

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTROL UNLAWFUL FUGITIVE
FELONS ACT OF 2017

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 533, I call up the bill (H.R. 2792) to amend the Social Security Act to make certain revisions to provisions limiting payment of benefits to fugitive felons under titles II, VIII, and XVI of the Social Security Act, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 533, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. 2792

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 "Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. REVISIONS TO PROVISIONS LIMITING PAYMENT OF BENEFITS TO FUGITIVE FELONS UNDER TITLE XVI OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT.

(a) FUGITIVE FELON WARRANT REQUIREMENT.—Section 1611(e)(4)(A)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1382(e)(4)(A)(i)) is amended—

(1) by striking "fleeing to avoid" and inserting "the subject of an arrest warrant for the purpose of";

(2) by striking "the place from which the person flees" the first place it appears and inserting "the jurisdiction issuing the warrant"; and

(3) by striking "the place from which the person flees" the second place it appears and inserting "the jurisdiction".

(b) PROBATION AND PAROLE WARRANT REQUIREMENT.—Section 1611(e)(4)(A)(ii) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1382(e)(4)(A)(ii)) is amended to read as follows:

"(ii) the subject of an arrest warrant for violating a condition of probation or parole imposed under Federal or State law.".

(c) DISCLOSURE.—Section 1611(e)(5) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1382(e)(5)) is amended—

(1) by striking "any recipient of" and inserting "any individual who is a recipient of (or would be such a recipient but for the application of paragraph (4)(A))"; and

(2) by striking "the recipient" each place it appears and inserting "the individual".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to benefits payable for months that begin on or after January 1, 2021.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Dakota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may

have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2792, the Control of Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act of 2017. In 1996, Congress and President Clinton worked together to reform welfare and reignite the American Dream for families in need.

Aligned with this goal was a provision prohibiting a range of welfare benefits—including Supplemental Security Income—to fugitive felons and violators of probation and parole because safety net programs need to be protected from abuse so they can remain in place for those individuals who need them.

Individuals who evade justice violate the social contract that grants them this safety net. Simply put, it is incoherent and self-defeating that a nation of laws would pay a wanted person and prolong their flight from justice. Unfortunately, due to a number of factors involving the courts, these provisions have been watered down in recent years and rendered ineffectual.

Through the CUFF Act, Congress can stand up, once again, on behalf of our communities and affirm what every participant in our society should understand: if you have an outstanding warrant for your arrest, you have an obligation to face justice or clear your name.

This legislation not only stops benefits from going to those who are not following the law, but it also helps law enforcement apprehend those suspects. A 2007 report by SSA's inspector general found that this policy aided law enforcement in apprehending almost 60,000 individuals who were evading arrest for outstanding warrants. In fact, law enforcement thinks this policy is so effective that the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs' Association, and the South Dakota Sheriffs' Association have expressed support for the CUFF Act.

Unfortunately, despite the fact that this commonsense bill is endorsed by law enforcement and has a proven track record of success, I anticipate that my colleagues across the aisle may try to convince you otherwise.

I have heard many of their arguments when the Ways and Means Committee considered this bill and when the Rules Committee also considered this bill.

So let's take each of those concerns in turn.

Some may say that this is an old, failed policy.

In reality, this policy has a long track record of success. In 2015, the Social Security inspector general said, at a hearing, that this bill would stop hundreds of millions of dollars in pay-

ments to individuals with felony warrants.

Some may say this bill targets people with outdated warrants.

In reality, SSA already has a wide authority to exempt individuals if the alleged offense is nonviolent and not drug related.

□ 0930

Some may say that this bill would throw beneficiaries off the rolls with no warning. In reality, the SSA provides beneficiaries advance notice of 35 days before suspending SSI benefits, and there is a robust appeal process for recipients who have had their benefits suspended.

Some may say that this policy is burdensome to law enforcement. In reality, this bill is supported by the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs' Association, and the South Dakota Sheriffs' Association because it helps them do their job to locate individuals.

