ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1414, a bill to provide bankruptcy relief for student borrowers.

S. 1514

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1514, a bill to amend title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education that participate in programs under such title to distribute voter registration forms to students enrolled at the institution, and for other purposes.

S. 1539

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1539, a bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide funding to secure nonprofit facilities from terrorist attacks, and for other purposes.

S. 1555

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1555, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve the Transition Assistance Program for members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 1565

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1565, a bill to establish a Corps of Engineers Flood Control Civilian Advisory Council, and for other purposes.

S. 1642

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1642, a bill to increase the recruitment and retention of school-based mental health services providers by low-income local educational agencies.

S. 1667

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1667, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain scholarships as earned income for purposes of the kiddie tax.

S. 1677

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1677, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide authority to postpone certain deadlines by reason of State declared disasters or emergencies.

S. 1687

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1687, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a special rule for certain casualty losses of uncut timber.

S. 1712

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 1712, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to encourage the development and use of DISARM antimicrobial drugs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1712, supra.

S. RES. 80

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 80, a resolution establishing the John S. McCain III Human Rights Commission.

S. RES. 142

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 142, a resolution condemning the Government of the Philippines for its continued detention of Senator Leila De Lima, calling for her immediate release, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 217

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 217, a resolution expressing support for the designation of June 7 through June 9, 2019, as ''National Gun Violence Awareness Weekend'' and June 2019 as ''National Gun Violence Awareness Month''.

S. RES. 221

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 221, a resolution recognizing the 30th anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre and condemning the intensifying repression and human rights violations by the Chinese Communist Party and the use of surveillance by Chinese authorities, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. KING, Mr. ROUNDS, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 1722. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to authorize State-licensed appraisers to conduct appraisals in connection with mortgages insured by the FHA and to ensure compliance with the existing appraiser education and competency requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1722

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 ''FHA Appraiser Eligibility Expansion Act''.

SEC. 2. APPRAISER STANDARDS.

(a) CERTIFICATION OR LICENSING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(g)(5) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1708(g)(5)) is amended by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

''(A) be certified or licensed by the State in which the property to be appraised is located;

''(B) be knowledgeable of the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice and the appraisal requirements established by the Federal Housing Administration;

''(C) meet the competency requirements described in the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice before accepting an assignment; and

''(D) have demonstrated verifiable education in the appraisal requirements established by the Federal Housing Administration under this subsection, which shall include the completion of a course or seminar that educates appraisers on those appraisal requirements and is provided by the Federal Housing Administration or is approved by the Course Approval Program of the Appraiser Qualification Board of the Appraisal Foundation or a State appraiser certifying and licensing agency.''.

(2) APPLICATION.—Subparagraph (D) of section 202(g)(5) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1708(g)(5)), as added by paragraph (1), shall not apply with respect to any appraiser approved by the Federal Housing Administration to conduct appraisals on mortgages insured under title II of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1707 et seq.) on or before the date on which the mortgagee letter or other guidance or regulations take effect under subsection (c)(3).

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH VERIFIABLE EDUCATION AND COMPETENCY REQUIREMENTS.—Effective beginning on the date on which the mortgagee letter or other guidance or regulations take effect under subsection (c)(3), no appraiser may conduct an appraisal for any mortgage insured under title II of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1707 et seq.) unless—

(1) the appraiser is in compliance with the requirements under subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) section 202(g)(5) of such Act (12 U.S.C. 1708(g)(5)), as amended by subsection (a); and

(2) if the appraiser was not approved to conduct such appraisals before the date on which the mortgagee letter or other guidance or regulations take effect under subsection (c)(3), the appraiser is in compliance with subparagraph (D) of such section 202(g)(5).

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than the 240 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall issue a mortgagee letter or other guidance or regulations that shall—

(1) implement the amendments made by subsection (a);

(2) clearly set forth all of the specific requirements under section 202(g)(5) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1708(g)(5)), as amended by this Act, for approval to conduct appraisals under title II of such Act (12 U.S.C. 1707 et seq.), which shall include—

(A) providing that, before the effective date of the mortgagee letter or other guidance or regulations, a demonstration of competency and completion of training that meet the requirements under subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) of such section 202(g)(5), as amended by subsection (a), shall be considered to fulfill the requirements under such subparagraphs; and

(B) providing a method for appraisers to demonstrate such prior competency and completion; and

(3) take effect not later than the date that is 180 days after the date on which the Secretary issues the mortgagee letter or other guidance or regulations.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1733. A bill to limit the separation of children from their parents or legal guardians, to limit the detention of families and children, to provide unaccompanied alien children with access to counsel, to increase the number of immigration judges and support staff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that will address one of the most pressing immigration problems facing our nation.

For the past decade, thousands of families have fled violence and poverty to seek asylum in the United States. These families include vulnerable children who must be kept safe once they arrive in the United States. However, since the beginning of the Trump Administration, several new policies have been implemented.

Most disconcerting is the Trump policy to separate young children, even babies, from their mothers and fathers. Dozens of these children spent days and weeks in cages with nothing but thin mats and aluminum blankets.

We have also learned that the Trump Administration then deported many of these parents, leaving the children to be orphaned in this country. In fact, hundreds of children who were separated under this policy have now been apart from their parents for many months, without any immediate prospects for reunification. These children continue to experience extreme stress that leaves them vulnerable to serious, lifelong mental and physical health problems.

