected 604 official associated with it? 605 Chairman Goodlatte. If the gentleman drafts something 606 like that, we will certainly take a look at it. I would not 607 want to commit to it until I had an opportunity to think 608 about it. Either you can do that now or you can work with 609 us as we move to the floor. I am not objecting to the 610 amendment. 611 Mr. Cohen. I am against crime, and I am for the 612 concept, but after I have seen it in Houston -- I am afraid 613 it was Houston -- it was the kind of advertising. 614 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman makes a point, and 615 if he drafts in such a way that we feel like it will not 616 discourage the use of the tool for the legitimate purposes 617 that the tool has, as described by the gentleman from 618 Florida, we would be happy to look at it. 619 Mr. Cohen. Thank you, sir. I yield back the balance. 620 Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman. 621 The question occurs --622 Mr. Conyers. Mr. Chairman. 623 Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the 624 gentleman from Michigan seek recognition. 625 Mr. Conyers. I rise in support of the Jackson Lee 626 amendment, and I support this amendment because it would

627 continue to allow Congress to provide funding for certain 628 programs to assist local efforts to fight crime. 629 Now, the Project Safe Neighborhoods battle envisioned 630 by the underlying amendment to the bill should not supplant 631 other efforts that would be more locally-based and likely 632 less under the direction of a United States attorney. 633 I fear that the majority's insistence on following its 634 self-imposed CUTGO restrictions will, without proper 635 consideration by this committee and input from constituents, 636 unwisely pull the rug out from under proven locally-based 637 crime-fighting programs, so I urge my colleagues to support 638 this helpful Jackson Lee amendment, and I yield back the 639 balance of my time. 640 Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman. 641 The question occurs on the amendment to the amendment 642 offered by the gentlewoman from Texas. 643 All those in favor of the amendment to the amendment 644 will respond by saying aye. 645 Those opposed, no. 646 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it. 647 A recorded vote is requested, and the clerk will call 648 the roll. 649 Ms. Adcock. Mr. Goodlatte? 650 Chairman Goodlatte. No. 651 Ms. Adcock. Mr. Goodlatte votes no.

652	Mr. Sensenbrenner?
653	Mr. Sensenbrenner. No.
654	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Sensenbrenner votes no.
655	Mr. Smith?
656	[No response.]
657	Mr. Chabot?
658	Mr. Chabot. No.
659	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Chabot votes no.
660	Mr. Issa?
661	Mr. Issa. No.
662	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Issa votes no.
663	Mr. King?
664	[No response.]
665	Mr. Franks?
666	Mr. Franks. No.
667	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Franks votes no.
668	Mr. Gohmert?
669	Mr. Gohmert. No.
670	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Gohmert votes no.
671	Mr. Jordan?
672	[No response.]
673	Mr. Poe?
674	[No response.]
675	Mr. Marino?
676	Mr. Marino. No.

1	
677	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Marino votes no.
678	Mr. Gowdy?
679	[No response.]
680	Mr. Labrador?
681	Mr. Labrador. No.
682	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Labrador votes no.
683	Mr. Farenthold?
684	[No response.]
685	Mr. Collins?
686	Mr. Collins. No.
687	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Collins votes no.
688	Mr. DeSantis?
689	[No response.]
690	Mr. Buck?
691	[No response.]
692	Mr. Ratcliffe?
693	Mr. Ratcliffe. No.
694	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Ratcliffe votes no.
695	Mrs. Roby?
696	[No response.]
697	Mr. Gaetz?
698	Mr. Gaetz. No.
699	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Gaetz votes no.
700	Mr. Johnson of Louisiana?
701	Mr. Johnson of Louisiana. No.

ı	
702	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Johnson votes no.
703	Mr. Biggs?
704	Mr. Biggs. No.
705	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Biggs votes no.
706	Mr. Rutherford?
707	Mr. Rutherford. No.
708	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Rutherford votes no.
709	Ms. Handel?
710	Mrs. Handel. No.
711	Ms. Adcock. Ms. Handel votes no.
712	Mr. Conyers?
713	Mr. Conyers. Aye.
714	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Conyers votes aye.
715	Mr. Nadler?
716	[No response.]
717	Ms. Lofgren?
718	Ms. Lofgren. Aye.
719	Ms. Adcock. Ms. Lofgren votes aye.
720	Ms. Jackson Lee?
721	Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.
722	Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jackson Lee votes aye.
723	Mr. Cohen?
724	Mr. Cohen. Aye.
725	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Cohen votes aye.
726	Mr. Johnson of Georgia?

```
727
          [No response.]
728
          Mr. Deutch?
729
          Mr. Deutch. Aye.
730
          Ms. Adcock. Mr. Deutch votes aye.
731
          Mr. Gutierrez?
732
          [No response.]
733
          Ms. Bass?
734
          Ms. Bass. Aye.
735
          Ms. Adcock. Ms. Bass votes aye.
736
          Mr. Richmond?
737
          [No response.]
738
          Mr. Jeffries?
739
          [No response.]
740
          Mr. Cicilline?
741
          Mr. Cicilline. Aye.
742
          Ms. Adcock. Mr. Cicilline votes aye.
743
          Mr. Swalwell?
744
          [No response.]
745
          Mr. Lieu?
746
          [No response.]
747
          Mr. Raskin?
748
          Mr. Raskin. Aye.
749
          Ms. Adcock. Mr. Raskin votes aye.
750
          Ms. Jayapal?
751
          Ms. Jayapal. Aye.
```

752	Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jayapal votes aye. Mr. Schneider?		
753	Mr. Schneider?		
754	Mr. Schneider. Aye.		
755	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Schneider votes aye.		
756	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from Colorado?		
757	Mr. Buck. No.		
758	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Buck votes no.		
759	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from New York?		
760	Mr. Nadler. Yes.		
761	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Nadler votes yes.		
762	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentlewoman from Texas has		
763	already voted.		
764	Ms. Jackson Lee. I am recorded.		
765	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from Georgia.		
766	Mr. Johnson of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to		
767	vote. Is that okay?		
768	Chairman Goodlatte. Yes, you are recognized to vote.		
769	Mr. Johnson of Georgia. Aye.		
770	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Johnson votes aye.		
771	Chairman Goodlatte. Has every member voted who wishes		
772	to vote?		
773	Ms. Jackson Lee. How am I recorded?		
774	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentlewoman is recorded as an		
775	aye in favor of her own amendment.		
776	Chairman Goodlatte. The clerk will report.		

