

would argue that. But that is an argument for the State legislature. It is not an argument for Congress. That is an argument on the economic merits of the State's exercise of its own tax powers and its own judgment within its own borders. For Congress to step in and say: New York must forgo \$125 million in revenue or some other State must forgo \$55 million or maybe \$22.38 entirely based on economic activity within that State is, frankly, none of our business.

Today we talk about the burden that this imposes. Yes, a State might be wise to exempt small amounts of income so you don't need 50 W-2s to someone who earns a total of \$50,000, but for someone who earns \$50 million and may earn \$20 million in a couple of days in a State, that State ought to be able to tax it, and it ought to be up to the economic and political judgment of that State as to how, in the interests of economic intelligence, to limit its exercise of its taxing power so as not to discourage business. That is a State's decision.

We hear a lot of rhetoric about States' rights and sovereignty and yielding power to the States on the floor, but here is an example going much farther than anything else I have seen, frankly, of the Federal Government stepping in and saying to a State: You may not exercise your taxing power within your State when it has nothing to do with another State.

If someone comes into the State and earns \$50 million in 10 days or 3 weeks or 4½ weeks, why shouldn't that State be able to tax it if it wishes to? By what right does Congress tell it that it can't? By what right does Congress tell New York: You must forgo \$100 to \$125 million in revenue?

Even the efficiency argument doesn't make much sense with today's computers and computer ability.

So I think that this is an invasion of States' rights. It is an invasion of the core ability of the State to tax within its own borders. It is an invasion of—it is not a theft—it is a deprivation, my own State is about \$125 million, which our taxpayers will have to make up, and it is wrong for that reason.

Now, I understand why ALEC might support this bill. ALEC wants government to do nothing, wants the Federal Government not to tax, the State governments not to tax, and have as little power as possible. That is a view, but it is not a view that justifies the Federal Government telling a State and telling the States' voters that, whether they like it or not, they shouldn't tax economic activity within that State, they should come up with the money some other way or they should have less State services. That is for the States' taxpayers, the States' voters to decide.

This bill is an imposition on the States. It is an imposition on the people of the States. It is wrong.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before I came to the United States Congress, I served as general counsel and chief legal officer for a small business. One of my primary functions was to ensure compliance on the patchwork of government requirements and issues that presented itself every day. It was a huge burden for our company. It was a huge burden for the employees of our company.

This is exactly what we are talking about today. This is the exact kind of compliance that is choking out small business and really, really falling on the shoulders of those who can least afford it.

Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense solution to a real problem. We live in a global economy. It is something we can't deny. Our mobile workforce is there, and it is going to continue to grow. We cannot continue to penalize companies and individuals for that fact.

We have 180 cosponsors for this that accede the exact basis for what we are trying to accomplish here. These are bipartisan folks—Republicans and Democrats. The same is true with a companion bill in the Senate. There are lots and lots of outside groups that support it, not just specific legislative groups, but businesses that deal with this every day.

So I am very proud of this bill. I am grateful to Representative JOHNSON of Georgia for his work on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2315.

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.

PROTECTION OF THE RIGHT OF TRIBES TO STOP THE EXPORT OF CULTURAL AND TRADITIONAL PATRIMONY RESOLUTION

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 122) supporting efforts to stop the theft, illegal possession or sale, transfer, and export of tribal cultural items of American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians in the United States and internationally, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 122

Whereas this resolution may be cited as the "Protection of the Right of Tribes to

stop the Export of Cultural and Traditional Patrimony Resolution" or the "PROTECT Patrimony Resolution";

Whereas the tribal cultural items of American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians (collectively "tribes" or "Native Americans") in the United States of America include ancestral remains; funerary objects; sacred objects; and objects of cultural patrimony (hereinafter "tribal cultural items"), which are objects that have ongoing historical, traditional, or cultural importance central to a Native American group or culture itself, and which, therefore, cannot be alienated, appropriated, or conveyed by any individual;

Whereas tribal cultural items are vital to tribal cultural survival and the maintenance of tribal ways of life;

Whereas the nature and the description of tribal cultural items are sensitive and to be treated with respect and confidentiality, as appropriate;