Even when families are reunified after months apart, some children no longer recognize the mothers and fathers. This is unconscionable. Today I am introducing the Protecting Immigrant Families and Improving Immigration Procedures Act, a bill that will not only end the practice of separating families at the border, but also put in place other safeguards to protect these at-risk groups.

The first component of the bill I am introducing today is the full text of the Keep Families Together Act, a bill I introduced earlier this year to halt the separation of families and which currently has more than 40 cosponsors. The President claimed to end his policy of separation in June 2018. However, we have since learned that the practice of separating families continues today.

In fact, the Inspector General for Health and Human Services found that thousands more children were separated than the administration initially revealed in June. Parents who try to protect their children from violence and poverty abroad should not be punished by having those children ripped from their arms. Children should not be subjected to severe trauma in the interest of deterring migration.

Instead, families should be kept together and given an opportunity to present their cases for asylum as has been done for the past seven decades.

The second part of the bill I'm introducing today ensures that families with children are not forced into prolonged, indefinite family detention in order to remain together. Child welfare experts, including the American Academy of Pediatrics and the United Nations, have found that detention of this sort has tremendous negative effects on children's health and welfare. This bill guarantees that the Trump Administration cannot reverse the crucial protections that are currently in place under the Flores settlement agreement.

The third piece of this bill would help address the backlog in our immigration courts while protecting the basic rights of children. This part of the bill contains provisions to provide adequate resources to our immigration court system. By adding additional judges and staff, courts will be able to reduce the crushing backlog of over a million pending deportation cases.

The fourth component of this legislation is Senator HIRONO's bill, the Fair Day in Court for Kids Act, that provides counsel for unaccompanied children. This is meant to ensure that these children receive a meaningful opportunity to present their cases in immigration court. This is important because young children, including toddlers, have been forced to represent themselves in immigration court in recent years. It is simply impossible for children to understand their legal immigration status or rights, let alone explain it to a judge.

This bill protects the most vulnerable children in by providing counsel when there is no parent or legal guardian available. The final part of the bill will ensure that immigration judges can manage their caseloads and prioritize the cases as needed. Currently, individuals in deportation proceedings who have been victims of human trafficking or have assisted with criminal prosecutions are often eligible for visas that would protect them from deportation. This bill would allow immigration judges to close these deportation cases quickly to protect these vulnerable individuals and conserve scarce courtroom time. This will be a crucial step in clearing the backlog of pending immigration cases.

By taking these steps, we will help put our immigration system on a pathway to respect the basic rights of children, particularly those who are fleeing violence and poverty abroad. These children are some of the most vulnerable people in the world, and it is absolutely essential that our legal system should treat them with fairness and respect.

These are goals that should be appealing to Democrats and Republicans alike. I hope my colleagues will join me in passing the Protecting Immigrant Families and Improving Immigration Procedures Act.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1733

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 ''Protecting Families and Improving Immigration Procedures Act''.

SEC. 2. ENSURING THAT FAMILIES REMAIN TOGETHER.

(a) LIMITATION ON THE SEPARATION OF FAMILIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An agent or officer of a designated agency shall not remove a child from his or her parent or legal guardian at or near the port of entry or within 100 miles of the border of the United States unless 1 of the following situations has occurred:

(A) A State court, authorized under State law—

(i) terminates the rights of a parent or legal guardian;

(ii) determines that it is in the best interests of the child to be removed from his or her parent or legal guardian, in accordance with the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–89); or

(iii) makes any similar determination that is legally authorized under State law.

(B) An official from the State or county child welfare agency with expertise in child trauma and development determines that it is in the best interests of the child to be removed from his or her parent or legal guardian because the child—

(i) is in danger of abuse or neglect at the hands of the parent or legal guardian; or

(ii) is a danger to himself or herself or to others.

(C) The Chief Patrol Agent or the Area Port Director, in his or her official and undelegated capacity, authorizes separation, upon the recommendation by an agent or officer, based on a finding that—

(i) the child is a victim of trafficking or is at significant risk of becoming a victim of trafficking;

(ii) there is a strong likelihood that the adult is not the parent or legal guardian of the child; or

(iii) the child is in danger of abuse or neglect at the hands of the parent or legal guardian, or is a danger to himself or herself or to others.

(2) PROHIBITION ON SEPARATION.—An agency may not remove a child from a parent or legal guardian solely for the policy goal of deterring individuals from migrating to the United States or for the policy goal of promoting compliance with civil immigration laws.

(3) DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall ensure that a separation based upon a situation described in paragraph (1)(C)—

(A) is documented in writing; and

(B) includes the reason for such separation and the stated evidence for such separation.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SEPARATION BY AGENTS OR OFFICERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,

the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall develop training and guidance, with an emphasis on the best interests of the child, childhood trauma, attachment, and child development, for use by the agents and officers, in order to standardize separations authorized under subsection (a)(1)(C).

(2) ANNUAL REVIEW.—Not less frequently than annually, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(A) review the guidance developed under paragraph (1); and

(B) make recommendations to the Secretary to ensure that such guidance conforms to current evidence and best practices in child welfare, child development, and childhood trauma.

(3) REQUIREMENT.—The guidance developed under paragraph (1) shall incorporate the presumptions described in subsection (c).

