

must place in my appointees, Ms. Semann is the best available person to serve as Acting Inspector General of the Department of Education at this time. In my judgment, Ms. Rocque can better serve the Nation performing other duties (i.e., returning to her position as Deputy Inspector General of the Department of Education).

I am providing this notification as a courtesy, a show of comity and respect between the executive and legislative branches. It should not be interpreted as a concession that the Congress can limit my power to remove any officer. "Because no single person could fulfill [the President's] responsibility alone, the Framers expected that the President would rely on subordinate officers for assistance." *Seila Law LLC v. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau*, 591 U.S. 197, 203–204 (2020). And the Constitution gives the President "the authority to remove those who assist him in carrying out his duties." *Free Enterprise Fund v. Public Company Accounting Oversight Board*, 561 U.S. 477, 513–514 (2010). "Without such power, the President could not be held fully accountable for discharging his own responsibilities; the buck would stop somewhere else." *Id.* at 514.

Ultimately, I have determined that the changed priorities of my Administration (as compared to the previous one) will be better reflected with new leadership in this Office. Therefore, I am apprising you of my intention to designate Ms. Semann as Acting Inspector General of the Department of Education, effective no less than 30 days from delivery of this message.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 4, 2025.

□ 1215

SAVE SBA FROM SANCTUARY CITIES ACT OF 2025

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 458, I call up the bill (H.R. 2931) to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to relocate certain offices of the Small Business Administration in sanctuary jurisdictions, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 458, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Small Business, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part B of House Report 119–130, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2931

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 "Save SBA from Sanctuary Cities Act of 2025".

SEC. 2. RELOCATION OF CERTAIN OFFICES IN SANCTUARY JURISDICTIONS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Administrator shall relocate each covered office located in a sanctuary jurisdiction in accordance with this section.

(b) *DETERMINATION REQUIRED.*—Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to a covered office only if, prior to ordering the relocation of such covered office under such subsection, the Administrator makes a determination that such covered office is located in a sanctuary jurisdiction and makes such determination publicly available.

(c) *RELOCATION REQUIREMENT.*—When relocating a covered office under this section, the Administrator shall relocate such covered office to a location that is not in a sanctuary jurisdiction.

(d) *RELOCATION DEADLINE.*—

(1) *DEADLINE.*—Not later 120 days after the Administrator makes publicly available a determination under subsection (b) with respect to a covered office, the Administrator shall relocate such covered office in accordance with subsection (c).

(2) *NONCOMPLIANCE.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—If a covered office described in paragraph (1) is not relocated in accordance with subsection (c) prior to the expiration of the 120-day period applicable to such relocation under such paragraph—

(i) not later 5 days after the expiration of such 120-day period, the head of such covered office shall submit to the Administrator a written explanation of why such covered office was not relocated prior to expiration of such 120-day period; and

(ii) during the period beginning on the day after expiration of such 120-day period and ending on the date on which such covered office is relocated to a location that is not in a sanctuary jurisdiction—

(I) such covered office shall cease operations; and

(II) each employee of the Administration whose duty station was at such covered office shall be assigned to a duty station at another covered office that is located in the same State and not in a sanctuary jurisdiction or, if no other covered office is located in the same State and not in a sanctuary jurisdiction, any other covered office that is not located in a sanctuary jurisdiction.

(B) *REMOVAL.*—The Administrator shall immediately remove the head of a covered office required to submit a written explanation under subparagraph (A)(i) if—

(i) such head does not submit such a written explanation in accordance with such subparagraph; or

(ii) the Administrator determines that the reasons provided in the written explanation submitted by such head under such subparagraph for the relocation of such covered office not being completed prior to the expiration of the 120-day period described in paragraph (1) with respect to such covered office are insufficient.

(e) *NEW OFFICE LIMITATION.*—The Administrator may not establish a covered office in sanctuary jurisdiction.

(f) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this section:

(1) *ADMINISTRATION.*—The term "Administration" means the Small Business Administration.

(2) *ADMINISTRATOR.*—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Administration.

(3) *COVERED OFFICE.*—The term "covered office" means a regional, district, or local office of the Administration, other than the headquarters of the Administration, or any other component of the Administration fully funded by funds appropriated by Congress.

(4) *SANCTUARY JURISDICTION.*—The term "sanctuary jurisdiction" means a political subdivision of a State that has in effect a statute, ordinance, policy, or practice that prohibits or restricts any government entity or official from—

(A) sending, receiving, maintaining, or exchanging with any Federal, State, or local government entity information regarding the citizenship or immigration status (lawful or unlawful) of any individual; or

(B) complying with a request lawfully made by the Department of Homeland Security under section 236 or 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226 and 1357) to comply with a detainer for, or notify about the release of, an individual.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2931, the Save SBA from Sanctuary Cities Act of 2025, introduced by Representative FINSTAD.

This legislation does exactly what is necessary to ensure SBA employees are safe.

Despite inheriting one of the most secure borders in American history, President Biden relaxed border policies, and today, communities continue to deal with these consequences.

I am talking about everything from crime against small businesses forced to close their storefronts to the death of innocent Americans, and it hasn't stopped, as evidenced by the tragedy in Boulder, Colorado, earlier this week.