Finally, some may raise concerns that it targets minority populations caught up in overcriminalization or overly harsh sentencing. To those concerns, I say that these issues are absolutely important, and I look forward to us having those conversations about criminal justice reforms here in Congress. However, that conversation is outside the scope of the legislation that we have before us today.

My legislation does not speak to the content of a warrant, just the fact that one exists. The decision to grant a warrant is made by a judge in a court of law, not by the Social Security Administration. It should not be the duty of the American taxpayer to subsidize individuals who are wanted by the police.

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, if an individual has an outstanding warrant, it must be addressed and cleared. This bill does nothing to change that.

Under my bill, nobody will lose their SSI benefits because of misdemeanor offenses such as merely having a parking ticket, petty theft, or even driving under the influence. This bill stops payments to individuals who have outstanding warrants for felonies. These are crimes like murder, rape, and kidnapping. It also stops payments to individuals with probation and parole violations, limiting their ability to evade arrest.

Supplemental Security Income is a lifeline to those who are in need. We must ensure we are not further facilitating criminal activity in communities that are all too often already struggling.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the time that we are spending to consider this important legislation, and I appreciate the opportunity to stand in support of my bill today.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my mother used to say: Right is right if nobody is right, and

wrong is wrong if everybody is wrong. H.R. 2792 is wrong. It is cruel. It is discriminatory.

I strongly oppose this Republican effort to strip low-income seniors and those with severe disabilities of Supplemental Security Income benefits, or SSI. I join in opposition with over 110 civil rights, disability, and aging advocates who have warned that H.R. 2792's harsh cuts will discriminate based on age, race, ethnicity, ability, income, and will further criminalize poverty.

I also strongly oppose the majority's decision to condition the reauthorization of our successful home visiting program on this bill's harm to the elderly and infirm.

SSI is only available to people who are elderly, who are severely disabled, and who have little or no assets. The typical SSI recipient lives on less than \$750 a month. So, by design, H.R. 2792, will only harm very poor, elderly, and disabled people. Within the population of adult recipients of SSI, approximately 83 percent are disabled, one-third are age 65 and older, and two-thirds are age 50 and older.

I reject proponents' claims that this bill will only target fugitive felons. In reality, current law terminates benefits for fugitive felons. This bill strikes the current restriction against fugitive felons and, instead, expands the benefit cutoff beyond those who are actually fleeing and encompasses everybody who had some unresolved run-in with the justice system based on allegation, not conviction.

I reject proponents' claim that only individuals charged with violent crimes or costly financial theft are affected by this bill. By undermining the constitutional presumption of innocence and depriving individuals of due process adjudication in a court of law, H.R. 2792 magnifies the deep inequities in our criminal justice system based on race, ethnicity, and income.

As an African-American man, I am very familiar with the decades of research documenting the racial-ethnic discrimination in our justice system. As an advocate for criminal justice reform, I know the dozens of studies documenting the faulty criminal justice data system on which benefit terminations will pivot solely because this bill removes due process by adjudication.

I reject proponents' claim that no one who has a misdemeanor or minor offense will be harmed. No uniform threshold for a felony exists. Indeed, four States—Florida, Massachusetts, Virginia, and New Jersey—have the lowest thresholds in the country, defining felonies as losses of \$300 or less, which is vastly different than the \$2,500 threshold set in Texas and Wisconsin. This bill cuts off an elderly or disabled person's lifeline benefits for a decades-old offense of \$300.

Also, we know that courts across the country are criminalizing poverty and raising revenue with fines and fees. Individuals on probation for mis-

demeanor offenses like vagrancy, shoplifting, and traffic violations get probation and fines or fees. When poor people can't pay these fees, arrest warrants are issued for a violation of their probation. As in the past, H.R. 2792 clearly terminates SSI benefits for such alleged violations without any due process.

I urge my colleagues to do what they know is right: stand up for our most vulnerable citizens, honor their most fundamental rights, and oppose H.R. 2792.