(4) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) EVIDENCE-BASED.—The guidance and training developed under this subsection shall incorporate evidence-based practices.

(B) TRAINING REQUIRED.—

(i) INITIAL TRAINING.—All agents and officers of designated agencies, upon hire, and annually thereafter, shall complete training on adherence to the guidance under this subsection.

(ii) ANNUAL TRAINING.—All Chief Patrol Agents and Area Port Directors, upon hire, and annually thereafter, shall complete—

(I) training on adherence to the guidance under this subsection; and

(II) 90 minutes of child welfare practice training that is evidence-based and trauma-informed.

(c) PRESUMPTIONS.—The presumptions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) FAMILY UNITY.—There shall be a strong presumption in favor of family unity.

(2) SIBLINGS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that sibling groups remain intact.

(3) DETENTION.—There is a presumption that detention is not in the best interests of families and children.

(d) REQUIRED POLICY FOR LOCATING SEPARATED CHILDREN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish final public guidance that describes, with specificity, the manner in which a parent or legal guardian may locate a child who was separated from the parent or legal guardian under subsection (a)(1). In developing the public guidance, the Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, immigrant advocacy organizations, child welfare organizations, and State child welfare agencies.

(2) WRITTEN NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall provide each parent or legal guardian who was separated, with written notice of the public guidance to locate a separated child.

(3) LANGUAGE ACCESS.—All guidance shall be available in English and Spanish, and at the request of the parent or legal guardian, in the language or manner that is understandable by the parent or legal guardian.

(e) REQUIRED INFORMATION FOR SEPARATED FAMILIES.—Not less frequently than monthly, the Secretary shall provide the parent or legal guardian of a child who was separated—

(1) a status report on the monthly activities of the child;

(2) information about the education and health of the child, including any medical treatment provided to the child or medical treatment recommended for the child;

(3) information about changes to the child's immigration status; and

(4) other information about the child, designed to promote and maintain family reunification, as the Secretary determines in his or her discretion.

(f) ANNUAL REPORT ON FAMILY SEPARATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to the committees of jurisdiction that describes each instance in which a child was separated from a parent or legal guardian and includes, for each such instance—

(1) the relationship of the adult and the child;

(2) the age and gender of the adult and child;

(3) the length of separation;

(4) whether the adult was charged with a crime, and if the adult was charged with a crime, the type of crime;

(5) whether the adult made a claim for asylum, expressed a fear to return, or applied for other immigration relief;

(6) whether the adult was prosecuted if charged with a crime and the associated outcome of such charges;

(7) the stated reason for, and evidence in support of, the separation;

(8) if the child was part of a sibling group at the time of separation, whether the sibling group has had physical contact and visitation;

(9) whether the child was rendered an unaccompanied alien child; and

(10) other information in the Secretary's discretion.

(g) CLARIFICATION OF PARENTAL RIGHTS.—If a child is separated from a parent or legal guardian, and a State court has not made a determination that the parental rights have been terminated, there is a presumption that—

(1) the parental rights remain intact; and

(2) the separation does not constitute an affirmative determination of abuse or neglect under Federal or State law.

(h) CLARIFICATION OF EXISTING LAW.—

(1) FEDERAL LAW.—Nothing in this section may be interpreted to supersede or modify Federal child welfare law, where applicable, including the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–89).

(2) STATE LAW.—Nothing in this section may be interpreted to supersede or modify State child welfare laws, as applicable.

(i) GAO REPORT ON PROSECUTION OF ASYLUM SEEKERS.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the prosecution of asylum seekers during the period beginning on January 1, 2008 and ending on December 31, 2018, including—

(A) the total number of persons who claimed a fear of persecution, received a favorable credible fear determination, and were referred for prosecution;

(B) an overview and analysis of the metrics used by the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice to track the number of asylum seekers referred for prosecution;

(C) the total number of asylum seekers referred for prosecution, a breakdown and description of the criminal charges filed against asylum seekers during such period, and a breakdown and description of the convictions secured;

(D) the total number of asylum seekers who were separated from their children as a result of being referred for prosecution;

(E) a breakdown of the resources spent on prosecuting asylum seekers during such period, as well as any diversion of resources required to prosecute asylum seekers, and any costs imposed on States and localities;

(F) the total number of asylum seekers who were referred for prosecution and also went through immigration proceedings; and

(G) the total number of asylum seekers referred for prosecution who were deported before going through immigration proceedings.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to Congress that describes the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

SEC. 3. FLORES SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A family unit may be detained only in accordance with the holding made in Flores v. Sessions et al. (9th Cir. July 5, 2017; C.D. CA; July 24, 2015)) and the stipulated settlement agreement as filed in the United States District Court for the Central District of California on January 17, 1997 (CV 85 4544 RJK) (commonly known as the ''Flores settlement agreement'').

(b) RULEMAKING.—Any regulation proposed or promulgated to supersede the Flores settlement agreement is null and void.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act may be construed—

(1) to affect the application of the Flores settlement agreement to unaccompanied alien children; or

(2) to abrogate the Flores settlement agreement.

(d) REVIEW OF DETENTION DETERMINATIONS.—The review of any determination by the Secretary to detain an individual or family unit under this section shall be in accordance with all other provisions of law, holdings (including any holding made in Flores v. Sessions et al. (9th Cir. July 5, 2017; C.D. CA. July 24, 2015)), consent decrees, and settlement agreements (including the Flores settlement agreement).

