well as Chairman SMITH, Ranking Member THORNBERRY, Subcommittee Chair LOFGREN, Subcommittee Ranking Member BUCK, along with Mr. GALLEGO and Mr. LIEU. I appreciate their willingness to work across the aisle and to demonstrate that it is possible to find common ground on some immigration and nationality issues.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I reserve balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4803, the Citizenship for Children of Military Members and Civil Servants Act.

Most people believe that, in all circumstances, as long as one parent is a U.S. citizen, a child is automatically a U.S. citizen. In reality, the Immigration and Nationality Act lays out specific residency, physical presence, and other requirements for when a child is deemed a U.S. citizen and what procedures a parent must go through to claim that citizenship.

For instance, section 320 of the INA requires that a child of a U.S. citizen automatically becomes a U.S. citizen if the child is under the age of 18 and is ''residing in the United States in the legal and physical custody of the citizen pursuant to a lawful admission for permanent residence.''

This creates a problem for some U.S. citizens and their families who are serving overseas in the military or other U.S. Government positions and who cannot return to the United States.

Until very recently, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, USCIS, had been interpreting the term ''residing in'' to cover children of U.S. citizen government employees or members of the U.S. Armed Forces who were employed or stationed outside the U.S. That interpretation, however, was inconsistent with other parts of the INA and inconsistent, even, with the State Department's interpretation.

Thus, there were instances when a U.S. citizen parent was told by USCIS that their child was automatically a U.S. citizen, but when the parent tried to obtain a U.S. passport for the child, they were told that the child was not yet a U.S. citizen because the proper process had not been followed.

In late August, USCIS issued policy guidance aimed at correctly interpreting ''residing in'' to be consistent with the INA and the State Department's interpretation.

It should be noted that, even if H.R. 4803 is not enacted, the children affected by USCIS' new guidance will still be able to claim U.S. citizenship; however, their families will have to jump through many more hoops to do so.

Luckily, this issue affects fewer than 100 families per year, most of whom are cases of adoption or where the child is a teenager when the parent naturalizes.

USCIS was legally correct to do what it did, but we in Congress are also right to make the technical change that allows the affected child to be automatically considered a U.S. citizen.

The committee ranking member worked closely with Chairman NADLER to craft H.R. 4803. The bill deems the child of a U.S. citizen parent to be in compliance with the residence requirements of INA section 320 in circumstances where: one, the U.S. citizen parent is an employee of the U.S. Government stationed abroad or a spouse of that employee residing abroad with that employee; or, two, the U.S. citizen parent is a member of the Armed Forces stationed abroad or spouse of that member residing abroad with that member, and the child is authorized to and is accompanying the member.

The bill ensures that children of U.S. Armed Forces members and U.S. Government personnel are not disadvantaged merely because their parents' service to our country requires them to be deployed abroad.

I am pleased that the legislative process worked as it should, that Republicans and Democrats saw a legal issue that needed to be fixed and we worked together to pass the affecting legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

This bipartisan legislation would provide greater flexibility and support to those who have dedicated their careers to serving our Nation when they have children born abroad.

I again thank my colleagues for the bipartisan nature of the work and support of this bill. I urge all my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4803, the Citizenship for Children of Military Members and Civil Servants Act.

I applaud Judiciary Chairman JERROLD NADLER (D–NY) and House Judiciary Ranking Member DOUG COLLINS (R–GA) for introducing this bipartisan legislation aimed to fix a problem in current citizenship laws.

The current citizenship law implemented by this Administration in October, serves as a disadvantage to certain children who are born abroad and reside with a parent serving overseas in the military or as a federal government employee.

Under current law, such children are required to establish U.S. residency in order to obtain citizenship, which can be difficult when a parent is stationed overseas.

This small but important change is the necessary fix for U.S. armed forces and in federal government positions overseas.

I am glad we could work together to introduce this bipartisan legislation that provides greater flexibility and support to those who have dedicated their careers to serving our nation.

American citizens who are deployed members of our military or government officials working abroad should have confidence their children will receive U.S. citizenship.