Thankfully, President Trump is taking action to restore the rule of law with executive orders that stop the Federal subsidization of areas that refuse to comply with immigration laws.

This legislation, in part, codifies those efforts and the work already done at the SBA. Under Administrator Loeffler's leadership, the regional offices in Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Denver, New York City, and Seattle will be moved to safer communities within those States; but there are other cities that need to be reached.

Under this bill, the SBA administrator will make determinations on what offices will be moved and will make those decisions public to ensure transparency.

It is important to note that SBA services to small businesses nationwide will not be interrupted by passing this legislation.

When a small business in any jurisdiction needs assistance, they can still go to their local small business development center or their community lender.

The previous administration's border crisis should not put the safety of small businesses who go to the SBA offices and the SBA employees who work in those offices at risk.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going to argue that Republicans are working to close SBA offices. This bill simply relocates these offices. As I said before, lending and counseling services for small businesses will still be provided to constituents.

I urge all of my colleagues who support this bill to make Main Street safe again.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2931. This bill is not about improving the SBA or expanding support for small businesses. It is about punishing cities for their politics and dragging a vital agency into another culture war.

Earlier this year, the SBA administrator abruptly announced that six regional offices located in cities like New York, Chicago, and Seattle will be relocated. These are some of the most diverse, economically important cities in the country. They are also home to thousands of small businesses that rely on these offices for support.

The decision was made without consultation, without any clear plan, and without even a basic briefing to Congress. In fact, 24 of my colleagues and I sent a letter to the administrator demanding answers. Myself and my colleagues still haven't received an adequate response; just rhetoric.

Now this bill will lock in that same reckless approach and expand on it. It strips regional, district, and local SBA offices out of so-called sanctuary cities, despite there being no legal definition and no justification for such a move.

This isn't about immigration enforcement. It is about politics. This administration wants to punish some of our larger cities because they have the nerve to vote Democratic. It is important to note all of the cities comply with the Federal laws.

Who will this bill hurt? It will not hurt politicians or city officials. It is the small business owners and their employees who will suddenly have to navigate SBA programs without the support they have relied on for years.

At the same time, the SBA is already in crisis. Huge numbers of staff have been fired or forced out. Customer service has plummeted. Small business owners are calling, and no one is there to answer. Now, in the middle of all of that, my Republican colleagues are talking about uprooting even more offices.

This bill doesn't fix anything. It adds more confusion and disruption for the people that are supposed to be helped. It wastes taxpayer dollars to carry out a political agenda, and it ignores the real economic challenges small businesses are facing.

Let's not forget, entrepreneurs across the country are already dealing with higher prices caused by tariffs. That is a direct result of this administration's trade policies. These added costs are squeezing margins and making it harder for small businesses to stay afloat. The last thing they need is less support from the very agency that is supposed to help them. They also don't need to be spending hours traveling to offices to get assistance.

If my colleagues really wanted to support the small businesses, they would be talking about access to capital. They would be looking at how to rebuild SBA policy, not gut it further. They would be focused on lowering costs, expanding outreach, and getting more entrepreneurs the tools they need to grow.

Just maybe, my colleagues could stop playing games and pass a bill exempting small businesses from the pain of this administration's on-again, off-again tariffs.

Instead, Members here are debating a bill that makes things worse. I urge my colleagues to reject this bill, stand up for small business owners in every ZIP Code and restore the SBA mission as a nonpartisan advocate for America's entrepreneurs.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ALFORD).

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for this important piece of legislation. I thank the ranking member for her passion and her concern for small businesses in America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2931, the Save SBA from Sanctuary Cities Act of 2025, championed by my good friend Congressman FINSTAD.

Mr. Speaker, this is not about a culture war in America. This is about putting American small business owners first, while ensuring lawless sanctuary cities do not reap the benefits of hosting SBA offices.

It is pretty simple. This is all about protecting America's small businesses and making sure that Federal taxpayer dollars are not funneled into lawless sanctuary cities that put illegal aliens ahead of their own citizens.

Why should hardworking American entrepreneurs in law-abiding communities be second in line to support from their own government? They shouldn't be.

This bill will relocate SBA regional offices from sanctuary jurisdictions to communities that actually respect the rule of law, that actually put American citizens first, and that is not controversial. It is just common sense.

President Biden's open-border policies let in millions of illegal aliens, unvetted illegal aliens, including dangerous, violent criminals.

The woke policies of Democrat-run sanctuary cities, fueled by woke politics, have become magnets for chaos, stretching public resources to the brink, and crowding out citizens who actually follow the law.

What happens? Well, it often depletes the public resources meant for U.S. citizens.

Moving SBA offices into nonsanctuary jurisdictions is a step in the right direction.

Let me be clear, Mr. Speaker. The Federal Government should not reward sanctuary cities with permanent SBA infrastructure. That is not just wrong, quite frankly, it is insulting to every law-abiding taxpayer and every small business owner struggling to stay afloat. These offices have got to be moved.

This legislation is another example of House Republicans working to codify President Trump's executive orders.

In March, SBA Administrator Loeffler announced a series of actions to put Americans first, including moving SBA regional offices out of sanctuary cities. This bill makes it law and backs that up.

This commonsense legislation, as well as others that Members will be voting on this week, put Americans and American small businesses first. It puts Main Street first.