SEC. 4. ACCESS TO COUNSEL FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

(a) APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL.—In any removal proceeding and in any appeal proceeding before the Attorney General from any such removal proceeding, an unaccompanied alien child (as defined in section 462(g) of the Homeland Security Act on 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g))) shall be represented by Government-appointed counsel, at Government expense.

(b) LENGTH OF REPRESENTATION.—Once a child is designated as an unaccompanied alien child under subsection (a)—

(1) the child shall be represented by counsel at every stage of the proceedings from the child's initial appearance through the termination of immigration proceedings; and

(2) any ancillary matters appropriate to such proceedings even if the child reaches 18 years of age or is reunified with a parent or legal guardian while the proceedings are pending.

(c) NOTICE.—Not later than 72 hours after an unaccompanied alien child is taken into Federal custody, the child shall be notified that he or she will be provided with legal counsel in accordance with this section.

(d) WITHIN DETENTION FACILITIES.—The Secretary shall ensure that unaccompanied alien children have access to counsel inside all detention, holding, and border facilities.

(e) PRO BONO REPRESENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Attorney General should make every effort to utilize the services of competent counsel who agree to provide representation to such children under this section without charge.

(2) DEVELOPMENT OF NECESSARY INFRASTRUCTURES AND SYSTEMS.—The Attorney General shall develop the necessary mechanisms—

(A) to identify counsel available to provide pro bono legal assistance and representation to children under this section; and

(B) to recruit such counsel.

(f) CONTRACTS; GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may enter into contracts with, or award

grants to, nonprofit agencies with relevant expertise in the delivery of immigration-related legal services to children to carry out the responsibilities under this section, including providing legal orientation, screening cases for referral, recruiting, training, and overseeing pro bono attorneys.

(2) SUBCONTRACTS.—Nonprofit agencies may enter into subcontracts with, or award grants to, private voluntary agencies with relevant expertise in the delivery of immigration related legal services to children in order to carry out this section.

(g) MODEL GUIDELINES ON LEGAL REPRESENTATION OF CHILDREN.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDELINES.—The Executive Office for Immigration Review, in consultation with voluntary agencies and national experts, shall develop model guidelines for the legal representation of alien children in immigration proceedings, which shall be based on the children's asylum guidelines, the American Bar Association Model Rules of Professional Conduct, and other relevant domestic or international sources.

(2) PURPOSE OF GUIDELINES.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall be designed to help protect each child from any individual suspected of involvement in any criminal, harmful, or exploitative activity associated with the smuggling or trafficking of children, while ensuring the fairness of the removal proceeding in which the child is involved.

(h) DUTIES OF COUNSEL.—Counsel provided under this section shall—

(1) represent the unaccompanied alien child in all proceedings and matters relating to the immigration status of the child or other actions involving the Department of Homeland Security;

(2) appear in person for all individual merits hearings before the Executive Office for Immigration Review and interviews involving the Department of Homeland Security;

(3) owe the same duties of undivided loyalty, confidentiality, and competent representation to the child as is due to an adult client; and

(4) carry out other such duties as may be proscribed by the Attorney General or the Executive Office for Immigration Review.

SEC. 5. INCREASES IN IMMIGRATION JUDGES AND SUPPORT STAFF.

(a) IMMIGRATION JUDGES.—The Attorney General shall increase the total number of immigration judges to adjudicate pending cases and efficiently process future cases by not fewer than 75 judges during fiscal year 2019.

(b) SUPPORT STAFF.—The Attorney General shall—

(1) increase the total number of judicial law clerks by 75 during fiscal year 2019; and

(2) increase the total number of support staff for immigration judges, including legal assistants and interpreters, by 300 during fiscal year 2019.

SEC. 6. DOCKET MANAGEMENT FOR RESOURCE CONSERVATION.

Notwithstanding any opposition from the Secretary, immigration judges may administratively close cases, and the Board of Immigration Appeals may remand cases for administrative closure, if an individual in removal proceedings—

(1) appears to be prima facie eligible for a visa or other immigration benefit; and

(2) has a pending application for such benefit before U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services or another appropriate agency.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) AGENT; OFFICER.—The terms ''agent'' and ''officer'' include contractors of the Federal Government.

(2) CHILD.—The term ''child'' means an individual who—

(A) has not attained 18 years of age; and

(B) has no permanent immigration status.

(3) COMMITTEES OF JURISDICTION.—The term ''committees of jurisdiction'' means—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(4) DANGER OF ABUSE OR NEGLECT AT THE HANDS OF THE PARENT OR LEGAL GUARDIAN.—The term ''danger of abuse or neglect at the hands of the parent or legal guardian'' shall not mean migrating to or crossing the United States border.

(5) DESIGNATED AGENCY.—The term ''designated agency'' means—

(A) the Department of Homeland Security;

(B) the Department of Justice; and

(C) the Department of Health and Human Services.

(6) FINDING.—The term ''finding'' means an individualized written assessment or screening by the trained agent or officer that includes a consultation with a child welfare specialist, formalized as required under subsection (b)(3) and consistent with subsections (c), (d), and (h).

