

the ownership of cultural property when: that property is in the United States pursuant to an agreement between the foreign state and the U.S. or a U.S.-based cultural or educational institution; the President has granted the work at issue immunity from seizure pursuant to the Immunity from Seizure Act; and the President's grant of immunity from seizure is published in the Federal Register.

The expropriation exception remains available to all claims concerning misappropriated cultural property to which these factual circumstances do not apply.

I would not support this bill if it did not contain a sufficient exception for claims arising from artwork stolen by the Nazis, their allies, and their affiliates.

H.R. 889 has just such an exception, ensuring that victims of Nazi art theft continue to have the opportunity to pursue justice in court.

This exception is appropriate in light of the sheer scale and the particularly concerted efforts of the Nazis to seize artwork and other cultural property from their victims.

The particular sensitivity surrounding compensation for artwork stolen by the Nazis has been highlighted in recent months by the motion picture *Woman in Gold*, which tells the story of Maria Altmann.

Mrs. Altmann's efforts to retrieve works by Gustav Klimt that the Nazis had taken from uncle in Austria in the 1930's led to an important Supreme Court decision that held that the expropriation exception applied to claims arising prior to the FSIA's enactment in 1976, which allowed Nazi-era victims to file suit for damages in federal court.

It is also critical to note that the bill's sponsors worked with the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany to revise the Nazi-era exception to ensure that it was broad enough to be a meaningful exception.

As a result, the Conference has stated, for itself and for the American Jewish Committee, that it will not oppose this bill.

I also note that all of the FSIA's other exceptions to sovereign immunity remain available to potential plaintiffs with claims concerning the ownership of cultural property.

In particular, I note that this bill does nothing to affect the attempts by Chabad to seek enforcement of its 2011 judgment against Russia, both because such judgment would predate the effective date of this bill and because it was not predicated on the loan of any artwork to the U.S., meaning that this bill would not effect that case even if it had been in effect in 2011.

To the extent it may be necessary, I would encourage consideration of adding clarifying language that this bill does nothing to affect enforcement of an already-entered judgment.

H.R. 889 is narrowly tailored to ensure that it provides for just enough immunity to encourage foreign states to lend their cultural property to American museums and universities for temporary exhibits and displays without protecting more than we intend to protect.

I recognize that some people may instinctively recoil at the idea of any bill that grants any level of immunity to a foreign state when ownership of a work of art or other cultural object is at issue.

But I would not support a bill that foreclosed all possibility of redress for such people.

And, H.R. 889 does not do that.

It simply ensures that works that have already been granted immunity from seizure by

the President pursuant to the Immunity from Seizure Act are also immune from suits for damages, which is in keeping with the Act's purpose of encouraging foreign countries to lend their works to American institutions without fear of litigation based on the act of lending those works.

I thank Representative STEVE CHABOT, Judiciary Committee Chairman BOB GOODLATTE, and Committee Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS, Jr. for their leadership on this issue and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but I would like to recognize Lafayette and Washington. The Hermione, the boat that brought Lafayette to Washington, a replica thereof, has just come to Virginia, and there is a recognition of that at Mount Vernon tonight. I think we should recognize their portraits here. They helped this country become free from the shackles of Great Britain and become the great country we are.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 889.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SUPPORTING LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 295) supporting local law enforcement agencies in their continued work to serve our communities, and supporting their use of body worn cameras to promote transparency to protect both citizens and officers alike.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

##### H. RES. 295

Whereas the United States Department of Justice issued a report titled, "Police Officer Body-Worn Cameras", which details a number of benefits of body-worn cameras, including—

- (1) increased transparency and citizen views of police legitimacy;
- (2) improved behavior and civility among both police officers and citizens; and
- (3) increased evidentiary benefits that expedite resolution of citizen complaints or lawsuits and improving evidence for arrest and prosecution; and

Whereas the University of Cambridge's Institute of Criminology conducted a 12-month study on the use of body-worn cameras used by law enforcement in the United Kingdom and estimated that the cameras led to a 50 percent reduction in use of force, and in addition, complaints against police fell approximately by 90 percent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes all law enforcement agencies and officers for their tireless work to protect us and make our communities safer;

(2) recognizes the potential for the use of body-worn cameras by on-duty law enforcement officers to improve community relations, increase transparency, and protect both citizens and police; and

(3) encourages State and local law enforcement agencies to consider the use of body-worn cameras, including policies and protocols to handle privacy, storage, and other relevant concerns.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H. Res. 295, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I would like to begin by thanking the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) for introducing this resolution and commend them for their work on this important issue.