Mr. Speaker, people can't stop there. There are many cities that share the same lawless, woke policies as sanctuary cities. They are soft on crime, even if they don't wear the sanctuary label outright.

Kansas City is one of those, just as one example. It is not officially designated as a sanctuary city, but it might as well be a first cousin of one.

That is exactly why I have asked Administrator Loeffler to relocate the SBA regional office from Kansas City in Missouri's Fifth Congressional District down to our district, the Fourth District.

At the end of the day, American citizens and small businesses should be the ones being served by SBA offices, not illegal aliens in sanctuary cities.

Let's get serious. Let's put America first, like the mandate directed to be done in November, the America First agenda led by President Donald J. Trump.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and vote "yes" for H.R. 2931.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. MCIVER).

Mrs. MCIVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me the time.

My colleague across the aisle, obviously, wants us to be "sleep" because that is the opposite of being woke. I guess my colleagues should introduce sleepy policies and be "sleep" at the job.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my strong opposition to the efforts to undermine American small businesses by the very agency tasked with fueling them.

Let me be clear. This is what H.R. 2931 would do. It would allow the Small Business Administration to gut punch the small businesses it is supposed to serve, just to punish cities that embrace their immigrant communities.

Targeting sanctuary cities, as this bill does, is beyond the scope of the SBA's duties. It flies in the face of what the SBA is supposed to do: lift up small businesses in communities across the country, no matter what city they are located in or what party they belong to.

Rather than driving economic growth, this legislation would strip essential resources from some of our Nation's most vibrant and diverse communities. This would hurt the livelihoods of hundreds of thousands of businessowners. If the New York office were to close, the effects would spill over into my own community. The SBA office in Newark services over 800,000 small businesses in New Jersey alone. Cutting offices from these areas will stall growth and jeopardize jobs. It will displace employees and disrupt critical services that local businesses rely on. It will burden nearby offices and stretch resources very thin. It will make it harder for businessowners to get the help they need when they need it. Newark's office would be overwhelmed if the New York City office closes.

This bill weaponizes Federal resources to hurt cities that have made the choice to protect immigrant communities. This is unjust.

I have worked closely with my Democratic colleagues to raise these concerns directly with the SBA administrator through multiple letters, outreach, and even in the Small Business Committee yesterday. SBA's responses, if any, have been dismissive.

I stand firmly against using the SBA as a tool to penalize cities based on their immigration policies. I hope my colleagues will stand with me.

I urge Members to vote "no" on the Save SBA from Sanctuary Cities Act of 2025 to protect the SBA's mission and vibrant economies for all of our cities.

□ 1230

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the great State of Colorado (Mr. CRANK).

Mr. CRANK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2931. We have allowed sanctuary cities to openly defy Federal immigration law for far too long. There must be real consequences for it.

I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FINSTAD) for introducing this important piece of legislation. I am also grateful to Chairman WILLIAMS of the Committee on Small Business

for working with me to ensure that my community, El Paso County and Colorado Springs, isn't swept up in the radical sanctuary policies coming out of Denver, Colorado.

Specifically, I thank the gentleman for accepting our amendment to ensure that communities like mine, which are fighting back against criminal-coddling politicians, remain eligible locations for SBA offices.

We have heard a lot of folks who are opposed to this bill say things like: It is undermining small business, or: It is creating a culture war.

This is about the rule of law. This is about cities thumbing their noses at taxpayers. You aren't entitled to Federal funds in America.

Mr. Speaker, there is a way to keep these offices in these cities: Stop being sanctuary cities. Comply with the law.

When did complying with the Federal law become something that was optional in America? It is incredible.

As we hold sanctuary jurisdictions accountable, we must recognize that not every community in a sanctuary State is part of the problem. I believe the amended bill draws that line distinctly, and it recognizes districts, like Colorado-05 that I represent, that have been bravely pushing back on their own.

When the Biden administration opened our borders and over 8 million or more crossed into our country illegally, 300 migrants per day rolled into Colorado because cities like Denver welcomed them with our taxpayer dollars. Migrants with connections to dangerous gangs, like Tren de Aragua, didn't just stay in Denver, but they moved to nearby communities, and they took over apartment complexes that were owned by individuals.

El Paso County, my county, recognized the threat, but had zero support from the Colorado legislature, who at the same time passed more laws to make it worse. The Colorado legislature passed laws prohibiting law enforcement from honoring ICE detainers. The Colorado legislature restricted data sharing with Federal immigration agencies. The legislature also passed a law that banned contracts for immigration detention centers.

This is lawlessness, and this body should recognize it as such.

In 2024, my good friend, Sheriff Joe Roybal of El Paso County, and other county leaders filed a lawsuit against the State arguing that these laws are unconstitutional and that they hamper public safety.

Contrast that with cities like Denver, which have exacerbated their housing crisis, and they continue to support illegal immigrants, going so far as to bar city employees from cooperating with Federal immigration enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, talk about playing politics. That is playing politics.

They passed laws in Denver to create a legal defense fund for illegal immigrants. They passed a law to spend

more than \$180 million a year on related services, all while hosting the SBA regional office and laughing at the American taxpayers while doing it.