(7) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

By Mr. CARPER:

S. 1734. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to allow the District of Columbia to receive Federal funding under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, today I am once again introducing legislation to allow the District of Columbia to receive funding and other benefits under the Coastal Zone Management Act. I am pleased to offer this companion legislation to a bill, H.R. 2185, introduced by the Congresswoman from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Few of us realize that 70 percent of the District is located within the coastal plain. Similar to my State of Delaware, sea level rise, upstream sources of water, degraded infrastructure, and coastal subsidence mean that the District could experience serious future cleanup and repair costs due to flooding—including damage to federal property, which makes up almost 30 percent of the District. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) reports that since 1950, nuisance flooding has increased by more than 300% in the District. And, since 2006, DC has experienced two 100-year flooding events, and District officials estimate that a future 100-year flood event could cause over $1.2 billion in damages. Needless to say, these events will become more and more common due to climate change—including rising sea levels—and coastal subsidence.

The District of Columbia would use funding from the Coastal Zone Management Program for flood risk planning and environmental restoration to prevent and mitigate future flood damage. At the same time, this work would help to restore and conserve the District's coastal resources such as habitat, fisheries, and endangered species.

If included in the Coastal Zone Management Program, the District of Columbia would be eligible for $1 million or more of federal funding annually to assist in coastal flood-control projects, to combat non-point source water pollution, and to develop special area management plans in areas experiencing environmental justice and/or flooding issues.

The National Coastal Zone Management Program, housed in NOAA, was established through the passage of the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972. At the time, Congress recognized the need to manage the effects of increased growth in the nation's coastal zone, which includes jurisdictions bordering the oceans and the Great Lakes.

There are currently 34 jurisdictional coastal zone management programs, including both States and territories. In order for the District of Columbia to participate in the program, Congress must pass this amendment to the Coastal Zone Management Act that would include the District under the definition of a ''coastal state.''

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1734

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 ''Flood Prevention Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. ELIGIBILITY OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR FEDERAL FUNDING UNDER THE COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1972.

Section 304(4) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1453(4)) is amended by inserting ''the District of Columbia,'' after ''the term also includes''.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1741. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to advance energy storage deployment by reducing the cost of energy storage through research, development, and demonstration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am introducing a set of three bills that will lower the cost of energy storage, increase flexibility in the power grid, and create a comprehensive set of grant programs to advance development of renewable energy technologies throughout the country.

Currently, many energy technologies—like energy storage—compete in unfair markets, making it hard for new innovations to measure up to more established technologies like those of the fossil fuel industry. Congress and the Department of Energy

can work hand-in-hand with industry to level the playing field, using a fair, tech-neutral approach when updating the electricity system, to benefit the American consumer.

My Reducing the Cost of Energy Storage Act will provide funding to the Department of Energy to research and develop ways to lower the cost of energy storage technologies. Ultimately, this bill will make it possible for renewable energy to be used on a more reliable and affordable basis.

To protect the power supply from disruptions caused by natural disasters, which can wipe out power to millions of homes, my Flexible Grid Infrastructure Act will require the Department of Energy to find and develop ways to make the power grid more flexible and responsive to these challenges. The bill will also connect displaced workers to training programs that will allow them to transition to high-skill clean energy jobs. Finally, this bill will provide States and utilities with resources to upgrade the flexibility and reliability of the power grid.

In order to ensure private sector growth in distributed energy technologies, my Distributed Energy Demonstration Act will create competitive, cost-share grant programs for new small-scale, grid-connected projects, such as rooftop solar panels, hot water heaters, electric vehicles, and modernized utility pricing technologies.

Together or apart, these bills will promote a more flexible electricity grid that can respond to power disruptions from natural disasters and ensure reliable, low-cost electricity for consumers now and in the future. They will also lower costs for energy storage technologies that make renewable energy more reliable and cost-effective, boost funding for cutting-edge research, and reward State and private sector innovations, which will make renewable energy more reliable and affordable for U.S. energy consumers.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself. Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HARRIS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1744. A bill to provide lawful permanent resident status for certain advanced STEM degree holders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1744

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 ''Keep STEM Talent Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR CERTAIN ADVANCED STEM DEGREE HOLDERS.

(a) ALIENS NOT SUBJECT TO DIRECT NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.—Section 201(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151(b)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(F)(i) Aliens who—

''(I) have earned a degree in a STEM field at the master's level or higher while physically present in the United States from a United States institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a))) accredited by an accrediting entity recognized by the Department of Education;

''(II) have an offer of employment from, or are employed by, a United States employer in a field related to such degree at a rate of pay that is higher than the median wage level for the occupational classification in the area of employment, as determined by the Secretary of Labor; and

''(III) are admissible pursuant to an approved labor certification under section 212(a)(5)(A)(i).

''(ii) In this subparagraph, the term 'STEM field' means a field of science, technology, engineering, or mathematics described in the most recent version of the Classification of Instructional Programs of the Department of Education taxonomy under the summary group of—

''(I) computer and information sciences and support services;

''(II) engineering;

''(III) mathematics and statistics;

''(IV) biological and biomedical sciences;

''(V) physical sciences;

''(VI) agriculture sciences; or

''(VII) natural resources and conservation sciences.''.