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

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD two letters of support. One is from the over 330,000 members of the National Fraternal Order of Police, and the other is from the National Sheriffs' Association.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,
Washington, DC, June 29, 2017.

Hon. KRISTI L. NOEM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. SAMUEL R. JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES NOEM AND JOHNSON: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our support for H.R. 2792, the "Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons (CUFF) Act."

In August 1996, President Clinton signed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act into law, which restricted the eligibility of fugitive felons, and probation and parole violators for Social Security benefits. The Social Security Administration's Office of the Inspector General (OIG) reported that this law has contributed to over 59,000 arrests since the inception of the program in 1996.

However, three different court decisions have eroded the law's effectiveness and the original intent of Congress, allowing fugitives to continue to collect benefits while on the run. This legislation will restore the original intent of the law by prohibiting an individual who is the subject of an outstanding arrest warrant for a felony or parole violation from receiving Social Security benefits.

The legislation will apply only to felony charges and amend the Social Security Act to make clear that the suspension of benefits is not just in cases of "escape, flight to avoid prosecution, or confinement, and flight-escape." The American taxpayer should not be forced to support those who are evading justice.

On behalf of the more than 330,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, thank you for your support for law enforcement. If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me or Jim Pasco, my Senior Advisor, in my Washington office.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,
National President.

NATIONAL SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, June 20, 2017.

Hon. DAVE REICHERT,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Trade, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN REICHERT: On behalf of the National Sheriffs' Association, I write today to endorse H.R. 2792, the "Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons (CUFF) Act." Too often, criminal felons receive federal benefits they are not entitled to collect. We believe this

clarifying legislation will help remediate this recurring problem and strike the right balance.

The bill does a number of important things including: amending the Social Security Act to prohibit an individual who is the subject of an outstanding arrest warrant for a felony or parole violation from receiving Social Security Benefits; restoring the original intent of the 1996 law, revising current law to discontinue benefits for individuals who are "the subject of an arrest warrant . . ." compared to the previous language of "fleeing to avoid" arrest, which was the main legal challenge; and applying only to felony charges, or a crime carrying a minimum term of one or more years in prison. This policy does not intend to punish individuals convicted of misdemeanors, such as outstanding parking tickets, as some have alleged.

Like you, I believe this is a commonsense bill that will give more Americans piece of mind in knowing that tax dollars aren't supporting criminal activity through continued benefits to those breaking the law. I applaud your efforts on this issue and look forward to working with you to ensure the passage of this key legislation.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN F. THOMPSON,
Executive Director and CEO.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is all about Republicans refusing to pay for an important public service that they know works. It is about their meager 6 percent solution, where they decline to extend services that empower families, that support young children and their parents, to extend that to the other 94 percent of eligible Americans, despite the fact that there is evidence-based indication that these services perform so well, and in one area, helped to prevent child abuse. It is about their refusal to respond in a fiscally responsible manner to support this program, despite what their own experts say about the effectiveness of the program.

So, instead of providing a reliable source of necessary funding for public services, Republicans insist upon being willing to remove life-sustaining resources from some of our country's most vulnerable citizens. It is really a punitive, mean-spirited effort to demonize the poor.

Let's look at who will be hurt by this retreat proposal, because they tried this a few years ago and it was rejected.

SSI, or Supplemental Security Income, is an initiative to help some of our most disadvantaged Americans. The SSI program pays modest cash benefits that can be obtained only by, essentially, showing that you have got nothing—well, not exactly nothing. You can have total assets other than your home of \$2,000. You can't have more than \$735 a month in income. If you are younger than 65, you must be disabled, perhaps a victim of cancer, chronic heart failure, or blindness.

There is strict enforcement of these standards, with over 70 percent of those who apply being denied.

What kind of person will they finance this child abuse prevention program from? Well, the 50-year-old man who had an arrest warrant—this is a true case—that had been issued when he failed to show up for court.

Why did he do that? Shouldn't he be punished?