Policing is an inherently dangerous job. Our law enforcement officers deserve our gratitude for the work they do on a daily basis to make sure that our streets are safe, the most helpless in our communities are protected, and those who commit crimes are brought to justice.

I am very concerned that force is used appropriately and that police officers are taking appropriate steps to protect innocent civilians when they make encounters. There is increasing unrest in our urban communities about policing.

I am also concerned with the repeated targeting of our police and law enforcement personnel. Last week, a terror suspect believed to be plotting to behead a Boston officer was killed in a confrontation with Boston police. Last month, two police officers were killed by criminals hoping to become cop killers. Officers Dean and Tate, responding to a routine traffic stop in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, were gunned down by a group of five men.

□ 1730

This comes on the heels of more widely known murders last year of Officers Ramos and Liu in New York, who were reportedly targeted by a man looking to kill a police officer.

It is clear that we must find a better way for our police and citizens to interact both in everyday situations and when more difficult circumstances

arise. In May, the Judiciary Committee held a very informative and productive hearing on policing in the 21st Century, where we looked at many of these issues, including the use of body-worn cameras by police officers.

Body-worn cameras present an opportunity to strengthen police and citizens' interactions, but there are many issues surrounding the use of body-worn cameras that should be addressed by legislators, law enforcement, and the general public before Congress or State legislatures mandate widespread use of this technology.

We must be cognizant of the cost and resources associated not just with outfitting officers with body-worn cameras, but with the regulations, training, and compliance associated with their use. We should also be aware of the costs and privacy implications associated with storing the footage of body-worn cameras.

Police routinely interact with crime victims, including minors, and members of the general public. Would all of these interactions be recorded and stored by law enforcement agencies? For how long? Who would have access to this information? For instance, could it be obtained in a civil suit, a divorce or custody case, or as part of a Freedom of Information Act request?

If an officer exercises his or her discretion to turn off a camera, it is possible the courts would impose an adverse inference against the government if a defendant then argued that something improper happened while the camera was not filming. The courts could also impose an adverse inference if there is a technical or storage glitch that interferes with taping or access to the video.

Society must also decide if it wants this technology recording us on a constant basis. Last week, the President signed the House-passed USA FREEDOM Act into law, which ended bulk metadata collection by the NSA.

We should exercise caution before mandating use of a technology that has the potential to gather and store information about Americans, many of them innocent civilians, based simply on a person's interaction with a police officer.

Body-worn police cameras can serve an important purpose in improving interactions between law enforcement and the general public and be a valuable source of evidence of wrongdoing; but we, as lawmakers and as a society, must ensure that this technology is used appropriately.

We have achieved this before when addressing the use of police dashboard cameras, but we must now do so again in a situation that is potentially much more intrusive.

Several police departments have already begun using body-worn cameras, and various pilot programs are also underway. Their successes and pitfalls will be instructive as we explore expanded use of this technology.

I once again thank the gentleman from Texas for his work on this resolu-

tion and also applaud the work of our law enforcement officers nationwide.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today to support this resolution and to thank my colleagues for putting forward H. Res. 295, particularly Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. CLAY and Mr. CLEAVER—both of whom represent the Missouri area—and a number of other Members who have joined in on sponsoring this legislation.

I like this because it is a kick-start to what Members of Congress, Mr. Speaker, have been talking about, and what we have talked about, criminal justice reform.

As we well know, we in the Judiciary Committee are receiving information. We are listening to Members; we are obviously listening to Members who are committed and dedicated, and we are committed to criminal justice reform.

This is the right kind of kick-start to be able to put on minds of individuals that we know that this effort of criminal justice reform requires the communication and cooperation of our law enforcement officers and as well to recognize the vitality and the importance of communities who have argued Black lives matter—or they have just argued that lives matter, which they do.

Let me, first of all, join Mr. GOODLATTE on acknowledging the tragedy of police shootings. Whether or not it was the heinous shootings in New York on two occasions and probably more or whether or not it was a recent incident in Houston, Texas, when a valiant officer was mowed down by a fleeing felon, or any number of incidents that have caught our men and women in the line of fire—and their families have seen their service, their life, and their contributions snuffed out by violence—that is not something that we applaud and we certainly abhor.