This is unacceptable. Sanctuary cities should not be rewarded with Federal offices and resources. That is why I wrote to SBA Administrator Kelly Loeffler urging her to move the regional office to Colorado Springs, where we cooperate with Federal authorities and support small business, and we uphold law and order for our citizens.

While President Trump has delivered on his promise to regain operational control of the border, the fight isn't over. We need full cooperation between Federal, State, and local law enforcement.

It is unfortunate that Colorado's leadership is still going in the wrong direction. Despite Governor Polis saying in January that he was open to working with the Trump administration, he instead signed new legislation in May that expands protections for illegal immigrants, even after local officials raised serious concerns.

My community, meanwhile, is doing the work. El Paso County and the Colorado Springs Police Department are partnering with ICE and the DEA. In April, they led a nightclub raid that resulted in over 100 illegal immigrants being detained for human and drug trafficking. This is something that we are going to support with lawlessness? Not in my community. In May, they turned over 13 illegal immigrants to ICE custody.

We understand the real consequences of sanctuary policies. Colorado has become a haven for illegal immigration. In one tragic case that we all now know about this week, an illegal immigrant who overstayed his visa launched Molotov cocktails at innocent Boulder residents in what was a hateful, racial attack, despite the State knowing that that person was already illegally in our country. The State of Colorado gave him a driver's license. We can't let sanctuary jurisdictions defy Federal law and endanger public safety.

I will be clear. El Paso County, my county, is not a sanctuary jurisdiction. Despite the policies from Denver, we are committed to working with Federal immigration authorities and protecting our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman WILLIAMS and his staff for working with me and working with my county. El Paso County is ready and willing to host the SBA office.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2931.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is quite rich to come to the House floor and talk about rule of law. At least on this side of the aisle, we don't have anyone who pardoned 1,500 felons.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LATIMER).

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, my district has over 30,000 small businesses, from restaurants and small grocery stores in New Rochelle to construction companies in Yonkers.

Every day, I hear from businessowners that they need certainty to run their businesses. They rely on an immigration system that ensures that their employees won't be targeted and unjustly detained on their way to work. They rely on trade policies that keep the cost of their products stable, and they rely on Federal partners who will be there when they need assistance.

Since taking office, President Trump and SBA Administrator Loeffler have outlined an agenda that will harm small businesses. Proposals such as cutting the SBA workforce by 43 percent; relocating SBA offices away from New York City, the center of that region; and firing an independent inspector general do not represent anything that looks like America First. It is an ideological agenda, and it is imposed upon the majority of this country that functions differently and requires tailored policies.

In addition, last week, my home county of Westchester was branded a sanctuary jurisdiction by the Department of Homeland Security, completely inaccurately. Westchester is not and has never been a sanctuary jurisdiction. In the last 7 years, we have reduced violent crime, and we have brought economic strength over a period of time that rivals any county in this Nation.

Westchester County cooperates with Federal immigration law. County law, however, requires that no administrative police can circumvent due process. We do this to ensure that all residents will cooperate with local law enforcement.

Westchester rejects the deep state police that appear masked and without badges and proper identification. This bill represents an attempt by House Republicans to enact retribution on places because this administration wants to impose its view of law enforcement: deep state authority not subject to judicial review.

The result of petty and punitive motives of this bill is that small businesses will suffer. You would think that, when you offer support for this President's tariff strategy, reckless as it is, which is damaging small businesses that rely on international goods, components, and supplies, they would instead be working to stimulate that. Yet, this bill could not be further from that goal.

If this bill is passed, SBA offices will be relocated as political payback, away from public access in major cities. In fact, that is the point: to reduce programs that help small businesses gain access to capital, professional services, and predictable tariff policies.

That is why I introduced an amendment to prohibit SBA from relocating an office if the next closest office is

more than 50 miles from the communities that were relocated. We should be debating legislation that will help small businesses tackle what they identify as their biggest needs: workforce development, stability, and access to capital. That is not what we are doing.

If we continue on this irrational path, American businesses will suffer.

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

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, the mistakes we are making in this Congress, bill after bill after bill, will damage this Nation's strength at a time when we need unity and strength more than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

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

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD two news articles about DHS sanctuary jurisdiction lists removed from their website given the fact that their local sheriffs were opposed to the lists, as well as a Third Way article highlighting that the red State murder rate was 33 percent higher than the blue State murder rate, which can be found at: <https://www.thirdway.org/report/the-21st-century-red-state-murder-crisis>.

[From Chicago Tribune, June 1, 2025]

LIST OF "SANCTUARY JURISDICTIONS" REMOVED FROM US GOVERNMENT WEBSITE FOLLOWING CRITICISM

WASHINGTON—A widely anticipated list of "sanctuary jurisdictions" no longer appears on the Department of Homeland Security's website after receiving widespread criticism for including localities that have actively supported the Trump administration's hard-line immigration policies. The department last week published the list of the jurisdictions. It said each one would receive formal notification the government deemed them uncooperative with federal immigration enforcement and whether they're believed to be in violation of any federal criminal statutes. The list was published Thursday on the department's website but on Sunday there was a "Page Not Found" error message in its place.

What is a 'sanctuary jurisdiction' and how was the US list of them made?