Well, it turns out he was in a coma at the time that the arrest warrant was issued. He was unable to breathe without a long plastic tube surgically inserted in his throat and connected to an oxygen tank on his wheelchair. By the time his case was resolved before a judge, the medical supply company was taking away the breathing equipment.

Or Rosa Martinez, who got confused with another Rosa Martinez, and she had to go to court even though she wasn't the person being accused.

Each of these people and so many others, like those suffering from dementia in a nursing home and who may never have been convicted of anything, are the type of people from whom they will take resources in order to fund a necessary program.

Republicans on our committee are so motivated by their rigid ideology that they would not even permit a discussion with our staff of how to move forward on this initiative unless we committed to funding every dollar by taking it away from some other vital social service program within our committee's jurisdiction.

It ought not be necessary to rob Paula in order to provide valuable services to little Pauline. Even when they know how much is at stake, such as child abuse and disadvantaged children, and even when we have a way to address those problems and prevent that abuse, they won't add a single dollar of additional revenue.

Mr. DAVIS and I offered a variety of different ways to pay for this program and to actually see it serve more than 6 percent of eligible people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. You don't have to raise taxes. For one of those different ways, just enforce our current law. If someone receives an alimony payment, require documentation so they will know and the IRS will know that that money is due. That will raise a significant amount of money that would fund much of this reauthorization.

But because they are so opposed to adding a dollar to serve even an effective program, they take from the person with dementia at the nursing home. It is wrong. It demonizes people who deserve to be treated fairly.

We should reject this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify exactly what this legislation does.

This legislation will take SSI benefits from individuals and stop those payments to those who have felony arrest warrants or who have violated their probation and parole.

I want to go through the process so that everybody recognizes that there is plenty of time for individuals to go through the appeal process. Notice is given if there is a warrant that they need to get rectified with the jurisdiction that has authority. So let me step through this process.

Step one is through the Office of Inspector General. Law enforcement agencies give OIG information about individuals who have outstanding felony arrest warrants or who are violating conditions of probation or parole.

Then OIG compares this information to its computer files of individuals receiving these dollars or serving as representative payees. If there is a match, OIG verifies the identity of the individual, ensures that the warrants for the individual are still active, works with local law enforcement to attempt to locate the person, and then OIG refers the cases to SSA to begin the suspension process.

When this process gets to the Social Security Administration, SSA sends an advance notice to the individual. This notice proposes the suspension of benefit payments and informs the individual of their right to appeal the suspension decision, payment continuation, and the timeframe to take such actions after receiving the advance notice.

□ 0945

This notice includes why the SSA is suspending benefits and where, why, and when the warrant was issued. If SSA finds out, through a data match, 35 days is given for the individual to protest. If the individual protests, SSA will not suspend benefits until it figures out if the individual qualifies for a good cause exception. If the individual does not appeal his or her advance notice, then the SSA will suspend the benefits.

If the individual does appeal and gives his or her advance notice and provides evidence for the payment continuation, the SSA verifies the evidence and then continues the payments.

Other things that we should know about this legislation and what this includes is that warrants may only be resolved in the issuing jurisdiction. Grounds for dismissal of a warrant include identity theft, administrative error, and the individual's own move from the jurisdiction, especially if low income.

Warrants for misdemeanors remain warrants for misdemeanors and cannot become felonies. There is also latitude for the Commissioner to make decisions in special areas where there may be something to be considered, such as dementia or low-income abilities.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been thoroughly vetted. We are making sure

that the only people who are denied their SSI benefits are those who have felony warrants for their arrest or have violated probation or parole and have not gotten straight with law enforcement and rectified that past infraction.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), an icon for human rights.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. For many years, I have been a proud member to serve on the Ways and Means Committee, the oldest committee in the U.S. Congress. Our committee has a responsibility to put people before politics. We have a commitment to act in the best interest of all, not just a select few. Most importantly, we have a duty to protect and preserve the United States Constitution.

Today, Mr. Speaker, it hurts my soul that our committee will pass a bill that attacks the constitutional principle that you are innocent until proven guilty.