	I		
777	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Chairman, 12 members voted aye; 16		
778	members voted no.		
779	Chairman Goodlatte. And the amendment is not agreed		
780	to. The question now occurs on the amendment offered by the		
781	chair.		
782	All those in favor will respond by saying aye.		
783	Those opposed, no.		
784	In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it and the		
785	amendment is agreed to.		
786	Mr. Conyers. Record vote, please.		
787	Chairman Goodlatte. A recorded vote is requested, and		
788	the clerk will call the roll.		
789	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Goodlatte?		
790	Chairman Goodlatte. Aye.		
791	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Goodlatte votes aye.		
792	Mr. Sensenbrenner?		
793	Mr. Sensenbrenner. Aye.		
794	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Sensenbrenner votes aye.		
795	Mr. Smith?		
796	[No response.]		
797	Mr. Chabot?		
798	Mr. Chabot. Aye.		
799	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Chabot votes aye.		
800	Mr. Issa?		
801	Mr. Issa. Aye.		

802	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Issa votes aye.
803	Mr. King?
804	[No response.]
805	Mr. Franks?
806	Mr. Franks. Aye.
807	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Franks votes aye.
808	Mr. Gohmert?
809	Mr. Gohmert. Aye.
810	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Gohmert votes aye.
811	Mr. Jordan?
812	[No response.]
813	Mr. Poe?
814	[No response.]
815	Mr. Marino?
816	Mr. Marino. Aye.
817	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Marino votes aye.
818	Mr. Gowdy?
819	[No response.]
820	Mr. Labrador?
821	Mr. Labrador. Aye.
822	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Labrador votes aye.
823	Mr. Farenthold?
824	[No response.]
825	Mr. Collins?
826	Mr. Collins. Aye.

1	
827	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Collins votes aye.
828	Mr. DeSantis?
829	[No response.]
830	Mr. Buck?
831	Mr. Buck. Aye.
832	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Buck votes aye.
833	Mr. Ratcliffe?
834	Mr. Ratcliffe. Yes.
835	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Ratcliffe votes yes.
836	Mrs. Roby?
837	[No response.]
838	Mr. Gaetz?
839	Mr. Gaetz. Aye.
840	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Gaetz votes aye.
841	Mr. Johnson of Louisiana?
842	Mr. Johnson of Louisiana. Aye.
843	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Johnson votes aye.
844	Mr. Biggs?
845	[No response.]
846	Mr. Rutherford?
847	Mr. Rutherford. Aye.
848	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Rutherford votes aye.
849	Ms. Handel?
850	Mrs. Handel. Yes.
851	Ms. Adcock. Ms. Handel votes yes.

Mr. Conyers? Mr. Conyers. No. Mr. Conyers. No. Ms. Adcock. Mr. Conyers votes no. Mr. Nadler? Mr. Nadler. No. Ms. Adcock. Mr. Nadler votes no. Ms. Lofgren? Ms. Lofgren. No. Ms. Lofgren votes no. Ms. Jackson Lee? Ms. Jackson Lee. No. Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jackson Lee votes no. Mr. Cohen? Mr. Cohen. No.
Ms. Adcock. Mr. Conyers votes no. Mr. Nadler? Mr. Nadler. No. Ms. Adcock. Mr. Nadler votes no. Ms. Lofgren? Ms. Lofgren. No. Ms. Adcock. Ms. Lofgren votes no. Ms. Jackson Lee? Ms. Jackson Lee. No. Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jackson Lee votes no.
855 Mr. Nadler? 856 Mr. Nadler. No. 857 Ms. Adcock. Mr. Nadler votes no. 858 Ms. Lofgren? 859 Ms. Lofgren. No. 860 Ms. Adcock. Ms. Lofgren votes no. 861 Ms. Jackson Lee? 862 Ms. Jackson Lee. No. 863 Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jackson Lee votes no. 864 Mr. Cohen?
Mr. Nadler. No. Ms. Adcock. Mr. Nadler votes no. Ms. Lofgren? Ms. Lofgren. No. Ms. Adcock. Ms. Lofgren votes no. Ms. Jackson Lee? Ms. Jackson Lee. No. Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jackson Lee votes no.
Ms. Adcock. Mr. Nadler votes no. Ms. Lofgren? Ms. Lofgren. No. Ms. Adcock. Ms. Lofgren votes no. Ms. Jackson Lee? Ms. Jackson Lee. No. Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jackson Lee votes no. Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jackson Lee votes no. Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jackson Lee votes no.
Ms. Lofgren? Ms. Lofgren. No. Ms. Adcock. Ms. Lofgren votes no. Ms. Jackson Lee? Ms. Jackson Lee. No. Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jackson Lee votes no. Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jackson Lee votes no. Ms. Adcock. Ms. Cohen?
Ms. Lofgren. No. Ms. Adcock. Ms. Lofgren votes no. Ms. Jackson Lee? Ms. Jackson Lee. No. Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jackson Lee votes no. Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jackson Lee votes no. Mr. Cohen?
860 Ms. Adcock. Ms. Lofgren votes no. 861 Ms. Jackson Lee? 862 Ms. Jackson Lee. No. 863 Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jackson Lee votes no. 864 Mr. Cohen?
861 Ms. Jackson Lee? 862 Ms. Jackson Lee. No. 863 Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jackson Lee votes no. 864 Mr. Cohen?
Ms. Jackson Lee. No. Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jackson Lee votes no. Mr. Cohen?
Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jackson Lee votes no. Mr. Cohen?
Mr. Cohen?
866 Ms. Adcock. Mr. Cohen votes no.
Mr. Johnson of Georgia?
868 [No response.]
Mr. Deutch?
Mr. Deutch. No.
Ms. Adcock. Mr. Deutch votes no.
Mr. Gutierrez?
[No response.]
874 Ms. Bass?
[No response.]
876 Mr. Richmond?

877	[No response.]
878	Mr. Jeffries?
879	[No response.]
880	Mr. Cicilline?
881	Mr. Cicilline. No.
882	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Cicilline votes no.
883	Mr. Swalwell?
884	[No response.]
885	Mr. Lieu?
886	[No response.]
887	Mr. Raskin?
888	Mr. Raskin. No.
889	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Raskin votes no.
890	Ms. Jayapal?
891	Ms. Jayapal. No.
892	Ms. Adcock. Ms. Jayapal votes no.
893	Mr. Schneider?
894	Mr. Schneider. No.
895	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Schneider votes no.
896	Mr. Johnson of Georgia. Am I recognized?
897	Chairman Goodlatte. You are, indeed.
898	Mr. Johnson of Georgia. Okay, I vote no.
899	
	Ms. Adcock. Mr. Johnson of Georgia votes no.
900	Chairman Goodlatte. Has every member voted who wishes
901	to vote? The clerk will report.