Military families are already making tremendous sacrifices to serve our country abroad and the children should not have to be penalized.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4803 because our military families should not have to deal with the bureaucracy of this Administration for their children to be United States citizens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4803, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADVANCING MUTUAL INTERESTS AND GROWING OUR SUCCESS ACT

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 565) to include Portugal in the list of foreign states whose nationals are eligible for admission into the United States as E1 and E2 nonimmigrants if United States nationals are treated similarly by the Government of Portugal, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 565

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 ''Advancing Mutual Interests and Growing Our Success Act'' or the ''AMIGOS Act''.

SEC. 2. NONIMMIGRANT TRADERS AND INVESTORS.

For purposes of clauses (i) and (ii) of section 101(a)(15)(E) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(E)), Portugal shall be considered to be a foreign state described in such section if the Government of Portugal provides similar nonimmigrant status to nationals of the United States.

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the AMIGOS Act is a bipartisan bill that I introduced, along with the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), my colleague, to encourage greater investment and trade between the United States and Portugal.

H.R. 565 makes Portuguese nationals eligible for E–1 and E–2 nonimmigrant visas if the Government of Portugal provides similar nonimmigrant status to U.S. nationals. Access to these investor visas will allow Portuguese investors to support projects in the United States, which will benefit our economy as well as that of Portugal.

As one of the first countries to recognize the United States after the Revolutionary War, Portugal is one of our closest economic partners and strongest allies. Today, the United States maintains that longstanding relationship as the fifth largest export market for Portugal and its largest trading partner outside of the European Union.

I am proud to represent the First District of Rhode Island, home to one of the country's largest and most vibrant Portuguese communities, a community that has made outstanding contributions in the arts, culture, business, and public service in this country for many decades.

From 2010–2015, we saw a 30 percent increase in trade between the United States and Portugal. 2015 also marked the year that the United States became Portugal's largest trading partner outside the European Union, with bilateral trade reaching $4.2 billion. Bilateral trade in goods and services between the United States and Portugal has continued to grow, with a 9 percent increase from $8 billion in 2018 when compared to just a year earlier. There are currently over 130 American companies operating in Portugal in a wide range of economic sectors, including pharmaceutical, chemical, technology, banking, and health sectors.

In 2018, the United States' direct investment position in Portugal was $2.8 billion, an increase of 37 percent from 2017. The direct investment position from Portugal in the United States, however, experienced a 3.5 percent decrease to $1 billion from 2017 to 2018.

While the majority of the countries within the European Union had preexisting bilateral investor treaties with the United States before joining the EU, Portugal did not and is one of the only five EU countries whose citizens are not currently eligible for E–1 or E–2 visas.

In the absence of a bilateral treaty, which Portugal cannot enter due to the rules of the European Union, Congress has the power to authorize E–1 and E–2 benefits to other countries; and we have exercised our authority to do so for both Israel in 2012 and New Zealand just last year. I am pleased to lead the effort to do the same for Portugal.

Foreign direct investment plays a significant role in the U.S. economy. One of the most important factors in encouraging investments in the United States is the availability of business-related visas, like nonimmigrant E–1 and E–2 visas. Allowing Portuguese citizens access to conduct substantial trade between the United States and Portugal or invest a substantial amount of capital in the United States to qualify for nonimmigrant E–1 and E–2 visas will help strengthen U.S.-Portugal ties and promote an increase in Portugal's investments in the United States.

Extending visas to Portugal not only gives Portuguese businesses an opportunity to invest in the United States, but it is a mutually beneficial relationship that promotes jobs in both countries and growth in United States businesses and our economy.

□ 1600

I am proud to lead this effort to support our ally and friend, Portugal. I want to thank Chairman NADLER for his strong support of this legislation and for bringing this bill to the floor today. I encourage all of my colleagues to support H.R. 565, the AMIGOS Act.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman said, currently the nationals of 84 countries are eligible for E–1 and/or E–2 status. During fiscal year 2017, about 48,000 E–1 and E–2 visas were issued.

In the past, countries became eligible for these programs through treaties signed with the U.S. However, in 2003, the Judiciary Committee reached an understanding with the U.S. Trade Representative that no immigration provisions were to be included in future trade agreements. Henceforth, legislation would be required to add countries.