(b) PROCEDURE FOR GRANTING IMMIGRATION STATUS.—Section 204(a)(1)(F) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1154(a)(1)(F)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''203(b)(2)'' and all that follows through ''Attorney General''; and

(2) by inserting ''203(b)(2), 203(b)(3), or 201(b)(1)(F) may file a petition with the Secretary of Homeland Security''.

(c) DUAL INTENT FOR F NONIMMIGRANTS SEEKING ADVANCED STEM DEGREES AT UNITED STATES INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—Notwithstanding sections 101(a)(15)(F)(i) and 214(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(F)(i), 1184(b)), an alien who is a bona fide student admitted to a program in a STEM field (as defined in section 201(b)(1)(F)(ii)) for a degree at the master's level or higher at a United States institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a))) accredited by an accrediting entity recognized by the Department of Education may obtain a student visa or extend or change nonimmigrant status to pursue such degree even if such alien intends to seek lawful permanent resident status in the United States.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1749. A bill to clarify seasoning requirements for certain refinanced mortgage loans, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

S. 1749

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 ''Protecting Affordable Mortgages for Veterans Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. SEASONING REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN REFINANCED MORTGAGE LOANS.

(a) GINNIE MAE.—Section 306(g)(1) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)(1)) is amended by striking the second sentence.

(b) VETERANS LOANS.—Section 3709(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter before paragraph (1), by striking ''is refinanced'' and inserting ''is a refinance''; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

''(1) the date on which the borrower has made at least six consecutive monthly payments on the loan being refinanced; and

''(2) the date that is 210 days after the first payment due date of the loan being refinanced.''.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to restrict or otherwise modify the authorities of the Government National Mortgage Association.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 1753. A bill to promote accountability and effective administration in the execution of laws by restoring the original understanding of the President's constitutional power to remove subordinates from office; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, President Trump was famous for many things even before he was elected. One of those things was the catch-phrase ''You're fired,'' which he popularized on his reality TV show ''The Apprentice.''

This is a relatively commonplace phrase. It is something that most persons are familiar with, but it is not surprising that the phrase would have so much appeal for a television audience. I think the reason has something to do with the fact that it carries a certain power and resonance with it because the person who has the authority to use it within any organization is, generally speaking, a person who gets to call the shots. It is emblematic of executive control and, therefore, the ability to get things done within an organization.

That is not to say that good leaders get their way solely or even primarily by threatening to fire people who work for them. Effective leadership, more often than not, requires what are sometimes called soft leadership skills.

But the fact, nonetheless, remains that the head of an organization must always have hanging in reserve, sort of like an employer Damoclean sword—the absolute right to terminate a subordinate.

It is the ultimate and essential backstop that enforces and reifies an executive's power to make decisions. This is true for pretty much any leader, whether that leader happens to be the CEO of a corporation, the coach of a sports team, or a general out on the field of battle.

Yet, remarkably, under our laws, the President of the United States lacks authority over many high-ranking officers within the executive branch. Despite its elemental association with Executive power, Congress and the courts have time and again deprived the President of the ability to remove his subordinates at will.

These restrictions often take the form of statutory for-cause removal

protections, such as the provision of the Federal Trade Commission Act that provides that Commissioners may be removed only ''for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.''

In enacting laws like this, Congress has cast aside the original meaning of the Constitution and thereby eroded a critical safeguard of American freedom. As anyone who has studied the Constitution or constitutional law, for that matter, can guess, my reference to the FTC's for-cause protection is not accidental.

That statute formed the basis of the lawsuit that culminated in the 1935 decision by the Supreme Court in a case called Humphrey's Executor, in which the Supreme Court held for the first time that Congress may impose restrictions on the President's removal power.

In so holding, the Supreme Court overruled its earlier precedent in Myers v. United States, which had held that Congress may not limit the President's ability to remove principal officers within the Federal Government, but Humphrey's Executor didn't simply overrule Myers. Rather, as Justice Scalia later wrote, ''it gutt[ed], in six quick pages devoid of textual or historical precedent. . . . a carefully researched and reasoned 70-page opinion.'' That juxtaposition alone tells you what you need to know about these decisions. One had constitutional text and original understanding and historical precedent behind it. The other was constitutional law by judicial fiat.

Article II of the Constitution unquestionably establishes a unitary executive. The vesting clause provides that ''the executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America.''

As Alexander Hamilton explained it in Federalist No. 70, placing the totality of the Executive power in a single individual was no happenstance. It was no mistake. It wasn't just sort of some fluke. The delegates to the Constitutional Convention recognized that a unified executive was essential to ensure energy and accountability in the execution of the laws, and the Constitution was drafted accordingly, consistent with this understanding.

Without the authority to supervise and direct, and, yes, ultimately fire his subordinates, it is impossible for the President to fulfill his duty imposed by article II to ''take care that the laws be faithfully executed.''

The Founders also understood that the President's removal power was the bedrock of his authority to oversee the executive branch. In a famous debate during the First Congress, James Madison argued that ''if any power whatsoever is in its nature Executive, it is the power of appointing, overseeing, and controlling those who execute the laws.''

He went on to note that ''if the President should possess alone the power of removal from office, those who are employed in the execution of the law will be in their proper situation, and the chain of dependence be preserved; [they] will depend, as they ought, on the President, and the President on the community.''