902 Ms. Adcock. Mr. Chairman, 15 members voted aye, 11 903 members voted no. 904 Chairman Goodlatte. And the amendment is agreed to. 905 Are there further amendments to H.R. 3249? 906 A reporting quorum being present, the question is on 907 the motion to report the bill H.R. 3249 as amended favorably 908 to the House. 909 Those in favor will respond by saying aye. 910 Those opposed, no. 911 The ayes have it, and the bill is ordered reported 912 favorably. 913 Members will have 2 days to submit views, and without 914 objection the bill will be reported as a single amendment in 915 the nature of a substitute incorporating all adopted 916 amendments, and staff is authorized to make technical and 917 conforming changes. 918 Pursuant to notice, I now call up H.R. 1730 for 919 purposes of markup and move that the committee report the 920 bill favorably to the House. The clerk will report the 921 bill. 922 Ms. Adcock. H.R. 1730: To amend Title 18 United States 923 code to provide for the protection of community centers with 924 religious affiliation and for other purposes. 925 [The bill follows:]

926 ********* INSERT 3 *******

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.

Freedom in the exercise of religion is a fundamental right that our Founding Fathers chose to place as he first recognized right in our Bill of Rights. In his farewell to the Nation, George Washington stated, "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion, and morality are indispensable supports." He continued, "And let us, with caution, indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion."

These learned men appreciated not only the spiritual benefits of religion to the individual, but the benefits to society of having a population committed to practicing their faith -- something that research shows is linked to strong marriages in families, that benefits the poor, and that leads to a reduction in the incidents of domestic abuse, crime, substance abuse, and addiction.

Unfortunately, our society no longer seems to place the same value on religious belief. In fact, it often feels that, in this modern society, religion is met with disdain and an attitude of militant secularization. We live in a time where violence and threats of violence are routinely used to scare people from practicing their religious

beliefs. Between January and March of this year alone, there were over 100 bomb threats called into Jewish community centers.

There have been numerous arson attempts on mosques as well. As a society, as a Congress, we must make clear that we value this vital right to exercise religious freedom and do what we can to encourage and foster this faith for the good of the country. That is why it is important that we make that threatening places of worship, threatening religious institutions, and ensuring good people from practicing their faith and exercising their right to do so will not be tolerated. H.R. 1730, the Protecting Religiously Affiliated Institutions Act of 2017, sends that important message.

This bill clarifies that Federal law prohibits threats towards religious institutions and that the protection extends beyond places of worship to places such as religiously affiliated community centers. Specifically, the legislation ensures that Federal law will prohibit threats to property, such as bomb threats, provided the threat is so serious that it obstructs an individual's ability to exercise their right to practice their religion. This bill applies to the property of any religious institution, whether it be Christian, Jewish, Muslim, or other.

In Matthew, chapter 18, verse 20, Jesus tells his

disciples, "Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in their midst." Community gathering, whether it be for worship, for socializing, for volunteer functions, is an important component to any religion, and more broadly, to a healthy and prosperous Nation. We must ensure these types of institutions are protected and recognize their vital function in our society. I want to thank Mr. Kustoff and Mr. Kilmer for introducing this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

[The prepared statement of Chairman Goodlatte follows:]

987 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT ******

988 Mr. Conyers. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Goodlatte. It is now my pleasure to recognize the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Conyers, for his opening statement.

Mr. Conyers. I rise in support of the amendment, because religious freedom and religious tolerance are fundamental principles on which our great Nation was founded. And as a result, we must be ever-vigilant against efforts to obstruct the free exercise of religious belief, and that is why I support H.R. 1730, which strengthens the current criminal code prohibition against damaging religious property to obstruct the free exercise of such rights.

This legislation is particularly timely given the recent upsurge in bomb threats, hate crimes, and vandalism committed against communities of faith.

More than 150 bomb threats were made against Jewish community centers in the first quarter of this year alone, and beginning late last year and continuing into this year, threatening letters were sent to mosques across the United States, with an alarming number of arsons and vandalism committed against mosques.

Sadly, this type of violence and threats against faith centers is not new to our country. For example, African-American churches were vandalized, firebombed, and burned with frequency, you may recall, during the struggle for

civil rights in the 1960s. Then, in the 1990s, there was a resurgence of arsons committed against African-American churches. As a result, Congress passed the Church Arson Prevention Act in 1996, making clear that such behavior would not be tolerated, yet here we are again, unfortunately.

I will address the substance of the bill more fully in connection with the substitute amendment that we will consider shortly, but it is fitting that we now improve upon the existing statute and reinforce our laws against violence motivated by hate and bigotry.

The First Amendment guarantees every American the right to freely practice their religion of choice, or to practice no religion at all. While some may disagree with the religious practices of others, what they may not do is use physical obstruction, force, or threats of force to deny others their right to worship.

No American should ever have to choose between their faith and their safety, and I thank the chairman and others on the committee on both sides of the aisle for their contribution to this legislation. And I look forward to consideration of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which I intend to support, and also support adoption of this bill as amended. I thank the chair and yield back any time that may be remaining.

1038	[The prepared statement of Mr. Conyers follows:]
1039	****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

1040	Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman and
1041	now recognizes the ranking member of the Subcommittee on
1042	Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security Investigations. She
1043	is not here; we will make sure her statement is made a part
1044	of the record.
1045	[The prepared statement of Ms. Jackson Lee follows:]
1046	****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

1047	Chairman Goodlatte. And now the question is, are there
1048	amendments to H.R. 1730? The chair recognizes himself for
1049	the purpose of offering an amendment and the clerk will
1050	report the amendment.
1051	Ms. Adcock. Amendment in the nature of a substitute to
1052	H.R. 1730, offered by Mr. Goodlatte. Strike all after the
1053	enacting clause and insert the following
1054	[The amendment of Chairman Goodlatte follows:]
1055	********* INSERT 4 *******

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read and the chair recognize himself to explain the amendment.

This amendment makes several changes to the underlying bill. First, rather than adding the language about threats to property in subsection (a)(1), it correctly places the language in subsection (a)(2). That prohibits force and threats of force that intentionally obstruct any person in the enjoyment of that person's free exercise of religious beliefs.

This provision has been charged previously in federal cases where the defendant has threatened places of worship. The language here clarifies that this provision may be used in future similar cases. The amendment also places the penalty for damage or destruction of property at a maximum of three years where the damage was caused by fire or explosives.

Finally, it changes the short title to accurately reflect that this applies to property of all religious institutions no matter what that religion may be. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Conyers. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Goodlatte. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan for his statement about the amendment.

1081	Mr. Conyers. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this
1082	amendment and ask unanimous consent to put my statement in
1083	the record, and yield back the balance of my times.
1084	[The statement of Mr. Conyers follows:]
1085	****** COMMITTEE INSERT *******

1086	Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman for
1087	his support and his brevity. It is a two-fer. And the
1088	question occurs on the amendment offered by the chair.
1089	All those in favor, respond by saying aye.
1090	Those opposed, no.
1091	The ayes have it and the amendment is agreed to. Are
1092	there any further amendments to H.R. 1730? A reporting
1093	quorum being present, the question is on the motion
1094	Mr. Deutch. Mr. Chairman?
1095	Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the
1096	gentleman from Florida see recognition?
1097	Mr. Deutch. I move to strike the last word.
1098	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5
1099	minutes.
1100	Mr. Deutch. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the committee's
1101	attention to this legislation. I helped introduce this bill
1102	with my colleagues, Representatives Kilmer, Kustoff, Poe,
1103	McMorris Rodgers, and Kennedy. The Combating Antisemitism
1104	Act, as renamed, will address the surge of bomb threats that
1105	occurred earlier this year against the American Jewish
1106	community.
1107	A threat to the Jewish community or any religious
1108	community is a threat to us all, and this bill appropriately
1109	as community religious centers like JCCs to protected sites
1110	under hate crime statutes. I am proud to see the committee

act on this crucial legislation.