The list was part of the Trump administration's efforts to target communities, states and jurisdictions that it says aren't doing enough to help its immigration enforcement agenda and the promises the president made to deport more than 11 million people living in the U.S. without legal authorization. The list is being constantly reviewed and can be changed at any time and will be updated regularly, a DHS senior official said.

"Designation of a sanctuary jurisdiction is based on the evaluation of numerous factors, including self-identification as a Sanctuary Jurisdiction, noncompliance with Federal law enforcement in enforcing immigration laws, restrictions on information sharing, and legal protections for illegal aliens," the official said in a statement.

Homeland Security Secretary Kristi Noem said on Fox News' "Sunday Morning Futures" that there had been anger from some officials about the list. However, she didn't address why it was removed.

"Some of the cities have pushed back," Noem said. "They think because they don't have one law or another on the books that they don't qualify, but they do qualify. They are giving sanctuary to criminals."

The list, which was riddled with misspellings, received pushback from officials in communities spanning from urban to rural and blue to red who said the list doesn't appear to make sense.

In California, the city of Huntington Beach made the list even though it had filed a lawsuit challenging the state's immigration sanctuary law and passed a resolution this year declaring the community a "non-sanctuary city."

Jim Davel, administrator for Shawano County, Wisconsin, said the inclusion of his community must have been a clerical error. Davel voted for Trump as did 67% of Shawano County.

Davel thinks the administration may have confused the county's vote in 2021 to become a "Second Amendment Sanctuary County" that prohibits gun control measures with it being a safe haven for immigrants. He said the county has approved no immigration sanctuary policies.

[From NPR, June 2, 2025]

HOMELAND SECURITY PULLS DOWN LIST OF 'SANCTUARY' CITIES AND COUNTIES AFTER BACKLASH

(By Ximena Bustillo)

The Department of Homeland Security removed a list of "sanctuary jurisdictions" days after the agency posted it on its website.

The list included dozens of cities and counties across 37 states and the District of Columbia that DHS said were in noncompliance with federal statutes.

"DHS demands that these jurisdictions immediately review and revise their policies to align with Federal immigration laws and renew their obligation to protect American citizens, not dangerous illegal aliens," the DHS page stated.

The list, which posted late last week and came down on Sunday, was supposed to be the latest step in the Trump administration's effort to push back against local municipalities that it believes are obstructing its goals to increase immigration-related arrests and deportations. Since the start of the administration, mayors and governors of cities seen as "sanctuary" have been called to testify in Congress and federal agencies have looked into curbing federal resources from these areas.

In practice, sanctuary jurisdictions prohibit local law enforcement from assisting federal immigration officials on immigration-related operations.

But the list quickly faced intense criticism from mayors and law enforcement confused as to why they had been included. Over the weekend, the National Sheriff's Association President Sheriff Kieran Donahue accused DHS of lacking transparency and accountability in how the list was compiled.

"This list was created without any input, criteria of compliance, or a mechanism for how to object to the designation. Sheriffs nationwide have no way to know what they must do or not do to avoid this arbitrary label," Donahue said, calling on DHS to remove the list. "This decision by DHS could create a vacuum of trust that may take years to overcome."

Local leaders across the country also raised issues with their inclusion on the list. Mayors from Boise, Idaho, and San Diego, for example, were surprised to see their cities named. Colorado leaders also raised concerns; Aurora was removed before the list was posted.

President Trump issued an executive order on April 28 that directed the department and the attorney general to publish a list of states and local jurisdictions “obstructing federal immigration law enforcement and notify each sanctuary jurisdiction of its non-compliance, providing an opportunity to correct it.”

“Some of the cities have pushed back. They think that because they don’t have one law or another on the books that they don’t qualify but they do qualify,” DHS Secretary Kristi Noem on Fox’s Sunday Morning Futures.

The list, a senior DHS official said in a statement to NPR, is constantly reviewed, can be changed at any time and will be “regularly” updated.

“Designation of a sanctuary jurisdiction is based on the evaluation of numerous factors, including self-identification as a Sanctuary Jurisdiction, noncompliance with Federal law enforcement in enforcing immigration laws, restrictions on information sharing, and legal protections for illegal aliens,” the official’s statement said.

Since taking office, the Trump administration has taken steps to retaliate against jurisdictions it considered “sanctuary.” For example, the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services ended coordination on naturalization ceremonies with “sanctuary cities that restrict the ability of law enforcement to cooperate with DHS—in defiance of the rule of law—to enforce immigration laws and keep American communities safe from illegal and violent aliens,” according to USCIS spokesman Matthew Tragesser.

The administration has vowed to review federal disaster aid and other assistance that goes to “sanctuary jurisdictions.” The withholding of funding prompted lawsuits from 16 jurisdictions. A judge blocked the move.

The administration has also taken cities to court over policies it says limit cooperation with immigration authorities.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CISNEROS).

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for her leadership on this issue and in the committee.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation does not actually address the safety of the SBA. Workers are small businesses. Since my colleagues on the other side of the aisle disagree with the city’s policy, the majority chooses to punish all small businesses in that area.

Let’s be clear: This bill strips resources not from cities but for millions of small businesses, and it makes it harder for Americans to access assistance to start and grow their businesses.

Supporting small businesses should not be a partisan issue. We in the Committee on Small Business have heard in our hearings that targeting SBA resources in major cities will be critically detrimental.