Where is the reason? Where is the compassion? What is the purpose? How can you gamble with the livelihood of those who are most in need? How can we punish the sick, the disabled, and the elderly? How can we pass a bill that targets Latinos, African Americans, and Native Americans? Mr. Speaker, how can you rob Peter to pay Paul?

Mr. Speaker, I urge each and every one of my colleagues to vote "no" on this mean and spiteful bill. It should never have seen the light of day. The American people deserve better, much better. We can do better. This bill should not be on the floor of the House. It is not worthy of the paper that it is written on.

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

Mr. Speaker, I live in the State of South Dakota. I have some of the poorest counties in the Nation in my State, and they happen to be my Native American Tribes. They face 80 to 90 percent unemployment, poverty like no other place in the country, and they are isolated. They also have very high drug and crime rates.

In fact, we have seen a record number of murders in these communities, especially on the Pine Ridge Reservation, in this calendar year, and it is deeply discouraging and disheartening to me to think of someone who could have committed a murder in one of my communities in the State of South Dakota, that there is a felony warrant out for their arrest, and that we may not be able to find them. This bill will fix that situation.

If that individual is receiving SSI payments, that helps law enforcement locate those individuals who have gone out and committed crimes against innocent people. Rape, murder, kidnapping, they all happen in my Native

American Tribes, and this helps law enforcement find them and bring them to justice. It is one of the important things that this legislation will help us do in some of our most vulnerable communities.

I also recognize that the previous speaker talked about the fact that we need criminal justice reforms, and that is a very good debate that we should be having in Congress. But this is not the bill to talk about criminal justice reforms because this is not germane to the discussion that we are having today.

I wanted to speak for a minute on what is good cause because there is latitude for good cause within statute today, and I think there is some confusion as to exactly how this bill would be interpreted when it is signed into law.

In some cases, the SSI will not suspend or seek an overpayment of payments for good cause exceptions. There are two types of good cause exceptions that already exist in statute. The mandatory good cause exception is the SSA cannot suspend payments if a court has found an individual not guilty or has dismissed charges. If a court has vacated the warrant or issued any similar exoneration, then they cannot suspend payments. They also cannot suspend payments if there is a mistaken identity due to identity fraud.

The other exception in statute today is discretionary good cause exceptions. The SSA may suspend benefits for mitigating circumstances under two options:

Option A is the individual must prove that the criminal offense was non-violent and not drug related. We also have that the individual has not been convicted of a felony crime since the warrant was issued, and the other point is that the law enforcement agency that issued the warrant reports that it will not act on the warrant. That is other exceptions for good cause.

Option B, the individual must prove all of these factors: if the criminal offense was nonviolent and not drug related; the individual has not been convicted of a felony crime since the warrant was issued; the warrant is the existing warrant and was issued 10 or more years ago and the individual lacks the mental capacity to resolve the warrant, which includes those living in a nursing home or mental treatment facility.

So as we have listened to opponents of this bill talk, they have discussed all of these issues as to how these benefits could be taken away from individuals that are clearly covered by good cause exceptions that are already in statute, and those situations are not relevant to the debate that we are having today.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, MIECHV Program is an effec-

tive evidence-based program that I am proud to support because I know it results in healthier families and stronger communities, but I am shocked at the way Republicans are choosing to pay for it.

Instead of enacting commonsense tax changes that could easily raise the needed revenue, Republicans have reached to the bottom of the barrel to find vulnerable people to harm.

In order to come up with a way to pay for this important bipartisan program, they are choosing to take Supplemental Security Income away from vulnerable seniors, low-income individuals, or those with disabilities; and they are doing it by maligning them as fugitives and felons just because they have an outstanding warrant. But the truth is a very different story.

The people who will be hurt by this bill are not hardened criminals. They haven't even had their day in court yet. In fact, many may not even know about the warrant because the police have decided that it is not worth pursuing. That is because the warrants are for small issues like writing a bad check or failing to appear for a hearing many years ago.