But even as we engage in this important work, the House Judiciary Committee has shamefully abandoned its oversight responsibilities in other areas. Three-hundred days ago, the Nation learned that Russia directed attacks at the United States during the 2016 election. Russia sought to take away the rights of the American people to choose their own destiny, to make a government of their own democratic free will, and to be free from the influence of a foreign power. How dare this committee ignore that attack?

This week, Special Counsel Mueller unveiled his first indictments and conviction, so what does this committee do in response? Absolutely nothing. I am embarrassed, and I am ashamed. But I suppose it is not entirely true that the Judiciary Committee has done nothing.

This committee and its members have announced an investigation into Hillary Clinton, a private citizen. On the President's efforts to thwart the operation of the United States Department of Justice, his firing of the acting Attorney General, his firing of the FBI director, and now threats to the special counsel? Nothing.

This committee has filled its agenda too often with red herrings and turned to scapegoating in an effort to change the subject. This committee, with its important history, has degenerated into little more than a show trial like

those, I might add, they still hold in Russia. Every week I watch as this committee fails the American people. Even now, we are ignoring the ongoing threats to the independence of the special counsel. Instead of investigating, this committee's inaction give sanctuary to those who would seek to obstruct justice.

As Members of Congress who swear an oath to protect and defend the United States Constitution, it seems that some have chosen to prioritize a different oath, an oath to their own political party. As a member of this committee, Congresswoman Barbara Jordan of Texas said at the start of President Nixon's impeachment proceedings, and I quote, "I am not going to sit here and be an idle spectator to the diminution, the subversion, the destruction of the constitution." Now, 43 years later, each member of this committee should be reminded that we are active participants in the writing of this chapter of American history.

When future generations of Americans look back it will be easy to see who among us stood on the side of the facts, who sought out the truth, who worked to defend the integrity of the American Republic, and on the other hand, who were so desperate to bury the criminal actions of our elections that they stained our Congress and our democracy in the process.

Senator Lowell Weicker of Connecticut led the Republican investigation into Watergate four decades ago,

and in an op-ed from June, before we learned of indictments and guilty pleas, he said this: "At the outset of the Watergate hearings there was a strong measure of bipartisan commitment to the truth in Congress.

When I listen to tapes of our sessions I am struck by how difficult it can be to distinguish between a Republican and a Democratic questioner." Later he went on to say that some politicians took advantage of this cynicism to play down or excuse the President's actions and even to smear or block the investigations.

Today I would ask the members of the majority to look into the past and then look into the future. Where do you think this is going? Witnesses are cooperating; guilty pleas and indictments have been secured. My colleagues, at this critical moment in our history, will you let cynicism continue to strangle the work of this committee, or will you join in the search for truth? I yield back.

Mr. Sensenbrenner. Mr. Chairman?

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

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

1182 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5
1183 minutes

1184 Mr. Sensenbrenner. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. It
1185 does not take much of a reading of the Constitution to show

that Congress cannot prosecute anybody. There is a special counsel that has been appointed. His charge is to look into allegations of Russian manipulation of the election. He is doing his work.

Now, in the past week or so, it has been disclosed that the Democrat National Committee, you know, laundered over \$9 million through the general counsel of the Clinton campaign's law firm to pay Fusion GPS, and that the dossier that came about as a result of that, you know, ended up having some dirt on candidate Trump.

I would hope that Mr. Mueller, in his charge, would take a look at this. But again, we are prohibited from passing bills of attainder. We should be prohibited in obstructing what the special counsel is doing, and we should not have a media show where there will be requests for immunity by witnesses in order to get their testimony on the record.

And I would just remind my colleagues here that it was the immunity that was given during the Iran-Contra media event 30 years ago that ended up getting John Poindexter and Oliver North off the hook, because the special counsel ended up using immunized testimony in a criminal trial. We ought to cool it, and I hope all of the members would recognize that, and I yield back.

Mr. Chabot. Mr. Chairman? Would the gentleman yield

1211	for just a moment?
1212	Mr. Sensenbrenner. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.
1213	Mr. Chabot. I thank the gentleman for yielding. A
1214	helpful amendment to what the gentleman said is that, as far
1215	is that dossier, a very questionable dossier, considering
1216	the sources and everything else. It alleged dirt on Trump.
1217	They are allegations and may be complete fabrications.
1218	Mr. Sensenbrenner. Thank you, and I yield back.
1219	Chairman Goodlatte. The chair would point out to the
1220	members that a substitute amendment has been adopted, and
1221	there is no further debate on this bill. So, you will have
1222	to save it.
1223	A reporting quorum being present
1224	Ms. Jayapal. Mr. Chairman? I wanted to comment on the
1225	bill, if I may.
1226	Chairman Goodlatte. The substitute has been adopted.
1227	People have had the opportunity to comment. The rules do
1228	not contemplate. We are not going to go any further.
1229	Mr. Nadler. Mr. Chairman, you just recognized Mr.
1230	Sensenbrenner.
1231	Chairman Goodlatte. I recognized two people and we are
1232	stopping right there. There will be more bills here, so I
1233	expect we are going to hear more things.
1234	A reporting quorum being present, the question is on
1235	the motion to report the bill H.R. 1730 as amended favorably

1236	to the House.
1237	Those in favor will respond by saying aye.
1238	Those opposed, no.
1239	The ayes have it, and the bill is ordered reported
1240	favorably. Members will have 2 days to submit views, and
1241	without objection the bill will be reported as a single
1242	amendment in the nature of a substitute incorporating all
1243	adopted amendments, and staff is authorized to make
1244	technical and conforming changes.
1245	Pursuant to notice, I now call up H.R. 3317 for
1246	purposes of markup and move that the committee report the
1247	bill favorably to the House. The clerk will report the
1248	bill.
1249	Ms. Adcock. H.R. 3317, to amend title 18 United States
1250	code to increase the penalty for female genital mutilation
1251	and for other purposes.
1252	[The bill follows:]
1253	****** INSERT 5 *******

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.

The Stopping Abusive Female Exploitation, or SAFE, Act addresses the internationally recognized human rights violation of female genital mutilation, FGM. Alarmingly, FGM has grown in prevalence in the United States over the past 2 decades.