For this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to the committee.

If the House rules permitted, I would have offered this motion with an important amendment to this bill. My amendment would prevent the legislation from taking effect until Congress receives reporting from the SBA on the proposed relocation of covered offices, including a justification for how these moves could possibly serve small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the text of this amendment immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for this motion to recommit.

I also submitted a separate amendment for consideration that would have prevented the implementation of this bill if the cost of relocating these offices out of Main Street would be more than zero dollars. Unfortunately, the Republican majority has blocked my amendment from receiving a floor vote today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and to vote in favor of my motion to recommit.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me begin by thanking the chair and the ranking member for their interest in good, managed, efficient SBA offices. They are Federal taxpayer dollars being invested to make sure that we continue to create jobs in our great country.

That being in mind, I would ask everybody to think about return on investment to taxpayers. Orange County, California, my home, today is probably the 30th largest economy in the world. It is home to Disneyland and the Anaheim Angels, and is probably the 30th largest economy in the world.

California, which always gets beat up here in this body, just became the fourth largest economy in the world. Let me say: We are the fourth largest economy in the world.

□ 1245

Guess what? As California taxpayers, we pay the Federal Government \$100 billion more in Federal tax dollars than we get back from the Federal Government. I would say, as an economy, we are doing pretty good. We need the workers. We need workers.

California has the biggest agricultural sector in the United States. We feed ourselves and other States in the Union and other nations, and 70 percent of our workforce is—guess what?—undocumented.

We are waiting for this body to pass immigration reform so good, hard-working individuals can be legalized.

We have the biggest manufacturing sector in the United States. It is not Pittsburgh or Michigan. California, southern Cal, is the biggest manufacturing sector in the United States. Guess who most of those workers are? Undocumented. They also pay Federal taxes.

Let’s evaluate the SBA not on rhetoric but on how many jobs an SBA office creates. What is that return on investment?

I am not sure why we are doing this today. We all know that there are millions and millions of undocumented workers in this country. Absolutely, we don’t want criminals, hardened criminals, in our district. I don’t want them as my neighbors.

If they are hardworking, honest individuals, taxpayers, what is wrong with giving them the opportunity to be American, to pursue that American Dream, and to be legalized? That is what America is all about.

I ask my colleagues to strongly consider their “yes” vote and please vote “no.” We are talking about Federal dollars, taxpayer dollars.

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

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

I include in the RECORD letters of opposition from the Democracy Defenders Action, UnidosUS, and the Small Business Majority, all organizations that raise concerns that the bill will deny small businesses access to critical support.

I am writing on behalf of Democracy Defenders Action (DDA), a non-partisan organization committed to safeguarding our democracy against rising authoritarian threats. We respectfully urge you to oppose the Save SBA from Sanctuary Cities Act, H.R. 2931.

The Save SBA from Sanctuary CMes Act is a blatant attempt to coerce cities into abandoning their values and violating the Constitution in service of Trump’s unpopular, unlawful deportation agenda. Cities must have the freedom to protect their citizens, and the data is clear: cities with welcoming policies are safer, stronger, and more prosperous.

If passed, this bill would essentially turn small businesses into collateral damage in Trump’s political war on immigrants—cutting off critical SBA support to entrepreneurs based solely on where they live. Ultimately, it will be small business owners, many of whom are already struggling in Trump’s economy, that will be most harmed by the uncertainty and service gaps prompted by the bill.

Congress must vote NO. Stand with local leaders. Stand with small businesses. Stand on the right side of history.

Best,

DIAMOND BROWN (she/her),
Senior Policy Counsel,
Democracy Defenders Action.

DEAR HILL COLLEAGUE, On behalf of UnidosUS, we urge Members to vote NO on both the Save SBA from Sanctuary Cities Act (H.R. 2931) and the American Entrepreneurs First Act (H.R. 2966).

H.R. 2931 represents an unacceptable politicization of the Small Business Administration (SBA), proposing to strip vital SBA resources from so-called “sanctuary” jurisdictions. This would deny millions of small businesses, especially those in underserved communities, access to essential services such as loans, disaster relief, and technical assistance, simply based on where they are located. These are businesses already navigating high prices and ongoing economic instability caused by the chaotic policies of the administration. Punishing them because their local governments instituted policies to draw a line between local law enforcement responsibilities and federal immigration enforcement will only deepen inequities and disrupt local economies.

H.R. 2966 adds insult to injury by imposing sweeping new restrictions on SBA loan eligibility, explicitly excluding entrepreneurs with certain immigration statuses—including asylees, refugees, DACA recipients, visa holders, and undocumented individuals. Many of these individuals are lawfully present in the U.S. and are creating jobs, paying taxes, and helping their communities thrive. Shutting them out of SBA programs undermines entrepreneurship, limits innovation, and weakens our long-term economic competitiveness.

Immigrant entrepreneurs open businesses at higher rates than native born Americans and Latino-owned businesses contribute almost \$800 billion to the nation's economy. And as we noted in our 2024 analysis on Latina Equal Pay Day, Latinas are key drivers of the U.S. economy. Their economic output exceeds \$1.3 trillion, surpassing the GDP of Florida, and they own over a quarter of all Latino-owned businesses. Yet despite these contributions, Latinas face profound structural barriers, earning just 58 cents for every dollar earned by non-Hispanic white men, and with nearly two-thirds lacking access to employer-based benefits. These challenges would be compounded by H.R. 2931 and H.R. 2966, which threaten to strip away the limited federal support many Hispanic entrepreneurs and workers can access.