Worse, these individuals are elderly, poor, or sick. They deserve support and help, not to be treated as a piggybank. Actually, piggybanks generally indicate savings. This is a policy equivalent of reaching into a couch cushion for change. We are talking about individuals who have a warrant from when they were a teenager or somebody with a mental illness who may not even remember the incident in question. This is cruel and unbecoming of this Congress.

I know because we have tried this before. The last time this penalty was used, it meant catastrophe for very low-income people with disabilities and for seniors. It hurt people like J.H., a Californian with an intellectual disability and other mental impairments. J.H. had his SSI benefits stopped because of an Ohio warrant issued when he was 12 years old and running away to escape an abusive stepfather. This 4-foot-7-inch-tall, 85-pound boy was charged with assault for kicking a staff member at a detention center where he was being held until his mother could pick him up. Many years later, he had no recollection of the incident or the charges, but his SSI benefits were stopped nonetheless.

Is that really how we want to pay for home visitations: Impoverishing one person to help another?

That is why I worked to curb this bill's negative effects, by offering amendments that would protect those with dementia or keep it from increasing homelessness. Unfortunately, Republicans rejected both my amendments on a party line basis, so now we are stuck with this overly broad punitive bill that I cannot support.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, taxpayers should not be subsidizing those who have felony warrants for their arrest or violating parole and probation.

I wanted to remind everyone today that in 1996, the same provision was amended into other programs that we have at the Federal Government level. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families—cash welfare—has these same provisions included in that program.

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—SNAP or food stamps—has these same provisions in the program. Housing programs, such as public housing, Section 8 vouchers, project-based Section 8, all have these same provisions in that program.

In addition, there are similar provisions added to Social Security disability and retirement programs, and the Department of Veterans Affairs benefits has this same provision that we are putting back into statute today when it comes to SSI payments.

Mr. Speaker, you can clearly see that this is bringing this program up to the same level of accountability to taxpayers and not subsidizing those who commit crimes against innocent individuals, and is an entirely appropriate debate here today.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 15 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from South Dakota has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2792, the hopelessly misnamed Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act.

As has become sadly routine in this Chamber under Republican rule, this bill considers those merely accused of a crime as if they were convicted felons without bothering with little niceties like due process. Having dispensed with basic constitutional protections, the bill then cuts off vital government assistance to some of the most vulnerable people in our society.

Under current law, the Social Security Administration helps law enforcement track down individuals with an outstanding arrest warrant for an alleged felony or an alleged violation of probation or parole. Those who are actively fleeing law enforcement can also have their Supplemental Security Income, or SSI, benefits terminated. Under this bill, however, SSI benefits, which serve as a lifeline for low-income seniors and people with disabilities, would be terminated, whether or not people are actually attempting to evade justice.

The mere issuance of a warrant or an alleged parole violation with no arrest,

no trial, and no conviction would be enough to cut off vital benefits to the neediest among us. This is not just unconstitutional, it is inhumane. The bill would ensure that many low-income seniors and people with disabilities will lose their benefits unfairly and unnecessarily.

The vast majority of people affected by this bill have outstanding warrants that law enforcement chooses not to bother serving, often because they are for very old or minor offenses. Many people do not even know that an arrest warrant has been issued for them, but this bill would consider them as felons fleeing justice.

Many warrants are issued on the basis of mistaken identity, inaccuracies, or paperwork errors. It can take months to resolve such errors, which might involve traveling to a distant jurisdiction, hiring an attorney, and working through an overloaded court system.

And supporters of this bill expect people living on less than \$750 a month to do all of this: to go to a different jurisdiction, to hire an attorney, to do all of this while the benefits they rely on to subsist are cut off?

That is outrageous.

□ 1000

We heard from the gentlewoman from South Dakota about various exceptions to the bill, you can go through this process and that process. With what attorney? With what money? Does this bill have an appropriation in it to supply attorneys for people faced with this cutoff, people who, by definition, are the poorest people, who can't afford an attorney?