Whereas violators often export tribal cultural items overseas with the intent of evading Federal and tribal laws;

Whereas tribal cultural items continue to be removed from tribal possession and sold in black or public markets in violation of Federal and tribal laws, including laws designed to protect tribal cultural property rights;

Whereas the illegal trade of tribal cultural items involves a sophisticated and lucrative black market, as items make their way through domestic markets, and then are often exported overseas;

Whereas auction houses in foreign countries have held sales of tribal cultural items from the Pueblo of Acoma, the Pueblo of Laguna, the Pueblo of San Felipe, the Hopi Tribe, and other tribes;

Whereas after tribal cultural items are exported abroad, tribes have difficulty stopping the sale of these items and securing their repatriation to their home communities, where the items belong;

Whereas Federal agencies have a responsibility to consult with tribes to stop the theft, illegal possession or sale, transfer, and export of tribal cultural items;

Whereas an increase in the investigation and successful prosecution of violations of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 470aa–470mm) is necessary to deter illegal traders; and

Whereas many tribes and tribal organizations have passed resolutions condemning the theft and sale of tribal cultural items, including—

(1) the National Congress of American Indians passed Resolutions SAC-12-008 and SD-15-075 to call upon the United States, in consultation with tribes, to address international repatriation and take affirmative actions to stop the theft and illegal sale of tribal cultural items both domestically and abroad;

(2) the All Pueblo Council of Governors, representative of 20 Pueblo Indian tribes, noting that the Pueblo Indian tribes of the southwestern United States have been disproportionately affected by the illegal sale of tribal cultural items both domestically and internationally and in violation of Federal and tribal laws, passed Resolutions Nos. 2015-12 and 2015-13 to call upon the United States, in consultation with tribes, to address international repatriation and take affirmative actions to stop the theft and illegal sale of tribal cultural items both domestically and abroad;

(3) the United South and Eastern Tribes, an intertribal organization comprised of twenty-six federally recognized tribes, passed Resolution No. 2015:007, which calls

upon the United States to address all means to support repatriation of ancestral remains and cultural items from beyond United States borders; and

(4) the Inter-Tribal Council of the Five Civilized Tribes, uniting the Chickasaw, Choctaw, Cherokee, Muscogee (Creek), and Seminole Nations, passed Resolution No. 12-07, which requests that the United States assist in international repatriations and take immediate action, after consultation with tribes, to address repatriation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) condemns the theft, illegal possession or sale, transfer, and export of tribal cultural items;

(2) calls upon the Secretaries of the Department of the Interior, the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Homeland Security and the Attorney General to consult with tribes and traditional Native American religious leaders in addressing this important issue, to take affirmative action to stop these illegal practices, and to secure repatriation of tribal cultural items to tribes;

(3) supports the development of explicit restrictions on the export of tribal cultural items; and

(4) encourages State and local governments and interested groups and organizations to work cooperatively in deterring the theft, illegal possession or sale, transfer, and export of tribal cultural items and in securing the repatriation of tribal cultural items.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. 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. Con. Res. 122, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 122, the PROTECT Patrimony Resolution, which expresses support for efforts to stop the theft, illegal sale, and trafficking of Native American tribal cultural items. I commend my colleague from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) for introducing this important resolution.

The United States is home to 567 federally recognized tribes. Tribal cultural items and sacred artifacts of these tribes are central to Native American culture and religion. As we study and learn from these items, it is imperative that we also protect them from theft and commercialization for personal gain.

The extent and nature of this illegal activity is largely understudied. While the exact numbers have yet to be determined, the Bureau of Indian Affairs reports in its most recent statistics

that more than 8,000 objects of cultural patrimony have been repatriated since 1990. It remains unclear, however, how many items have been stolen or illegally sold. We must obtain more comprehensive data to better understand the nature of this issue.

For that reason, I joined Congressman PEARCE and Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee Chairman SENSENBRENNER in requesting a study by the Government Accountability Office to determine how the Federal Government can help prevent the illegal excavation and removal of cultural items from Federal and tribal land, the status of Federal agency efforts to repatriate Native American cultural items, and information about the international market for trafficking these cultural items.