By excluding entire categories of immigrant entrepreneurs, these bills risk driving more individuals into the shadow economy, undermining transparency and accountability. States and localities have a strong interest in knowing which businesses are operating in their communities, including street vendors and other informal enterprises. Instead of supporting these efforts, the legislation would make it harder to identify and engage such businesses, ultimately hindering local economic development and effective regulation.

Together, these bills are part of a broader effort to scapegoat immigrants, even when doing so comes at the direct expense of American small businesses and working families. We urge Members to reject this harmful and short-sighted agenda by voting NO on H.R. 2931 and H.R. 2966.

I'm reaching out on behalf of Small Business Majority to urge your office to vote NO on H.R. 2931, the Save SBA from Sanctuary Cities Act of 2025, which would penalize and strip SBA resources away from hundreds of thousands of small businesses at a time in which uncertainty on Main Street is skyrocketing.

H.R. 2931 would require the SBA to relocate any regional, district, or local office located in a "sanctuary jurisdiction," without any consideration for the cost or process of determining a new location for these offices. The bill follows the SBA's March announcement that it would relocate six regional offices from major entrepreneurial hubs, including New York City, Denver, and Chicago. As a result, hundreds of thousands of small businesses in these cities now stand to lose access to vital SBA personnel and resources—simply because the agency is prioritizing a political statement over the needs of entrepreneurs.

A statement from Small Business Majority Founder and CEO John Arensmeyer is below: "The federal government should do everything it can to meet small businesses where they are, which is why H.R. 2931 is an example of a policy proposal that would be ineffective at best and harmful at worst. The bill, which would require the U.S. Small Business Administration to relocate any regional, district or local SBA office housed in a 'sanctuary jurisdiction', ignores the fact that millions of small businesses are located

in or near cities that could be designated as a 'sanctuary jurisdiction.' Moving offices farther away from the small businesses they were intended to support certainly would not facilitate SBA better servicing these small firms. What's more, there is no evidence to even suggest that a city's policy toward immigrants has any relationship to its ability to effectively meet the needs of local small businesses. With that in mind, we strongly encourage members of the House of Representatives to ignore distractions like H.R. 2931 and focus on policies that would actually benefit America's entrepreneurs."

In addition to ongoing efforts to shutter regional offices, with no detailed or communicated plans as to where those offices will be relocated, SBA has also slashed its workforce by 43%, further restricting the agency's ability to meet the growing demands of today's small businesses. Recent national polling found that 78% of small business owners are concerned about cuts to the SBA and its programs. Nearly 8 in 10 small business owners report having used SBA programs for their business.

We urge your office to vote NO on H.R. 2931 which would continue to undermine the SBA's capacity to carry out its mission and strip resources away from hundreds of thousands of entrepreneurs for politically charged reasons.

Thank you for your consideration and please let me know if you have any questions.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the SBA is supposed to serve American small businesses, full stop—not just in certain cities, not just when it is politically convenient, but everywhere for everyone.

This bill doesn't meet that standard. It will rip support away from small businesses in the economic centers of this country because of the political party that runs their city. It creates disruption, wastes money, and puts politics ahead of supporting the American economy.

Politicians love to say that small businesses are the backbone of our economy. I ask, why target millions of them by supporting this bill? We should be supporting these businesses, not tearing them down.

The entrepreneurs I hear from aren't talking about asking for this. They are asking for better access to capital, more outreach, and a stable SBA that is there when they need it.

This bill moves us in the wrong direction. I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 458, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Cisneros of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2931 to the Committee on Small Business.

The material previously referred to by Mr. CISNEROS is as follows:

Mr. Cisneros of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2931 to the Committee on Small Business with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following new section:
SEC. 3. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon making a determination under section 2(b), the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate a report on the proposed relocation of any covered office that includes the following:

(1) The number of small business concerns located in the sanctuary jurisdiction served by the covered office compared to the number of such concerns located in area to which the covered office will be relocated.

(2) A detailed summary of the data-driven criteria used to inform the decision to relocate covered offices located in metropolitan areas.

(3) An explanation of how a relocation under this Act will better serve small business concerns.

(4) A detailed list of the district offices of the Administration that may be impacted by this Act.

(5) A detailed explanation of the plans to maintain the provision of services of the Administration during and after relocations made under this Act, particularly in metropolitan areas that are major economic centers.

(6) A detailed summary of the timeline for the proposed relocations.

(7) A detailed list, including names and titles of the employees for each covered office to be relocated.

(8) A summary of established clear, outcome-oriented goals and performance measures for the proposed relocations.

(9) An explanation of the extent to which such goals align with the mission of the Administration to—

(A) aid, counsel, assist, and protect the interests of small business concerns;

(B) preserve free competitive enterprises; and

(C) maintain and strengthen the overall economy of the nation.

(10) An identification of the individuals responsible for carrying out a proposed relocation under this Act and the resources required for such relocation, including a detailed summary of the experience of such individuals and the ability of such individuals to manage the relocation process.