According to the Center for Disease Control, approximately 500,000 women and girls in the United States have undergone the procedure or are at risk of having it inflicted upon them. FGM is a grotesque, barbaric practice that provides no health benefits for women and girls and has long-lasting and harmful physical and psychological consequences.

Under current law, FGM is rightly a Federal crime.

However, despite its ongoing occurrence in the United

States, it has never been prosecuted until this year. In

the first case of its kind, Federal charges for committing

FGM have been filed against two Michigan doctors for

performing FGM on two 7-year-old girls. The current penalty

is insufficient, however, and does not reflect the barbaric

and medieval nature of the crime. That is why we are

considering the SAFE Act today.

This legislation enhances the statutory maximum penalty

for FGM operations from 5 to 15 years. Furthermore, it expresses the sense of Congress that States should enact laws that require healthcare professionals, teachers, and other school employees to report instances of suspected FGM to local law enforcement agencies. The criminals committing this horrific act against small children are not doctors, they are butchers, and State medical licensing boards should act accordingly.

This committee's core mission is to protect the health and well-being of our citizens, and this legislation is in furtherance of that mission. As a father and grandfather, I can think of no more important work than protecting our children from those who seek to do them harm.

I commend Representative Dave Trott, an alumnus of this committee, and Representative Carolyn Maloney for introducing the SAFE Act and for their tireless efforts on behalf of FGM victims, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

1297 [The prepared statement of Chairman Goodlatte follows:]

1298 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

1299	Mr. Conyers. Mr. Chairman?
1300	Chairman Goodlatte. It is now my pleasure to recognize
1301	the ranking member of the committee, Mr. Conyers, for his
1302	opening statement.
1303	Mr. Conyers. Well, I support the bill completely. I
1304	commend you for your statement. I agree with it, and I
1305	would ask unanimous consent to put my statement in the
1306	record along with yours.
1307	Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, it will be made
1308	a part of the record.
1309	[The prepared statement of Mr. Conyers follows:]
1310	****** COMMITTEE INSERT *******

1311	Mr. Conyers. Thank you.
1312	Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the
1313	gentleman from New York seek recognition?
1314	Mr. Nadler. I move to strike the last word.
1315	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5
1316	minutes.
1317	Mr. Nadler. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is an
1318	excellent bill. I commend the sponsors, I commend you for
1319	scheduling it, and I urge everyone to vote for it. I also
1320	commend the chairman for the realism of his remarks a few
1321	minutes ago, pointing out that, likely in the next bill or
1322	two, some of the discussion Mr. Deutch started would
1323	continue, and indeed it will.
1324	I want to make a couple comments in this respect. Two
1325	comments, really. Number one, talking about that dossier
1326	and who paid for it is a total red herring and irrelevancy.
1327	GPS Fusion or whoever did it was originally paid by a
1328	Republican donor who did not like Mr. Trump who was
1329	supporting some other candidate. When it became clear that
1330	Mr. Trump was going to win the Republican nomination, he
1331	stopped, and it was picked up by Democratic sources, who
1332	continued to do it. I think it was the DNC.
1333	In any event, there was nothing wrong when the
1334	Republican donor I think it was Mr. Singer did it;
1335	there was nothing wrong when the Democrats did it. There is

nothing wrong with paying for opposition research. The question with regard to that dossier is not who paid for it, because it does not matter who paid for it as long as it is properly reported.

What matters is, is it true? Are the allegations within it true or not? So far, some of those allegations have been verified; many have not yet been. I am not aware that any has been definitely disproven, but maybe some will be.

The question is, as I said, not who paid for it, which is a total red herring because every campaign pays for opposition research, and there is no reason that the Democrats should not have paid for it. There is no reason that some rival Republican campaign should not have paid for it. It is legal. It is fine. It is normally done. The question is, are the allegations or the assertions in it true or not? And we will see, but the red herring about who paid for it is irrelevant.

Secondly, what is not irrelevant is that the electoral process was sought to be subverted by a hostile foreign power, namely Russia. People in the United States cooperated with that. Obviously, people in the Trump campaign, we now know, were interested in cooperating, at least to some extent. They were eager to "accept dirt on Hillary," as they put it, from the Russian government.

Whether that actually happened or not remains to be seen.

But the point is, it was an active attempt by the Russians to subvert our election. There was at least some cooperation from some people within the Trump campaign. We will see how far that went. But it is this committee's jurisdiction to look into some of this, regardless of criminal charges. Mr. Muller is pursuing criminal charges, and obviously some people probably committed crimes, and we will see who they are and what happens.

But our charge is not crimes. Our charge is protecting the integrity of American democracy, protecting the integrity of the FBI, protecting the integrity of the Justice Department. And clearly, things happened in the Justice Department and in the FBI -- the firing of Mr. Comey, Mr. Trump said, because of the Russian thing -- which may or may not have amounted to the criminal charge of obstruction of justice, but were clearly improper. And it is this committee's jurisdiction, which we have absolutely ignored, to look into, to have oversight over the conduct of the FBI and over the Justice Department, among others.

And in this grave crisis for American democracy, and it is a grave crisis for American democracy, where people in this country who -- this is a different question, but people in this country clearly worked with -- maybe even just the people from WikiLeaks -- but many people in this country

clearly -- people in this country clearly worked with agents of a hostile foreign power to subvert an election, to support one candidate over another.

The use of the Internet, which is also partially under the jurisdiction of this committee, was used clearly by the Russians with fake ads, with fake news stories, with all kinds of things. See, I think the figure was that fake stuff on Facebook started by the Russians was seen by 126 million Americans; nobody knows. Obviously, no one can ever know whether all this affected the result of the election. Maybe it did, maybe it did not. That is not the point.

The point is, our election process was attacked. It was subverted, and we have to make sure that we have protections in place so it does not happen again, and that is the job of this committee, the jurisdiction of this committee, and we are very shamefully ignoring it, and I think that is Mr. Deutsch's complaint. That is my complaint.

Regardless of the actions of the special prosecutor in looking at crimes, our job is not to look at crimes. It is to protect the integrity of the democratic process, with a small D, in the United States and we are not doing that, and that is a shame, and we ought to do it. I yield back.

Mr. Sensenbrenner. Mr. Chairman?

1410 Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the

1411 gentleman from Wisconsin seek recognition?

1412 Mr. Sensenbrenner. I move to strike the last word.

1413 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5

1414 minutes.

Mr. Sensenbrenner. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very interesting listening to the flow of complaints that we have heard from the other side of the aisle. First, the committee was accused of wasting time, you know, in looking into the matters relating to Mrs. Clinton, and this came out after the revelation that there was money that was laundered through her general counsel's law firm to pay for Fusion GPS.

Now, I think the American people ought to know if there were any of those deleted emails that had anything to do with this transaction. Now, we are hearing that, well, this is, you know, legitimate opposition research. And one thing, you know, I think that I am hearing that opposition research against Republicans is just fine, but trying to follow the money is a terrible waste of time.