Several auctions around the world have been criticized for routinely selling Native American goods. Earlier this year, the planned sale of an Acoma shield used in religious ceremonies was halted after the Federal Government and the Acoma Tribe advocated for its repatriation, claiming that there was reason to believe that this object was stolen.

H. Con. Res. 122 condemns the theft, illegal possession, or sale and export of tribal cultural items; supports the development of explicit restrictions on the export of tribal cultural items; calls upon the secretaries of various Federal agencies and the Attorney General to take affirmative steps to secure the repatriation of these items to their respective tribes, and encourages cooperation between governmental and tribal entities in these efforts.

□ 1930

Protection of tribal cultural items is critical to maintaining our Nation's cultural heritage. I look forward to obtaining more information through the GAO's research, and I urge passage of the resolution sponsored by my colleague, Congressman PEARCE.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 122, the Protection of the Right of Tribes to stop the Export of Cultural and Traditional Patrimony Resolution, or the PROTECT Patrimony Resolution. I commend Mr. PEARCE and his Democratic cosponsor, Ms. McCOLLUM, for their leadership on this issue.

This important resolution condemns the theft, illegal possession, sale, transfer, and export for tribal cultural items belonging to American Indians, Alaska Natives, and American Hawaiians in the United States and internationally.

For those of us who have visited reservations, such as those in the State of Texas and Pueblos in New Mexico, we are well aware of the long, long history of Native Americans throughout the

United States. For far too long, Native Americans have struggled to protect their sacred and cultural artifacts—such as ancestral remains, funerary objects, and sacred items—from thieves who steal these precious objects, all in the pursuit of profits; and I hope it will now stop.

These irreplaceable objects are vital to the survival of tribal culture and to the maintenance of tribal ways of life. Yet, time and again, they are stolen by thieves who come in the dark of the night with axes, shovels, and even power tools to remove them from historical sites, which are often destroyed in the process.

In turn, these tribal cultural items are illegally sold domestically and internationally through black and public markets in violation of Federal and tribal laws that protect tribal cultural property rights. The loss of these artifacts harms not only Native Americans but all Americans. It robs our Nation of an incredibly important opportunity to learn from and respect these rich and vibrant cultures.

In recognition of these concerns, H. Con. Res. 122 calls upon various Federal agencies to consult with Native American tribes and their religious leaders in order to better understand the problem and, thereby, stop these illegal practices and repatriate stolen tribal cultural items to their rightful owners.

This resolution also asks the Government Accountability Office to study the scope of illegal trafficking in these artifacts, both domestically and internationally, which will help identify ways to end illegal trafficking.

Further, the resolution expresses support for the development of explicit restrictions on the export of tribal cultural items. Specifically, it encourages cooperation among State and local governments, as well as groups and organizations, in an effort to deter the theft, illegal possession, sale, and export of these items.

Accordingly, I support H. Con. Res. 122.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), the sponsor of the resolution.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BISHOP for yielding the time. I appreciate the comments from my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), on this significant bill and resolution that we are talking about tonight.

I grew up in the corner of New Mexico that does not have Indian tribes in it, so when I was elected to Congress in 2003, I began service, started traveling into some of the Indian reservations, and slowly began to develop relationships and friendships with those tribes.

In 2013, one of my friends from Laguna Pueblo called and said: we have one of our culturally significant items that is going on sale in Paris and in France.

And he said: we are going to try to buy it, but we are not sure that we can bring it home.

They ended up purchasing that item at the auction. And, sure enough, France would not allow them to take it out of the country, so we negotiated between our State Department and the French State Department. Finally, they were allowed to bring that item out.

They bought a first-class ticket for it. It was so significant that they did not want to let it travel as cargo in the hold of the airplane, instead, buying that first-class ticket to where it would sit there in the compartment with them.

Now, that is not a culture that I was familiar with until I began to form friendships among the Native Americans, but it is a story I hear repeated.

The same young man who purchased the item was going to buy the second item in that same sale and was dropped off the Internet down on the Indian reservation and did not purchase it. It is in his explanation of the missing of that second article. He said that he and his wife had lost a child in childbirth. And he said the feeling of missing that item was exactly the same as losing the child in childbirth.