I believe the language in this resolution gives us the sense of Congress that allows us to recognize all law enforcement agencies and officers, thanking them for their tireless work to protect us and make our communities safer, and recognize the potential for the use of body-worn cameras by on-duty law enforcement officers, to improve community relations, increase transparency, and protect both citizens and police.

I will assure you that the Judiciary Committee will thoughtfully look at legislation that fits squarely on the framework of this taking into consideration many concerns and encourages State and local law enforcement agencies to consider the use of body-worn cameras, including policies and protocols, to handle privacy, storage, and other relevant issues.

I am glad those are recognized because we are a country of laws, and we recognize the civil liberties and civil rights of all citizens.

As we discuss this legislation, however, I want to emphasize the impor-

tance of the timing. It is time for comprehensive policing and criminal justice reform. We are witnessing a sea change unlike many others with support for this great cause spanning the ideological and party divide. We in the Judiciary Committee have spoken about it and are finding common ways to work together.

In the area of policing, the problems revealed by several of the more notorious incidents involving the use of lethal force against unarmed citizens have captured the attention of the Nation over the past few months and demonstrates a critical need for a national response.

Law enforcement officers individually will indicate training is a key element of this. Any response to these tragic events must go hand in hand with a holistic view of criminal justice reform. It will do us no good to be able to point at one group and not try to help another, so I am very grateful that my State, the State of Texas, has contributed to this dialogue and most recently in grand jury reform.

As I have joined with my colleagues to acknowledge and celebrate law enforcement and encourage the move forward on criminal justice reform, I am grateful to again do it today, but we should also look at a vast array of opportunities.

Sentencing and prison reform should be on our agenda. One such proposal would give the Federal Bureau of Prisons the discretion to release nonviolent prisoners who served at least half of their sentence, are 45 or more years old, and who have not been disciplined for a violent offense. This would not only alleviate some prison overcrowding, but it would dip into the \$75 billion that we are paying for incarceration.

Congress should also look at the fact in the Federal system that right now we give 47 days for 54 days of good time. If we did one for one, it would be an opportunity to save millions of dollars, at least \$41 million; and 4,000 persons would be able to be lifted who would be able to be rehabilitated.

One of the more difficult parts of coming into the criminal justice system is the journey of coming out of it. Where an individual has paid his or her debt, the process of reentering society is paid with tremendous and often insurmountable obstacles.

I have drafted legislation that will allow those with a criminal conviction to have a fair chance to compete for jobs with Federal agencies and contractors. This "ban the box" measure delays a potential employer's inquiry into the applicant's criminal history until later in the hiring process. Employers can still ask, but pushing the inquiry into a later stage in the process where you have seen whether this person is ready and able to have a job.

Again, this resolution speaks about our view and affection for our law enforcement and adding more tools. Each of us have had wonderful experiences with those men and women who serve.

Mr. Speaker, the time for comprehensive policing and criminal justice reform has arrived. We are witnessing a sea shift unlike any others, with support for this great cause spanning the ideological and party divide.

In the area of policing, the problems revealed by several of the more notorious incidents involving the use of lethal force against unarmed citizens has captured the attention of the nation over the past few months and demonstrates the critical need for a national response.

And any response to these tragic events must go hand-in-hand with changes to the entirety of our criminal justice system.

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee; as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations; and as a Representative from Houston, let me extend my thanks to the Congressman from my home state of Texas for contributing to the discussion of this very important and timely issue.

Just as I have joined with him in Houston before—to acknowledge and celebrate law enforcement and to encourage and move forward criminal justice reform—I am grateful to do so again today.

The very fact that this measure is on the floor today is a great indicator that Congress is ready for comprehensive criminal justice and policing reform.

This is why I am looking at reforms that will address all aspects of our criminal justice system and drafting legislation accordingly.

One such proposal would give the Bureau of Prisons discretion to release nonviolent prisoners who have served at least half their sentence, are 45 or more years old, and who have not been disciplined for violent conduct while in prison.

This would not only alleviate some prison over-crowding, it would result in substantial cost savings by removing the expensive medical care for older prisoners.