I would urge my colleagues on the other side to at least be kind of consistent in their complaints, you know, rather than having a different standard for opposition research against Republicans and how money was laundered through Mr. Elias' law firm, you know, in order to try to get that dossier, which I admit an anti-Trump Republican was

trying to get and decided to cut off the money once Mr.

Trump had the delegates to win the Republican nomination.

And I yield back.

1439 Chairman Goodlatte. Will the gentleman yield?

1440 Mr. Sensenbrenner. I yield.

Chairman Goodlatte. I thank the gentleman for yielding. First of all, I appreciate very much the gentleman's remarks, but I want to point out to the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Florida, and others that this committee is hardly ignoring this issue.

The fact of the matter is that other committees in the Congress in both the House and Senate are looking into various aspects of this. It involves the Russian Government in some manner we do not know, but the intelligence committee certainly are well within their right to look at that. But the role of this committee is oversight of the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice is determined to appoint a special counsel, and we have not ignored that.

First of all, we have communicated with the special counsel to make sure that the special counsel is doing his job properly. I have met with the special counsel, along with the gentleman from Michigan, to ask questions about the conduct of his work, and we will continue to do that. But we are not going to interfere with his work; we are just

going to make sure that he is doing his work properly.

Secondly, there are questions about what the special counsel is investigating, and perhaps rightfully, he is not going to disclose all that information in the middle of an investigation, so we asked to meet with the deputy Attorney General of the United States, because the Attorney General has recused himself from this investigation. And again, Mr. Conyers and I met with the deputy Attorney General to ask questions.

I am not satisfied that they are investigating matters that were left on the table by the last administration that are serious questions about the conduct of the investigation regarding Mrs. Clinton's emails or many things that last year perplexed members on both sides of the aisle with regard to this, including the decision to take upon himself as the FBI director a decision that is normally reserved for members of the Justice Department.

The timing of that decision, whether the decision was made before or after the witnesses were even interviewed and evidence examined, and a particular concern, because I heard about it last October, members of the other side of the aisle, the decision made by the FBI director to disclose that he was reopening an investigation and telling the world about it about a week before the presidential election.

Those are serious matters that should be looked at in terms

1486	of how the FBI conducted itself and to make sure that it
1487	does not conduct itself in that manner in the future.
1488	So, I think that it is appropriate to continue to
1489	monitor the work of the special counsel, but it is not
1490	appropriate, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has pointed
1491	out, to take actions that could interfere with that work.
1492	And I thank the gentleman for yielding.
1493	Mr. Sensenbrenner. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.
1494	Mr. Conyers. Mr. Chairman?
1495	Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the
1496	gentleman from
1497	Mr. Conyers. Michigan.
1498	Chairman Goodlatte. I think the gentleman from
1499	Michigan has been recognized already, so we may need on
1500	the amendment. Remember?
1501	Mr. Conyers. Well
1502	Chairman Goodlatte. Actually, on the bill, so we do
1503	not have any amendments. And the gentleman from New York
1504	has been recognized. So, what purpose does the gentleman
1505	from Tennessee seek recognition?
1506	Mr. Cohen. I move to strike the last word.
1507	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from Tennessee is
1508	recognized for 5 minutes.
1509	Mr. Cohen. I would like to ask the chair, there is a
1510	bill I presume it is in this committee that Mr.

Conyers and Mr. Jones have filed to insulate and protect the special counsel from being fired without cause and particular other standards that are in that bill. Is that not relevant for this committee to discuss? And should that not be something that we should look at rather --

Chairman Goodlatte. Let me just say that I think that the authority of a President of the United States to take actions with regard to personnel is very clear, and the President has also made it clear that he has no intention of firing a special counsel, so I do not agree that it should be taken up.

Mr. Cohen. Mr. Chair, the President has said a lot of -- he said he was in favor of Lamar Alexander's bill before he said he was not in favor of Lamar Alexander's bill. The President changed from day to day. The President never declared he was not going to fire Comey, but he fired Comey. The President has been encouraged by Steve Bannon and Jim Robertson and the Wall Street Journal to fire Comey.

The President responds not with his intellect and what is best politically and the safest thing to do, thinking Lindsey Graham is right, that holy hell will be raised if he fires the special prosecutor, but he responds with his personal believe that he has been attacked or threatened in some way. And when somebody comes at him like Mr. Comey did and like Mr. Mueller has, there is a goodly chance he will

1536 | fire him.

But the issue is, what standards should there be to determine whether he should be fired? The President is not the king. We fought a war to say we did not have a king. The President does not have unlimited powers, and when the President is being investigated by a special counsel established by law to look into charges that he has basically mutilated our democracy, then we should look into that bill that Mr. Conyers has filed and that should be our first priority. You may not want to interfere with what Mr. Mueller does, and I understand that.

And what Mr. Sensenbrenner says about granting immunity, that is all fine and good. But the whole idea of whether he should be fired and under what standards he should be fired -- it is not the issue of whether or not you believe Trump is not going to fire him; it is what the law President, and the next President. So, I would ask you --

Chairman Goodlatte. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. Cohen. I would ask you to schedule that bill for a hearing.

1556 Chairman Goodlatte. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. Cohen. Yes.

Chairman Goodlatte. The standards by which the

President must conduct himself with regard to firing

employees is set forth in the United States Constitution. I

1561 suggest you read it.

Mr. Cohen. I have read the Constitution, sir. And under the special counsel, there are specific standards that come to be met through statute. I yield to Mr. Conyers, who has the bill, and would like to ask him about, does he think this committee should take up that bill and look into the standards by which the special counsel could be fired?

Mr. Conyers. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And of course. That is why we introduced it in the first place. And I would like to discuss with the chairman, and you as well, how soon we can get to the bill. I think sooner is better.

Mr. Cohen. Thank you, Mr. Conyers. I am all for this bill before us on female genital mutilation, but I am also in favor of not mutilating our democracy and not mutilating our Constitution, and not mutilating our special counsel.

And this committee has a duty to look into seeing that the special counsel cannot be fired at the whim and the caprice of the President of the United States.

He is not the king. He is not the sole decider, the arbitrator. He is a servant of the people and he should serve our democracy in a way that people feel like it is fair, and just, and everybody is subject to the law.