(11) A description of the outreach and engagement the Administrator conducted for small business concerns located in sanctuary jurisdictions, and the input of such concerns on the proposed relocation.

(12) A detailed and comprehensive estimate of the cost of the proposed relocations and an explanation of the funding for costs associated with such relocations.

(b) PROHIBITION.—The Administrator may not relocate a covered office before the day after the date on which Administrator submits the report required by subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

CAPPING EXCESSIVE AWARDED OF SBLC ENTRANTS ACT OF 2025

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 458, I call up the bill (H.R. 2987) to amend the Small Business Act to require a limit on the number of small business lending companies, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 458, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Small Business, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2987

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 "Capping Excessive Awarding of SBLC Entrants Act of 2025" or the "CEASE Act of 2025".

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF SMALL BUSINESS LENDING COMPANIES.

Section 23 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 650) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(k) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF SMALL BUSINESS LENDING COMPANIES.—The Administrator shall ensure that not more than 16 small business lending companies that are not nonprofit entities are authorized to make loans under section 7 at any time."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. 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 material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2987, the CEASE Act, introduced by Representative BRESNAHAN.

This bill is simply a reversal of an irresponsible change made by the Biden administration's SBA, which raised concerns on both sides of the aisle.

Unlike a traditional community bank, small business lending companies, or SBLCs, are regulated by the SBA. Historically, the SBA recognized that they had finite resources to conduct oversight of the SBLCs, reinforcing a need for a cap on the number of SBLCs.

Despite this, in 2023, the Biden administration lifted the 40-year moratorium on licensing the SBLCs to participate in its flagship 7(a) program, a government-backed lending program.

The SBA heard concerns from Members from both Chambers and both sides of the aisle. Even the ranking member, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, said earlier this week during the Rules Committee hearing that she was one of the first to raise questions when the SBA lifted the licensing moratorium.

Biden's SBA hid behind promises of lender oversight and stronger borrower protection yet still awarded a license to an unqualified entity. This entity, which was seeking to sell its business when it was awarded a license, ultimately surrendered its license before it could even make a 7(a) loan.

This legislation puts the guardrails back and restores integrity to the 7(a) program, ensuring taxpayer dollars are safe. I am confident that the 16 SBLCs can and will be overseen effectively under Administrator Loeffler's leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2987, the so-called Capping Excessive Awarding of SBLC Entrants Act, or the CEASE Act.

This bill would impose a permanent statutory cap on the number of small business lending company, or SBLC, licenses the SBA can issue, limiting them to just 16.

While I understand and share some of the concerns raised about how the SBA has handled oversight of these licenses, I cannot support legislation that is rushed, vague, and potentially harmful to the very businesses we are supposed to be helping. Let's take a step back.

For more than 40 years, the SBA maintained a moratorium on new SBLC licenses, citing a lack of resources to properly supervise new entrants. That changed in 2023 when the agency finalized a new rule lifting the moratorium and began issuing additional licenses to expand participation in the 7(a) loan program. The goal was to help fill lending gaps, particularly in underserved communities that have historically struggled to access capital. That is a goal that I support.

I also believe it should be done carefully with the right oversight in place. I raised questions about the SBA's roll-

out of this policy when it first proposed the rule. I flagged concerns about whether the agency had the capacity to supervise these lenders effectively, and I called for transparency and clarity every step of the way.

I am not here to defend the SBA's process blindly, but H.R. 2987 doesn't actually fix the oversight issues. It just slaps an arbitrary cap on the program without addressing the real questions of how to improve accountability, how to expand access responsibly, and how to ensure these programs are helping the businesses that need it the most.

What is worse, the bill is completely silent on how this cap would apply to the Community Advantage program, a critical SBA initiative that helps make smaller-dollar loans available to startups, veterans, rural entrepreneurs, and other underserved borrowers.

Since being transitioned into the SBLC framework, Community Advantage lenders have continued to show strong results. Last year alone, the program issued over 1,100 loans worth nearly \$200 million, with an average loan size of just \$175,000.

These are the kinds of loans that traditional banks often will not make because they are not profitable, but they are exactly what many small businesses need to get off the ground. By leaving out an exception for mission-based CA lenders from the cap, this bill opens the door for a future administration to freeze new licenses or even eliminate the CA SBLCs altogether. That is a concern we have heard directly from lenders, community organizations, and small business advocates around the country.

These are the very lenders we relied on to help target PPP assistance to the smallest of small businesses during the global pandemic. They met the moment for many small employers in our communities that were locked out of the first rounds of PPP assistance.

At a time when small businesses are facing rising costs, tariff uncertainty, and tightening credit, Congress should be doing everything it can to expand access to capital, not pulling back on programs that are actually working. That is why I cannot support this bill in its current form.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRESNAHAN).

Mr. BRESNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, my bill, the Capping Excessive Awarding of SBLC Entrants Act, or the CEASE Act, restores a vital piece of integrity to the flagship SBA 7(a) loan program.

The Small Business Administration is authorized to issue government-backed 7(a) loans through certified depository institutions, like banks and credit unions, as well as certified nonbank lenders, like fintech companies.

Unlike certified depository institutions, whose primary regulator is the