By including a clarification of the federal prisoner good time credit law, the cost savings of this proposal is even more significant. Congress intended for all federal prisoners to be eligible for 54 days of good time credit, not 47 days as currently interpreted by the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

This small change—just one week per year—will not only reflect our original intent, it will save at least \$41 million annually.

One of the most difficult parts of coming into the criminal justice system is the journey of coming out of it.

For an individual who has paid his or her debt, the process of re-entering society is paved with tremendous, and often insurmountable, obstacles.

I have drafted legislation that will allow those with a criminal conviction to have a fair chance to compete for jobs with federal agencies and contractors. This “ban-the-box” measure delays a potential employer’s inquiry into the applicant’s criminal history until later in the hiring process.

Employers can still ask—but pushing the inquiry until a later stage in the process allows applicants to get a foot in the door and be considered at the early stage on their merits alone.

Many studies, including one released by the Journal of Adolescent Health, demonstrate that the adolescent brain continues to develop as young persons mature well into their 20s.

Yet, we begin holding our young offenders accountable as adults when they reach the age of 18, 16, and sometimes even earlier. And we send them off to what many describe as “criminal college.”

This is why I am developing legislation that will provide judges with new and different options when a young offender comes before them. These options will give judges discretion to tailor a punishment to that young offender’s needs.

And, when sending a young offender to prison is necessary, my legislation will ensure that the Bureau of Prisons separates these young offenders out from the rest of the prison population and provides specialized programs for their needs. This will put young offenders on a path for change, not one of crime.

It is not enough to improve the system of criminal justice, we must also address the unnecessary loss of life that can result from police and civilian interactions. Reform must take a step towards increasing trust between our communities and law enforcement.

This is why I am developing legislation that will provide law enforcement agencies with the funding and assistance to put in place the policies, protocols, and training programs in accord with national accreditation standards.

But rebuilding the trust in this relationship also requires greater transparency when government responds to incidents involving the use of lethal force against unarmed citizens.

This is why I have drafted legislation that provides incentives and support for jurisdictions to bring in an independent investigation and prosecution team for an unbiased review of such incidents.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time on this debate.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure at this time to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), the author of this legislation.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor to stand in the well of the House and have an opportunity to advocate on behalf of the constituents of the Ninth Congressional District. Today is no exception.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to stand here in support of bipartisan legislation, legislation that encourages law enforcement to use body cameras. This legislation is legislation that I am proud to say has received a good deal of support and a good deal of consideration and deliberation.

I would like to thank the Speaker of the House, Mr. BOEHNER, for his assistance in bringing this legislation forward. Of course, the Honorable NANCY PELOSI must be given kudos as well. I thank her for allowing the legislation to come forward and assisting.

The Democratic whip, Mr. HOYER, I want to thank him because we had a conversation concerning this legislation. Of course, the chairperson of the Judiciary Committee, the Honorable BOB GOODLATTE, he and I have had an opportunity to talk through this legislation, and I am eternally grateful for the consideration that you have given, sir, and I thank you.

I also would like to thank the dean of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN CONYERS. He has been here on so many occasions when legislation that is exceedingly important has been passed upon and has been a voice, a voice on all of these issues through the years. I am proud to say that I had an opportunity to speak to him about this legislation.

Of course, I want to thank Mr. TED POE of Texas. He and I came to Congress together, and we worked together. This is a piece of legislation that he was the first to sign onto, H. Res. 295.

Mr. EMANUEL CLEAVER of Missouri, he and I have worked together to shepherd this from the very beginning, and he is still a part of it. He is not here tonight, but he is with us on this legislation. I am proud to say he is a friend, and he has been a partner throughout the effort to bring this legislation to the floor of the House.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER, he has been a friend in this; Mr. CLAY of Missouri; Mr. YODER of Kansas; and, of course, Ms. CLARKE of New York—all friends and all supportive of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, as has been indicated, is the beginning. I don’t see it as the end of a process. I see it as more of a preamble with the Constitution to follow. I see it as a lawyer might see an opening statement with the closing statement yet to come.

Of course, as a Christian, I see it as a part of Genesis, with many revelations yet to come. It is a good first step, and it is a good step in the right direction. I don’t see it as the end of the process, but I do want to commend and thank those who have helped us to get to this point.