This legislation is a blatant violation of due process, and it will cause untold suffering to the people who need our help the most. At a time when Republicans are unveiling their proposal for massive tax cuts for the wealthy, this bill is a shameful illustration of the majority's priorities.

It is also a shameful illustration of something we have seen on this floor too often, and that is the assumption that anyone accused of something is guilty and that we don't have to bother with a trial, we don't have to bother with proof, and we don't have to bother with due process. That eviscerates much of the reason for the existence of this country, to vindicate due process, to give people rights and not to assume that anyone who a judge or someone thinks may have committed a crime is automatically guilty. We believe in due process in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this bill's defeat.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources. I thank him for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2792 and to thank the gentlewoman from South Dakota for her tremendous effort on this piece of legislation.

This is a good bill which improves existing law and sends an important message: taxpayers should not provide benefits to individuals wanted by the police under outstanding warrants or parole violations for felonies or other serious crimes. Let me say that again. This improves existing, actually, bipartisan law, and it is not a new concept. It only applies to individuals with outstanding warrants for serious crimes.

The bill provides 4 years for the Social Security Administration to implement this law and to ensure benefits are not unfairly or improperly discontinued.

It also provides a process under which SSA notifies beneficiaries of issues with an outstanding warrant or parole violation and provides time for them to address the concern with law enforcement.

In addition, SSA is empowered to provide compassionate allowances for those with serious disabilities or medical concerns who are unable to clear their warrant in a timely fashion.

Mr. Speaker, this is a narrow bill which protects both law-abiding beneficiaries and taxpayers. It is important that we have these funds to help the needy families who are benefiting from the MIECHV program, the home visitation program, a unique Federal program that actually shows that it makes a positive difference in the lives of young people and young families.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we look at the entire issue in a fiscally responsible way, where we have the funds through this bill to pay for the needs among needy families across America.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding and for his tireless leadership for families everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2792, the so-called Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act. This cruel and misguided bill would terminate Supplemental Security Income benefits for vulnerable seniors and people with disabilities who have an outstanding warrant.

Let me be clear. This is a horrible bill. It is mean-spirited and it is unfair. Despite this bill's misleading title, Americans who would be harmed by this bill are not felons and they are not fugitives.

In reality, this bill would rip benefits from individuals who haven't been arrested, tried, or even convicted. They have only been accused. This violates the basic principle of innocent until proven guilty, and it would terminate benefits without due process.

What is worse, most of these outstanding warrants are decades old and involve minor infractions when people are unable to pay for court fines and fees. This is awful.

This bill criminalizes families living in poverty, and it disproportionately

harms communities of color. One in five SSI recipients are African Americans. Without this critical program, believe you me, African Americans will struggle even more.

Make no mistake; cutting off SSI benefits would put all families at risk of being unable to keep a roof over their heads, put food on the table, and meet other basic needs. And for what? To pay for the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program.

We know that this is an important program and helps millions of struggling families, but we cannot afford to rob Peter to pay Paul. Lives are at risk here. This is as sinister as it gets.

Taking an ax to these lifesaving benefits is cruel and heartless. That is why 120 civil rights, disability, and retirement organizations oppose this, including the NAACP, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the League of United Latin American Citizens, the National Council of Churches, and the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, this should really be a wake-up call to this Chamber to defeat this bill immediately. Instead of ramming through a bill that would push more people into poverty, we should be working to create good-paying jobs and expand opportunities for all.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this mean-spirited and heartless bill.

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

I just want to remind everyone that the bill we are debating here today would suspend SSI benefits for those who have felony warrants for their arrest and those who have violated probation or parole. That is the discussion that we are having here today. And let's go back over, in summary, what the policy actually does and says.

This policy should not be thought of in isolation. This is part of a larger effort to reauthorize the evidence-based, outcome-focused Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program.

H.R. 2824, which passed this Chamber on Tuesday, will be joined with this bill upon passage. It helps to improve the lives of families in at-risk communities, focusing on the first years of a child's life.