Madison's argument prevailed, and the First Congress declined, on constitutional grounds, for the reasons articulated by James Madison himself, to create for-cause removal protections for the heads of the newly established executive branch departments. They considered it; Madison raised, very persuasively, this constitutional argument against it; and then they voted it down. That was the original understanding of the removal power, and it predominated for nearly 150 years after the Founding.

Since Humphrey's Executor and its radical departure from the original understanding in 1935, for-cause removal protections, both statutory and otherwise, have, sadly, proliferated, giving rise to a vast, headless, out-of-control branch of government, a fourth branch of government, if you will, that exists beyond the control of the President and is therefore unaccountable to the people.

In fact, by some estimations, there are over 80 so-called independent agencies within the executive branch. These executive branch agencies that we refer to somehow as independent are entrusted with regulating immense swaths of American life—from competition policy and workplace safety regulations to labor relations and even securities laws. They make rules; they adjudicate rights; and they enforce laws. The potential for abuse is tremendous; the inconsistency with the republican principles this country was founded on, obvious.

Now, there are a lot of people here who like the sound of the term ''independent agency,'' and they might suppose, incorrectly, that an agency that is independent, that is beyond the control of the President of the United States to oversee, that that is somehow a good thing.

On closer inspection, we discover that quite the opposite is true. When we insulate someone from Presidential oversight, what we are doing is taking the American people out of the picture. There is a reason why we have elections every 4 years, and those elections focus on the election of a President. It is so there is some chain of accountability between the people and the executive branch of government.

That has become more important, not less, over the last few decades as we have created more and more executive branch agencies and we have entrusted those agencies with more and more power. It has never been more important than it is today to make sure the people are connected. If you disconnect the American people by insulating them from the political process, then you have a whole group of people who these days are charged not just with administrating the laws but, in some cases, with effectively making it and interpreting it, and you are taking them beyond the supervision that would otherwise be appropriate by the President of the United States within the executive branch of government.

In their fight against British tyranny, the Patriots of the American Revolution rallied behind the principle of ''no taxation without representation.'' Today we are faced with a somewhat different threat to freedom, as Chief Justice Roberts wrote in a case just a few years ago. ''The growth of the Executive Branch, which now wields vast power and touches almost every aspect of daily life, heightens the concern that it may slip from the Executive's control, and thus from that of the people.''

In other words, as Chief Justice Roberts explained, when you take this power away from the President, you are taking it away from the people. The people lose their input on and their control over these very important functions of what is appropriately described as the people's government.

The concern is further compounded by the existence of independent agencies that are, by law, divorced from any Presidential control. As a result, in this new fight against tyranny, our watchword perhaps must be ''no regulation without representation.'' That is why I have spearheaded the Article I Project and why I supported legislation such as the REINS Act and the Separation of Powers Restoration Act that would bring the Federal regulatory apparatus, as we know it, to heel.

Of course, more is needed. We need to not only reform Congress's relationship with the administrative state but the President's as well. To that end, I am introducing new legislation called the Take Care Act. The bill would restore the unitary executive envisioned by the Founders and, in fact, required by the Constitution by stripping away all existing for-cause removal protections from the so-called independent agencies. It would also limit Congress's ability to create for-cause protections by implication in the future and take other critical steps to fortify the President's directive authority.

Simply put, the Take Care Act would eliminate the headless fourth branch of government, empower the President to ensure faithful execution of the law, and make the bureaucracy accountable to the people again. Importantly, the Take Care Act would not cause the work of administrative agencies to become subject to the unmitigated whims and caprices of a President. There is still very real, very meaningful political constraints, including the Senate's advise and consent role, that would ensure, as they do now, in areas outside of these so-called independent agencies, that the executive officers can fulfill their congressionally assigned duties without undue interference.

In other words, although there are some so-called independent agencies as to which the President has no removal

power, there are a whole lot that are not. The President's Cabinet and many other positions within the Federal Government involve people who are appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate, and who serve at the pleasure of the President who can be fired at any moment for any reason the President might deem appropriate.

Nevertheless, that does not mean that Presidents go around just firing people arbitrarily because Presidents understand that there is a political cost to doing that. We have seen in recent years, and we have seen earlier in American history, how Presidents, even when they have disagreements with members of their Cabinet or other people who serve at the pleasure of the President—Presidents are still reluctant to fire people because there are political costs attached to that, and especially where Congress perceives there might be a partisan political motive in mind, Congress may well take action.

In the case of the Senate, it almost inevitably will at least threaten, if not carry out the threat, to hold up future confirmations of Presidential appointees if Presidents abuse this power.

So it simply isn't true to say that this would open the floodgates and cause all Presidents to just fire people arbitrarily without hesitation in the future. What it would mean is that our elected President would have the power to represent the people and to oversee the executive branch of the Federal Government just as article II already requires.

So all this bill would do would be to rescind and limit unconstitutional restrictions on the President's removal power, and while it may be more convenient to limit this power by statute, convenience and efficiency are not the primary objectives or the hallmarks of a democratic government, as the Supreme Court has repeatedly reminded us.

Another famous catchphrase popularized by an American President is ''the buck stops here,'' which President Truman, of course, displayed on a placard on his desk in the Oval Office at the White House during his Presidency. What it means is, the President is the final decision maker within the executive branch, and, therefore, bears the sole and ultimate responsibility for executing the laws.