I would cite now, if I may, a Justice Department report. This report styled “Police Officer Body-Worn Cameras” found that body-worn cameras increased transparency. People have the opportunity to see what actually took place. It makes a difference because this will increase police legitimacy.

Officers don’t have to get into disputes about what actually occurred. The empirical evidence is there by way of the camera’s eye.

It will improve citizen and police behavior. Once the camera is on and once people know that it is on—that is both citizens and police officers—their behavior tends to be adjusted such that we get better results.

It will improve effective prosecution. This is evidence that can be introduced into court. When it is introduced, it can help effectuate positive results.

Another study, a study from the University of Cambridge, its Institute of Criminology, after a 12-month study, found a 50 percent reduction in the use of force as a result of body cameras, a 50 percent reduction in use of force, a 90 percent reduction in complaints against police officers as a result of body cameras being utilized.

Of course, there is a final study that I will cite in Rialto, California. This

report from Rialto, California, indicates that, after 1 year of use of body cameras, there was a 60 percent reduction in the use of force and an 88 percent reduction in complaints against police officers.

The evidence is in. It is clear that these body cameras do provide an opportunity for us to have the transparency we need, for us to provide legitimacy for both police officers and citizenry but, more importantly, to reduce the complaints that we see emanating from scenes that are disputed.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

□ 1745

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, we see a reduction in complaints. As we view the many incidents that have occurred around the country, there is no question that there is a divide. I believe that these body cameras can span the chasm across the divide and make a difference in the perception that we have in the way our police and our communities interact with each other.

I am proud to be a sponsor, and I am proud to have the cosponsors that we have. I am proud that the chairperson of the Judiciary Committee has signed onto this and that the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee is on board.

I want to thank my colleague from Houston, Texas, the Honorable SHEILA JACKSON LEE, who has served on the Judiciary Committee for many, many years, and I am most appreciative that she, too, finds favor with this piece of legislation. I am honored that she is on the floor tonight to shepherd it through, and I pray that my colleagues all will support what I believe to be a piece of legislation that can span the chasm between the police and the community in a most positive way.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no speakers remaining, and I am prepared to yield back.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume as I am the final speaker.

First of all, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his very eloquent explanation of this legislation. Let me add my appreciation as well to Chairman GOODLATTE, to Ranking Member CONYERS, and to Chairman SENSENBRENNER. It is certainly my pleasure to manage and to work with this legislation, in the purpose of this legislation.

I close with just a few points that I feel compelled to comment on. As I do so, I am not giving all of the names of those fallen. As I have indicated, we tragically buried an HPD officer just a couple of weeks ago and, of course, officers in Mississippi, officers in New Mexico, in Omaha, Nebraska, and in Pennsylvania, among others. We recognize that we are challenged and that we must find that common ground.

Again, I note that this kick start will help us to look at comprehensive criminal justice reform.

Let me just add one last point on the young offenders issue that may be somewhat similar to the video that has now imploded across the airwaves of America in McKinney, Texas. One study dealing with young offenders or individual adolescents includes a report by the Journal of Adolescent Health which demonstrates that the adolescent brain continues to develop as young persons mature well into their twenties; yet we begin holding our young offenders accountable as adults when they reach the age of 18 and sometimes earlier, and we send them off to what many describe as a criminal college. So I am hoping that we will have legislation that can address by science the concept, if you will, of how we treat those from 18 to 24.

This legislation allows us to build on policing and community trust. I am looking forward to working with law enforcement agencies with the funding and assistance to put in place the policies and protocols dealing with training, deescalation, accreditation. That is, of course, something that we hope to be working on with the full Judiciary Committee.

There are some stark differences of treatment between two cities—the city of Charleston, South Carolina, where a tragic incident occurred and where the city responded immediately, and the city of Cleveland, where a tragic incident occurred and where the city did not respond immediately.

Then, this past weekend, we saw confusing footage, I think, that dealt with teenagers at a pool party. We know that police were called. We know that this party was, really, a party of girls who happened to be African American, and we understand that some boys, who tend to like to find girls, came and may have caused somewhat of a disturbance. The reason I think it is important as we discuss this legislation is that the bill does indicate our appreciation for law enforcement. My words say that this will allow us to kick-start and look at issues where we can work together to get along. But as the video indicates, we see a scattering of young people, and we see a number of foul-mouthed comments being made coming from one particular officer. They are quotes I will not offer to repeat on this floor.