And if the special counsel is not immunized or made clear that the standards are such that he has a right of

1586 review and that he can only be fired for abuse of his 1587 powers, or for some other purpose --1588 Mr. Sensenbrenner. Will the gentleman yield? 1589 Mr. Cohen. Sure. 1590 Mr. Sensenbrenner. I have a Constitution here in my 1591 Could he please tell me which article and which 1592 section prohibits the President from firing any executive 1593 branch employee? I have not been able to find one. 1594 Mr. Cohen. We already have set standards by which the 1595 special counsel can be fired. And Mr. Conyers and Mr. 1596 Jones' bill make it clear that there are stronger standards. 1597 And, yes, there may not --1598 Mr. Sensenbrenner. Will the gentleman yield again? 1599 Mr. Cohen. -- be any prohibition, but that does not 1600 mean that there cannot be a restriction. And the special 1601 counsel is a special type of employee who is not necessarily 1602 -- especially when he is investigating --1603 Mr. Sensenbrenner. Will the gentleman yield again? 1604 No. I will not. Especially when he is Mr. Cohen. 1605 investigating the President of the United States for 1606 collusion with Russia, for destroying our democracy, and for 1607 flaunting his and his campaign associates' activities with 1608 Russia, which they have constantly lied about. 1609 And this committee is being made a mockery and a joke 1610 of by not taking up any issues at all dealing with that.

1611	have a duty do it and we should be having this bill for us
1612	now.
1613	Mr. Chabot. Mr. Chairman?
1614	Mr. Cohen. I yield back the balance of my time.
1615	Mr. Chabot. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman?
1616	Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the
1617	gentleman from Ohio seek recognition?
1618	Mr. Chabot. Move to strike the last word.
1619	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5
1620	minutes.
1621	Mr. Sensenbrenner. Does the gentleman yield?
1622	Mr. Chabot. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.
1623	Mr. Sensenbrenner. I refresh the memory of the
1624	gentleman from Tennessee, that we did have an independent
1625	counsel law which expired in 2001. You know, that did have
1626	a court appoint an independent counsel and set the
1627	parameters of an independent counsel's investigation. That
1628	law was extended several times. It was terminated largely
1629	as a result of excesses that were done by Kenneth Starr
1630	during his investigation of President Clinton. I yield back
1631	to the gentleman from Ohio.
1632	Mr. Chabot. And I would, again, just say I will
1633	just yield back. Never mind. I yield back.
1634	Mr. Cicilline. Mr. Chairman?
1635	Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the

gentleman from Rhode Island seek recognition?

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

1638 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 5
1639 minutes.

Mr. Cicilline. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for his eloquent words. And sadly, the comments of so many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have proved the validity of his eloquent arguments.

The notion that other committees are doing their job -well, hurray for them. We ought to be doing our job. And
it certainly does not absolve the Judiciary Committee of our
critical oversight responsibilities that the intelligence
committees or the Senate Judiciary Committee are doing their
jobs.

I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, the statue he can look to is 18 U.S.C. 1512 through 1505, which are the obstruction of justice statutes. The President of the United States is not free to fire any employees if it is done to obstruct justice. This committee has oversight responsibilities. The evidence is growing that a foreign government interfered with the presidential election. They did so by buying advertising, by advocating, by generating false stories. The list goes on and on. And now, we are seeing growing evidence that there was an attempt, at least,

1661 to collude with the Trump campaign.

We just heard some imaginary story about the DNC money laundering. We have actual indictments that allege that a jury has found probable cause to believe that the President's campaign chair engaged in money laundering as a result of work he did for a foreign government that continued -- that money laundering continued -- while he was a campaign manager for the President of the United States. A conviction from another person who was identified as a foreign policy adviser with an active effort to collude and gather information from the Russians that was detrimental to the campaign of Hillary Clinton.

It is hard to imagine what exactly it will take for this committee to begin some of its oversight responsibilities. It is, in fact, embarrassing. When I go home to Rhode Island, and people say, "Well, you are on the Judiciary Committee. What are you doing about this?" And I have to say, "Nothing. We are trying, but we do not have colleagues on the other side of the aisle who will demonstrate any courage to take on this issue of a foreign government interfering with our democracy."

That should not be a Republican or a Democratic issue. This should be an American issue. We should all care about this. We have tried in every way that we can. We have written 18 letters to the chairman of this committee dating

back to November of 2016, requesting information in a variety of different areas, particularly with respect to our oversight responsibilities. Eighteen letters.

We have done five resolutions of inquiry in an effort to try to bring attention and raise the conscience of this committee of our responsibilities to examine these issues, without success.

We have introduced legislation that focuses on ways to protect the integrity of our democracy and provide meaningful oversight of the Department of Justice and the FBI, and we cannot get a hearing. What will it take for this committee to begin to fulfill our responsibilities to protect our democracy and to make sure that never again will the Russians or any other foreign adversary meddle in our elections?

I am happy to have a fight every day, a lively debate with Republicans about important public policy issues in this country and about the direction we should take on many important issues. I do not have any interest in having to fight the Russians. And so, with that, Mr. Chairman, I would yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Nadler. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to make a couple of quick points. Number one, the gentleman from Wisconsin referred to laundering money.

Laundering money is only laundering money when you are

dealing with an improper, illegal object. If A decides that B should cooperate with him in paying for legal opposition research, that is not laundering money. That is perfectly legal and okay.

On the other hand, if Donald Trump, Jr. agrees with the Russians to give their opposition research, they are a foreign power. It is illegal for a foreign power or any foreign national to give something of value for an American campaign. Opposition research is certainly something of value. If money was passed, that would be money laundering.

But the difference is paying for opposition research is perfectly okay. Colluding with a foreign power for information is not okay; nor is colluding with a foreign power -- and this has not been proven yet. But clearly, our intelligence agencies tell us the Russians hacked the DNC, stole the emails. Those emails were then given to WikiLeaks and leaked. All of that was done with the object of helping Mr. Trump. If anybody in the Trump campaign participated in that, that was a crime.

But the point is, talking about money laundering with the GPS Fusion thing is a red herring. And the other point is, all of this is a threat to American democracy, when a foreign power gets involved, when it subverts, perhaps, the FBI, when the President fires someone in the FBI because they are looking into this. That is a subversion of our

democracy.

And there is a fundamental legal principle going way back to Anglo-Saxon law. No man may be a judge in his own case. That will have to limit certain presidential and other powers because we have to get to the bottom of these things. And there has to be real justice done. And this committee has the responsibility for oversight, to see that all of the institutions under its jurisdiction are working properly when faced with the subversion of democracy and the subversion of an election by a foreign power.

We are not doing that. That is shameful. We ought to be doing it. And all the other stuff -- Hillary's emails, et cetera -- I do not care if anybody investigates that. It does not matter at this point. It is a waste of time, but that is a different question. But it is not the same thing.

Here we are talking about an attempt to subvert the American election by a foreign power, clearly with the agreement of some people in the campaign of the winning candidate, maybe with more participation. That remains to be seen.

But we are not just talking about crimes. That is up to the special prosecutor. We are talking about systemic misconduct, system subversion of Facebook and Twitter, and all these things, and that is what we ought to be looking into, to protect our democracy and to protect our elections.