In order to fulfill that very special, sacred, important responsibility, the President must have plenary power to direct the President's subordinates in how they carry out their assigned tasks and, if necessary, fire them. That is what the Constitution and, indeed, common sense require. By restoring the original understanding and restoring the removal power to the Presidency, the Take Care Act would give the President this authority.

By taking this step, we would reempower the American people with that which is rightfully theirs to begin with.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 231—CONDEMNING THE HORRIFIC ANTI-SEMITIC ATTACK ON THE CHABAD OF POWAY SYNAGOGUE NEAR SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, ON APRIL 27, 2019

Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 231

Whereas on April 27, 2019, a 19-year-old armed with an assault rifle attacked the Chabad of Poway Synagogue near San Diego, California, while congregants were celebrating the last day of the Passover holiday;

Whereas the gunman wounded Almog Peretz, Noya Dahan, and Rabbi Yisroel Goldstein;

Whereas Lori Gilbert Kaye, a founding member of the congregation, was killed while bravely saving the life of Rabbi Goldstein;

Whereas, in describing the attack, Rabbi Goldstein said—

(1) ''. . . Lori took the bullet for all of us. She died to protect all of us''; and

(2) ''This is Lori. This is her legacy, and her legacy will continue. It could have been so much worse.'';

Whereas Oscar Stewart, a veteran of the Army, and Jonathan Morales, a border patrol agent, bravely fought back, running toward the perpetrator of the attack;

Whereas law enforcement and first responders, including the San Diego Sheriff's Department, acted quickly and professionally to respond to the attack and care for the victims;

Whereas the perpetrator of the attack, who expressed White supremacist and White nationalist sentiments, entered the synagogue shouting anti-Semitic slurs;

Whereas the attack occurred 6 months to the day after the attack on the Tree of Life Synagogue in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, which killed 11 innocent people and injured 6 others, including 4 law enforcement officers;

Whereas anti-Semitism is an age-old form of prejudice, discrimination, persecution, and marginalization of Jewish people that runs counter to the values of the United States;

Whereas, according to an annual audit conducted by the Anti-Defamation League, in 2018—

(1) anti-Semitic incidents remained at near-historic levels in the United States; and

(2) the number of anti-Semitic incidents with known connections to extremists or inspired by extremist ideology reached the highest levels since 2004;

Whereas, in a manifesto attributed to the perpetrator of the attack, the perpetrator of the attack claimed responsibility for the burning of a mosque in Escondido, California, and demonstrated anti-Muslim bias;

Whereas growing White supremacy and White nationalism is—

(1) a threat to the security of the United States; and

(2) antithetical to the American values of dignity and respect of all people, including Jewish, Muslim, Black, Latino, Asian American, immigrant, and LGBTQ peoples; and

Whereas hate has no place in the United States and there is a duty to condemn all forms of hatred: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the horrific anti-Semitic attack on the Chabad of Poway Synagogue near San Diego, California, on April 27, 2019, which killed 1 individual and injured 3 others;

(2) honors the memory of Lori Gilbert Kaye, who was killed in the attack;

(3) expresses hope for a full and speedy recovery for the individuals injured in the attack;

(4) offers heartfelt condolences to—

(A) the Chabad of Poway congregation;

(B) the San Diego area Jewish community; and

(C) the friends and family of those individuals affected by the tragedy;

(5) recognizes the dedicated service of the law enforcement emergency response officials and medical professionals who responded to the attack and cared for the victims; and

(6) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to condemn—

(A) anti-Semitism;

(B) White supremacy;

(C) White nationalism; and

(D) all forms of hatred.

SENATE RESOLUTION 232—CALLING FOR THE IMMEDIATE EXTRADITION OR EXPULSION TO THE UNITED STATES OF CONVICTED FELONS JOANNE CHESIMARD AND WILLIAM MORALES AND ALL OTHER FUGITIVES FROM JUSTICE WHO ARE RECEIVING SAFE HAVEN IN CUBA IN ORDER TO ESCAPE PROSECUTION OR CONFINEMENT FOR CRIMINAL OFFENSES COMMITTED IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 232

Whereas Joanne Chesimard, one of the most wanted terrorists of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, was convicted of the May 2, 1973, murder of New Jersey State Trooper Werner Foerster;

Whereas William Morales, leader and chief bomb-maker for the terrorist organization Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional, committed numerous terrorist attacks on United States soil, including the bombings of Fraunces Tavern in lower Manhattan on January 25, 1975, and the Mobil Oil employment office in New York on August 3, 1977, which killed 5 people and injured over 60 others;

Whereas more than 70 fugitives from the United States, charged with offenses ranging from hijacking to kidnapping to drug offenses to murder, are believed to be receiving safe haven in Cuba;

Whereas other fugitives from United States justice who are receiving safe haven in Cuba include Charles Hill, wanted for the killing of a State trooper in New Mexico, and Victor Manuel Gerena, on the list of the 10 most wanted fugitives of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for carrying out a brutal robbery of a Wells Fargo armored car in Connecticut;

Whereas, according to the Treaty Between the United States and Cuba for the Mutual Extradition of Fugitives from Justice, signed at Washington April 6, 1904 (33 Stat. 2265), and the Additional Extradition Treaty Between the United States and Cuba, signed at Havana, January 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 2392), the United States has a bilateral extradition treaty with Cuba;

Whereas, in January 2002, the Government of Cuba deported to the United States Jesse