Now, that is not something I necessarily can identify with, but I certainly identify with the emotions that say there are things that are so significant they should not be trafficked in.

We continued our kind of unofficial visits with the auction house at that point, and they began to say: look, many of the collectors would simply give the items back. They just don't want to be charged for things. These were sold usually in some sort of legal process. And so we had discussions, but nothing ever came of it.

Then again, at that same point, the Hopi Tribe in Arizona had articles for sale. One of them cost \$130,000. They had to buy them back. Again, the French Government would not help them at all. They took it to court and were simply turned down.

This year, Acoma came and said: look, we have got a couple of items that are in France, they are going on auction. We contacted the French Government, and they were simply resistant.

So we decided, with the help of the Acoma Tribe, with my friend, Mr. COLE, and Ms. MCCOLLUM, who has been a champion for Native American rights—we all formed the idea of this bill and submitted it. The day we submitted the bill, the French pulled the item. It was this time a shield from Acoma. They pulled it out of the auction.

Negotiations are still going on to bring that item back. But the idea that we as a government, we as the U.S. Government, should be studying these things that are around the world being sold internationally, maybe have enough significance that we would want them to be repatriated, we would

want them to come back to where people would know about their heritage.

Now, as I began to be familiar with the Indian culture, the U.S. Government was not always gracious in dealing with those Native American tribes. And so the least that we can do is help them reestablish that culture that lets them tell the children who are coming up about who they were, where they came from, and the things that are significant to them.

When I visit the tribes, occasionally they will bring out canes that were given to them to indicate their sovereignty. Those were given by Abraham Lincoln. Now, it sends goose bumps up and down my spine when I am standing on a tribal ground and they carefully bring out these canes that came from Abraham Lincoln to just signify their importance to the country. That is the value that their culture places on these items, and those items are passed around from one family to another to be in charge of the caretaking for it.

So this resolution today simply says that we want to study it, we want to figure out what we can do better, and let's do better.

Again, I thank my Democrat cosponsors. It is a very good bipartisan bill. It is a bicameral piece of legislation. I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and subcommittee Chairman SENSENBRENNER and the entire Judiciary Committee staff for the work on it.

I urge the passage of H. Con. Res. 122. Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, let me thank my good friend, Mr. PEARCE, and his cosponsors, Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. COLE, for their leadership.

In closing, tribal cultural objects play a crucial role in ensuring that Native Americans and generations to come retain the opportunity to learn about their rich heritage. They help to connect tribal members to their history, traditions, and personal identity. The story Mr. PEARCE told was a moving one and evidences how important this legislation is.

The theft of these objects is a direct assault against the vitality of Native American cultures. When they are stolen or destroyed, a piece of that culture is irretrievably gone not only for Native Americans but for all Americans and all others to understand that culture.

Our Nation has a responsibility to do everything in its power to protect and return these priceless artifacts. H. Con. Res. 122 recognizes the importance of this responsibility.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) that the House suspend the

rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 122, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRENGTHENING THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY SECURE MAIL INITIATIVE ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4712) to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide for an option under the Secure Mail Initiative under which a person to whom a document is sent under that initiative may require that the United States Postal Service obtain a signature from that person in order to deliver the document, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4712

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Strengthening the Department of Homeland Security Secure Mail Initiative Act".

SEC. 2. OPTION FOR SIGNATURE REQUIREMENT UNDER THE SECURE MAIL INITIATIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide for an option under the Secure Mail Initiative (or any successor program) under which a person to whom a document is sent under that initiative may require that the United States Postal Service obtain a signature from that person in order to deliver the document.

(b) FEE.—The Secretary shall require the payment of a fee from a person requiring a signature under subsection (a). Such fee may be set at a level that will ensure recovery of the full costs of providing all such services. Such fee may also be set at a level that will recover any additional costs associated with the administration of the fees collected.

SEC. 3. REPORT.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to Congress a report which includes—

- (1) the implementation of the requirements under section 2;
- (2) the fee imposed under section 2(b); and
- (3) the number of times during the previous year that a person required a signature under section 2(a).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 4712, currently under consideration.