I submit for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, an article from *The Atlantic* as, I think, this is a testament to how we can work to avoid this kind of public incident.

[From the Atlantic, June 8, 2015]

(By Yoni Appelbaum)

On Friday, a large group of teens gathered for a pool party in the city of McKinney, Texas. Shortly thereafter, someone called the police. And by Sunday night, as footage of the police response spread across the internet, the McKinney Police Department announced it was placing Eric Casebolt, the

patrol supervisor shown in the video, on administrative leave.

It is the latest in a string of incidents of police using apparently excessive force against African Americans that has captured public attention. And it took place at a communal pool—where, for more than a century, conflicts over race and class have often surfaced.

The video shows a foul-mouthed police corporal telling the young men he encounters to get down, and the young women to take off, although far more obscenely. When several seated young men appear to ask, politely, for permission to leave, he explodes at them: “Don’t make me fucking run around here with thirty pounds of goddamn gear in the sun because you want to screw around out here.” The corporal was white. The young people he detained were, almost without exception, black.

The video next shows him repeatedly cursing at a group of young women, telling them to move on. Then he wrestles one to the ground. As bystanders react in horror, and several rush toward the young woman as if to her assistance, he draws his sidearm. They flee. He returns to the teenager, wrestles her back down, forces her face into the ground, and places both knees on her back.

The McKinney police said, in a statement, that they were called to respond to the Craig Ranch North Community Pool for a report of “a disturbance involving multiple juveniles at the location, who do not live in the area or have permission to be there, refusing to leave.” They added that additional calls reported fighting, and that when the crowd refused to comply with the first responding officers, nine additional units were deployed.

The mayor, Brian Loughmiller, described himself as “disturbed and concerned,” and the police chief vowed “a complete, and thorough, investigation.”

Like many flourishing American suburbs, McKinney has struggled with questions of equity and diversity. The city is among the fastest-growing in America, and its residents hail from a wide range of backgrounds. Formal, legal segregation is a thing of the past. Yet stark divides persist.

In 2009, McKinney was forced to settle a lawsuit alleging that it was blocking the development of affordable housing suitable for tenants with Section 8 vouchers in the more affluent western portion of the city. East of Highway 75, according to the lawsuit, McKinney is 49 percent white; to its west, McKinney is 86 percent white. The plaintiffs alleged that the city and its housing authority were “willing to negotiate for and provide low-income housing units in east McKinney, but not west McKinney, which amounts to illegal racial steering.”

All three of the city’s public pools lie to the east of Highway 75. Craig Ranch, where the pool party took place, lies well to its west. BuzzFeed reports that the fight broke out when an adult woman told the teens to go back to “Section 8 housing.”

Craig Ranch North is the oldest residential portion of a 2,200 acre master-planned community. “The neighborhood is made up of single-family homes,” says the developer’s website, “and includes a community center with two pools, a park and a playground.” Private developments like Craig Ranch now routinely include pools, often paid for by dues to homeowners’ associations, and governed by their rules. But that, in itself, represents a remarkable shift.

At their inception, communal swimming pools were public, egalitarian spaces. Most early public pools in America aimed more for hygiene than relaxation, open on alternate days to men and women. In the North, at least, they served bathers without regard for race. But in the 1920s, as public swimming

pools proliferated, they became sites of leisure and recreation. Alarmed at the sight of women and men of different races swimming together, public officials moved to impose rigid segregation.

As African Americans fought for desegregation in the 1950s, public pools became frequent battlefields. In Marshall, Texas, for example, in 1957, a young man backed by the NAACP sued to force the integration of a brand-new swimming pool. When the judge made it clear the city would lose, citizens voted 1,758–89 to have the city sell all of its recreational facilities rather than integrate them. The pool was sold to a local Lions' Club, which was able to operate it as a whites-only private facility.

The decisions of other communities were rarely so transparent, but the trend was unmistakable. Before 1950, Americans went swimming as often as they went to the movies, but they did so in public pools. There were relatively few club pools, and private pools were markers of extraordinary wealth. Over the next half-century, though, the number of private in-ground pools increased from roughly 2,500 to more than four million. The declining cost of pool construction, improved technology, and suburbanization all played important roles. But then, so did desegregation. As historian Jeff Wiltsie argues in his 2007 book, *Contested Waters: A Social History of Swimming Pools in America*:

Although many whites abandoned desegregated public pools, most did not stop swimming. Instead, they built private pools, both club and residential, and swam in them. . . . Suburbanites organized private club pools rather than fund public pools because club pools enabled them to control the class and racial composition of swimmers, whereas public pools did not.