1761 And we are woefully failing at that responsibility. I yield 1762 back. 1763 Chairman Goodlatte. Are there any amendments to H.R. 1764 3317? A reporting quorum being present, the question is on 1765 the motion to report the bill H.R. 3317 favorably to the 1766 House. 1767 Those in favor will say aye. 1768 Those opposed, no. 1769 The ayes have it and the bill is reported favorably. 1770 Members will have 2 days to submit views. 1771 Pursuant to notice, I now call up H.R. 4203 for 1772 purposes of markup and move that the committee report the 1773 bill favorably to the house. The clerk will report the 1774 bill. 1775 Ms. Adcock. H.R. 4203: To amend title 18 United States 1776 Code with regard to stalking. 1777 [The bill follows:] 1778 ******* INSERT 6 ******

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.

Every year, about 7.5 million people are stalked in the United States. Of these victims, 11 percent have been stalked for 5 years or more, and 46 percent experience at least one unwanted contact per week. The impact of stalking victims is significant. Many of them fear what a stalker will do or feel vulnerable and isolated because no one understands why they are afraid. Stalking even causes one in eight persons to skip work and one in seven to move out of fear, and increases the prevalence of anxiety, insomnia, and depression upon victims.

Among these victims, predators disproportionately target children, knowing that they are susceptible to stalking. These children commonly report the same feelings that adult victims have: fear and concern for their safety. But unlike adults, children may find greater difficulty in reporting a predator that is stalking them or finding a way to escape harassment.

We must take further action to protect children and promote their safety. While most States have criminal laws to prohibit stalking, the Federal Criminal Code also contains provisions to punish the most egregious forms of stalking when that conduct crosses State lines. For

example, it is a Federal crime for an individual to stalk someone by crossing State lines with the intent to kill or seriously injure that individual.

However, the Federal Code does not have additional

However, the Federal Code does not have additional penalties when the victim is a child. To further protect children from these crimes, H.R. 4203, The Combat Online Predators Act enhances the Federal penalty for stalking victims under the age of 18 years by increasing the maximum term of imprisonment by 5 years when the victim is a minor.

It also directs the Department of Justice to evaluate Federal, tribal, State, and local efforts to enforce stalking laws and identify the best practices for enforcing these laws. With this bill, we can further deter stalking and learn the best ways to protect the most vulnerable Americans from harm. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4203 --

Mr. Conyers. Mr. Chairman?

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

[The prepared statement of Mr. Goodlatte follows:]

1825 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

Mr. Conyers. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, The Combat Online Predators Act seeks to address the greater harm that can be inflicted on young victims of stalking, and it does it by increasing by 5 years the maximum penalties for stalking offenses committed against victims under the age of 18. And I support this legislation without reservation because it provides a reasonable means of protecting our young people from stalking, whether online or in person.

It also helps ensure that these vulnerable individuals are shielded from the potentially devastating and long-term physical and mental scars that stalking can inflict. And it punishes those who seek to do them harm.

The increased maximum penalty for offenses committed against minors is a sensible modification of the stalking statute, because children and adolescents are, in many respects, among the most vulnerable of our population.

Although this measure raises the maximum penalty, sentencing judges will still have the ability to determine the appropriate sentence: deciding whether or not a more severe punishment is warranted after reviewing the facts in each case.

And I thank the chairman for bringing this important legislation to the committee for consideration. I support this thoughtful and measured response to a very serious

1851	issue, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.
1852	And I yield back the balance of my time.
1853	[The prepared statement of Mr. Conyers follows:]
1854	****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

1855	Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman.
1856	Are there any amendments to H.R. 4203?
1857	Mr. Chabot. Mr. Chairman?
1858	Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the
1859	gentleman from Ohio seek recognition?
1860	Mr. Chabot. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the
1861	desk.
1862	Chairman Goodlatte. The clerk will report the
1863	amendment.
1864	Ms. Adcock. Amendment to H.R. 4203 offered by Mr.
1865	Chabot
1866	Mr. Chabot. I would ask unanimous consent that the
1867	amendment be considered as read.
1868	[The amendment of Mr. Chabot follows:]
1869	******* INSERT 7 *******

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

Mr. Chabot. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I will be brief. First, I strongly support not only this amendment, but the legislation, the underlying legislation. Stalking is a very significant, severe problem in this country and it adversely impacts far too many people.

And with this amendment, I am proposing two small technical chances. First, the amendment fixes the conforming amendment language in this bill by striking the language which inadvertently placed it in the Interstate Domestic Violence section, and it would place it in the stalking statute, where it belongs.

Second, the amendment allows DOJ to create a free-standing, one-time report on stalking laws and best practices. This change will assure the report on stalking will not go unnoticed as part of the Attorney General's larger annual report.

It is time that we examine these stalking laws and assure that they are being used efficiently and effectively, and I would like to thank Mr. Fitzpatrick for introducing this bill and his leadership on this issue, and I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I would yield back.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan seek recognition?

Mr. Conyers. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. This amendment makes two changes to the language of the bill. The bill currently contains a conforming amendment that would apply a 5-year increase to the maximum penalty under section 2261 of title 18, the Interstate

Domestic Violence Statute. This amendment makes a necessary clarification to ensure that this increase will apply only to offenses defined in Section 2261(a) of title 18, the stalking statute itself.

And as written, the bill requires the Attorney General to evaluate Federal, State, and tribal efforts to enforce antistalking laws and to identify methods that are most effective. The amendment makes this a one-time report. And so, I urge support of the clarifying changes to the bill on all of the members of the committee. I yield back the -- Chairman Goodlatte. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Conyers. Yes, sir. I will.

Chairman Goodlatte. I very much thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his support. In fact, I want to thank all of the members on both sides of the aisle, not only on this committee, but off the committee, who have supported this important initiative. And I especially want

1920	to single out the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr.
1921	Fitzpatrick, who is the chief sponsor of the legislation.
1922	So, I thank the gentleman and again encourage everybody to
1923	support the amendment and the underlying bill.
1924	Mr. Conyers. I yield back. I yield back the balance
1925	of my time.
1926	Chairman Goodlatte. Thank you, Mr. Conyers. The
1927	question occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman
1928	from Ohio.
1929	All those in favor, respond by saying aye.
1930	Those opposed, no.
1931	The ayes have it and the amendment is agreed to.
1932	Are there further amendments to H.R. 4203?
1933	Mr. Conyers. I do not think so.
1934	Chairman Goodlatte. A reporting quorum being present,
1935	the question is on the motion to report the bill H.R. 4203,
1936	as amended, favorably to the House.
1937	Those in favor will respond by saying aye.
1938	Those opposed, no.
1939	The ayes have it and the bill is ordered reported
1940	favorably. Members will have 2 days to submit views. And
1941	without objection, the bill will be reported as a single
1942	amendment in the nature of a substitute, incorporating all
1943	adopted amendments and the staff is authorized to make
1944	technical and conforming changes.

1945	This concludes our business for the committee for
1946	today, and I thank all the members for attending, and the
1947	markup is adjourned.
1948	[Whereupon, at 12:48 p.m., the committee was
1949	adjourned.]