This bill would make Portuguese nationals eligible for E–1 and E–2 visas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, which will strengthen the really important and historical relationship between the United States and Portugal, which will help to promote economic growth in both of our countries, lead to the creation of good paying jobs, and really strengthen the long and important economic relationship between our two great countries.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 565, "The Advancing Mutual Interests and Growing Our Success Act" or AMIGOS Act.

Despite deep ties with Portugal, it remains one of only five EU countries whose citizens are ineligible for E–1 and E–2 visas.

Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, nationals of countries with which the United States maintains a treaty of commerce and navigation may be admitted temporarily to the United States to engage in international trade, an E–1 visa, or to develop and direct an investment enterprise, E–2 visa.

E–1 and E–2 visas may be granted to individual traders and investors or to employees of organizational traders and investors.

Applicants for E–1 and E–2 visas must generally demonstrate the existence of a bilateral treaty of commerce and navigation between the applicant's country of nationality and the United States.

Some treaties allow for the admission of both E–1 and E–2 nonimmigrants, while others allow for the admission of only E–1 or E–2 nonimmigrants.

In addition, the visa applicant must be a national of the treaty country.

If the applicant is an employee of an organizational trader or investor, both the applicant and the organization must possess the nationality of the treaty country.

The nationality of the organization is determined by the nationality of the individual owners—at least 50 percent of the organization must be owned by nationals of the treaty country.

The enterprise must be more than marginal and must generate income beyond that which is required to provide a minimal living for the investor and their family.

An individual investor must be coming to the United States to develop and direct the business.

An applicant who is an employee of an organizational trader or investor must be coming to the United States to fulfill an executive or supervisory position or possess skills that are essential to the firm's U.S. operations.

Spouses and minor children accompanying or following to join the principal E–1 or E–2 nonimmigrant will be admitted for the same period of stay as the principal trader or investor.

Congress has the ability to take action to improve the historical relationship between the United States and Portugal.

If H.R. 565 is enacted, Portuguese nationals would become eligible for E–1 and E–2 visas, but only after an agreement for reciprocal treatment between Portugal and the United States is finalized.

In 2012, Congress passed—and the president signed into law—H.R. 3992 to permit Israeli nationals to participate in the E–2 treaty investor program. However, Israeli nationals did not have the ability to apply for E–2 visas until May 1, 2019, when an agreement with Israel was finalized and took effect.

It was favorably reported by the House Judiciary Committee without amendment by voice vote; passed by the House on motion to suspend the rules (371 to 0) and passed by the Senate, without amendment, by Unanimous Consent.

Similarly, S. 2245, the "Knowledgeable Innovators and Worthy Investors (KIWI) Act," became law on August 1, 2018, but New Zealanders were unable to apply for E–1 and E–2 visas until June 10, 2019 when an agreement for reciprocal treatment took effect.

It was Discharged by the Senate Judiciary Committee by Unanimous Consent and passed by the Senate without amendment by Unanimous Consent; passed by the House on motion to suspend the rules by voice vote.

The last two bills to add countries to the E–1 and E–2 visa programs passed Congress without controversy.

Portugal is a longstanding United States ally, with "bilateral ties dating from the earliest years of the United States, when Portugal recognized the United States in 1791 following the Revolutionary War."

The United States is also Portugal's largest trading partner outside the European Union (EU), with bilateral trade in goods and services reaching $8 billion in 2018, a 9 percent increase from the previous year.

Similarly, U.S. direct investment in Portugal reached $2.1 billion in 2017, with U.S. companies playing a significant role, investing in the Portuguese banking, pharmaceutical, and chemical industries.

Both countries have also agreed to a bilateral income tax agreement to prevent double taxation.

Portuguese participation in the E–1 and E–2 visa programs will deepen an already strong bilateral trade and investment relationship, and benefit business communities in both countries.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 565, "The Advancing Mutual Interests and Growing Our Success Act" or AMIGOS Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 565, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOOD CONDUCT TIME CREDITS FOR CERTAIN ELDERLY NONVIOLENT OFFENDERS

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4018) to provide that the amount of time that an elderly offender must serve before being eligible for placement in home detention is to be reduced by the amount of good time credits earned by the prisoner, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4018

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

SECTION 1. GOOD CONDUCT TIME CREDITS FOR CERTAIN ELDERLY NONVIOLENT OFFENDERS.