Today, that complicated legacy persists across the United States. The public pools of mid-century—with their sandy beaches, manicured lawns, and well-tended facilities—are vanishingly rare. Those sorts of amenities are now generally found behind closed gates, funded by club fees or homeowners' dues, and not by tax dollars. And they are open to those who can afford to live in such subdivisions, but not to their neighbors just down the road.

Whatever took place in McKinney on Friday, it occurred against this backdrop of the privatization of once-public facilities, giving residents the expectation of control over who sunbathes or doggie-paddles alongside them. Even if some of the teens were residents, and others possessed valid guest passes, as some insisted they did, the presence of "multiple juveniles . . . who do not live in the area" clearly triggered alarm. Several adults at the pool reportedly placed calls to the police. And none of the adult residents shown in the video appeared to manifest concern that the police response had gone too far, nor that its violence was disproportionate to the alleged offense.

To the contrary. Someone placed a sign by the pool on Sunday afternoon. It read, simply: "Thank you McKinney Police for keeping us safe."

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is not dealing with a vast group of protesters, which, ultimately, did occur in the last 24 hours in that area. This is dealing with youngsters. Many of us raise children and send them to pools and various camps, and we hope they will be well, but this is understanding the whole level of law enforcement. Again, I believe it is time for the Congress to re-create the criminal justice system.

Juveniles are naturally fearful of authority and lack maturity when faced

with fearful events. Running is the natural instinct of most youth, and in this case, the youth attempted to leave when the police approached to disperse the crowd. Then the police chased, shooting a Taser. When the officer confronted the young girl with aggression, other youth attempted to help her—that is, teenagers—who were also threatened with force by the officers. These children received mixed messages. Establishing trusting relationships between youth and police officers is of the utmost responsibility.

What I would say is that the outrage and the expressions of a community and parents came about because we were not talking to each other, because actions did not track what those young people were doing in McKinney. They were being teenagers. They were running. They may have had the incidences of misbehavior, and, frankly, they could have been handled in a way that the misbehavior could have been addressed.

Why now?

Again, I opened with the remarks that we now have an opportunity to kick-start this wonderful discussion of criminal justice reform. Wonderful? Yes, because, in America, we are a nation of civilians and law. The civilian law enforcement is made up of those who implement those laws, but the Constitution reigns as well. I look forward to working with the chairman and the ranking member and all of the Members of this body and the Judiciary Committee for a very constructive journey on letting the American people know that we hear their pain, that we respect those who uphold the law, and that we are going to work constructively to do that.

I left Houston while talking to a police officer. I know he is not listening, but let me just simply say thank you for the service that you give. Hopefully, he will hear this and will know that we are committed to working together in this Congress. I ask my colleagues to support House Resolution 295.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) for their hard work on this, for coming to see me and others on our side of the aisle about this important issue, and for working with us on getting the language straight in this resolution in order to make sure that we are properly encouraging this exploration while also taking into account the issues that arise with the use of body cameras.

I want to thank the ranking member and the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. CONYERS, and the ranking member of the subcommittee, Ms. JACKSON LEE, for their work on this as well. I also want to thank all of the staff involved.

This is an important issue, and it will help to inform us as we move

ahead on a number of issues related to criminal justice reform. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 295.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

## COMMODITY END-USER RELIEF ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 2289) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-users manage risks, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 246, nays 171, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 309]

YEAS—246

Abraham	Black	Carter (GA)
Aderholt	Blackburn	Carter (TX)
Allen	Blum	Chabot
Amash	Bost	Chaffetz
Amodei	Boustany	Clawson (FL)
Ashford	Brady (TX)	Coffman
Babin	Brat	Cole
Barletta	Bridenstine	Collins (GA)
Barr	Brooks (AL)	Collins (NY)
Barton	Brooks (IN)	Comstock
Benishek	Buchanan	Conaway
Billirakis	Bucshon	Cook
Bishop (GA)	Burgess	Costa
Bishop (MI)	Byrne	Costello (PA)
Bishop (UT)	Calvert	Cramer