Section 231(g)(5)(A)(ii) of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (34 U.S.C. 60541(g)(5)(A)(ii)) is amended by striking ''to which the offender was sentenced'' and inserting ''reduced by any credit toward the service of the prisoner's sentence awarded under section 3624(b) of title 18, United States Code''.

SEC. 2. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4018 is a modest, but important, bill that I introduced with Ranking Member COLLINS to address an inadvertent drafting error in the Second Chance Act, one that has prevented elderly offenders who qualify for early release under a pilot program for compassionate release from receiving credit for the good conduct time they have accrued while in custody.

Our Nation's Federal prison population is rapidly aging. Of the 1.5 million adults currently in State and Federal prisons, there has been a 300 percent spike in the elderly population since 1999. By 2050, it is estimated that one-third of the prison population of the United States will be over age 50.

Today more people die of old age in U.S. prisons than ever before, and from 2001 to 2007 alone, nearly 8,500 people over age 55 died behind bars. The Federal prisoner reentry initiative, a pilot program created under the Second Chance Act, allows offenders who are elderly and have served at least two-thirds of their sentence to petition for release from prison and to serve their remaining term of imprisonment in a halfway house. This program is not only humane, it is fiscally responsible.

The increasing number of elderly prisoners is leading to soaring costs for the Bureau of Prisons. With a more elderly prisoner population, prison infrastructure must be outfitted or equipped to accommodate the unique needs of elderly prisoners. Prisons need to be outfitted with ramps, lower bed heights, bunk beds eliminated, handrails installed in showers, and other structural changes. Also, prison staff need to be trained to work with elderly prisoners and move elderly prisoners around the facilities.

We imprison too many elderly inmates unnecessarily for far too long, and the data reveals that the recidivism rate is reduced dramatically as the population ages. Good conduct time is provided to all prisoners who have satisfactory behavior in the Bureau of Prisons. A prisoner can earn 54 days of good conduct time or days off their sentence per year, however, due to an inadvertent error in the Federal prisoner reentry initiative, elderly inmates are not permitted to receive credit for good conduct.

Elderly inmates, who otherwise have satisfactory behavior, should not lose the good conduct time they have earned solely as a result of this drafting error. Such an unjust result was not the intent of Congress when drafting the Second Chance Act, as the intent behind this compassionate program is to release a vulnerable population from prison when they present little risk to their communities.

H.R. 4018 would correct this problem, and therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important bill. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4018, the elderly offender good conduct time legislation. Last year, Ranking Member COLLINS and Congressman HAKEEM JEFFRIES led the way in drafting and shepherding through Congress the First Step Act. Attorney General Barr has repeatedly stated his intent to fully implement the provisions of the act.

Our job as legislators in this space is twofold; first, to conduct oversight to ensure the First Step Act is responsibly implemented; and, two, to address issues in that implementation.

One such technical issue is addressed by H.R. 4018. This bill would allow the Bureau of Prisons to transfer eligible elderly, nonviolent offenders from BOP facilities into home confinement when they have reached 60 years of age and served two-thirds of the term of imprisonment to which they were sentenced.

This is a bill technical in nature designed to correct a flaw in the First Step Act that will promote fairness in the implementation of good conduct time, as reformed in the First Step Act, and ensure our prisons do not become nursing homes. I believe that if we do not ensure that this act works, we will lose credibility with the American people, and any future efforts to reform our criminal justice system will fail.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same. I thank the gentleman for his support of this fine legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CLINE, Chairman NADLER, Ranking Member COLLINS, and Mr. JEFFRIES for their leadership on this effort.

Mr. Speaker, the process for earning time off for good conduct in prison is important as a matter of fairness and also effective prison administration.

Individuals who earn good conduct time should not lose credit for this time because of an error in a statute, and elderly, nonviolent offenders should receive credit for the time they have earned.

Therefore, H.R. 4018 is required to address an unfortunate, inadvertent