Unlike most Federal social programs, MIECHV funding is tied to real results, which ensures limited taxpayer dollars are actually delivering the intended results and helping those that are most in need.

Under current law, the program is 100 percent federally funded, but H.R. 2824 introduces a Federal match similar to what States must already do in other social programs, such as foster care,

Medicaid, child support enforcement, childcare, and others. The rest of the package ensures this program remains a shining example of evidence-based policy by expecting the program to continue to demonstrate effective outcomes. That reauthorization is fully offset by the bill that we are considering here today, H.R. 2792.

Instead of focusing on our Nation's debt, we should be doing more of what we are doing right here in these bills: prioritizing Federal spending and focusing on what works by improving the integrity of one program to provide funding for another.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for yielding and the gentlewoman from South Dakota for managing this bill.

The crux of this bill, however, is, again, to support and fund the multi-trillion-dollar tax cuts that have just been introduced, that will give millions, if not billions, if not trillions, to the richest of Americans, and that is a very sad commentary.

I oppose the Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act because it is not that. It will terminate essential benefits for poor people, deprive poor people of due process, and increase mass incarceration.

If the Rules Committee had simply taken my amendment, it would have remedied these criminal justice defects, which struck the arrest warrant language because it recklessly targets vulnerable people. This bill deprives citizens of due process, particularly where many poor individuals are completely unaware of a pending warrant.

Let me be very clear. What you have is a situation where you may have a mentally ill individual in a nursing home who now has a warrant that they are not aware of. You will then cut off their benefits.

What does that do to those families.

Prohibiting SSI payments to individuals with an outstanding warrant or parole or probation violation without due process is simply inhumane. This bill would terminate those benefits from very low-income seniors and people with disabilities. They may not even know that they have these warrants.

Now, I am a strong supporter of the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program, and I tell you that the Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee had an amendment to pay for a 5-year reauthorization of that program, doubling the funding, by closing a tax loophole. They were not allowed to even vote on that amendment.

What does that say? This is a conspiracy.

There are 110 organizations that are against this, including the Alliance for

Retired Americans, the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Hand in Hand; The Domestic Employers Network, and the Coalition on Human Needs.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a document with the names of all of these organizations.

JUNE 26, 2017.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: On behalf of the 119 undersigned organizations, we urge you to oppose efforts to cut Supplemental Security Income (SSI) to offset the costs of the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program (MIECHV program).

H.R. 2824 would reauthorize the MIECHV program, which funds voluntary, evidence-based home visiting programs for at-risk pregnant women and parents with young children up to kindergarten entry. The current MIECHV program has demonstrated beneficial outcomes associated with improved maternal and child health, including increased access to screening and early intervention for childhood disabilities.

Unfortunately, H.R. 2824 proposes to pay to extend this valuable maternal and child home visiting program by cutting off SSI entirely for certain adolescents and adults with disabilities, as well as seniors.

H.R. 2824 would revive an old, failed policy that had catastrophic effects for many people with disabilities and seniors, employing procedures that did not withstand judicial scrutiny. The Social Security Act currently prohibits SSI payments to individuals fleeing from law enforcement to avoid prosecution or imprisonment. The existing system is already working to ensure that those who shouldn't be paid SSI benefits don't receive them.

The proposed cut, Section 201 of H.R. 2824, would bar payment of SSI benefits to people with an outstanding arrest warrant for an alleged felony or for an alleged violation of probation or parole. Most of the warrants in question are decades old and involve minor infractions, including warrants routinely issued when a person was unable to pay a fine or court fee, or a probation supervision fee.

Based on prior experience with SSA's failed former policy, the people who would be affected are those whose cases are inactive and whom law enforcement is not pursuing. Many people are not even aware that a warrant was issued for them, as warrants are often not served on the individual. A very high percentage of people who would lose benefits have mental illness or intellectual disability. Many are unaware of the violation, may not have understood the terms of parole or probation, or may have other misunderstandings about their case.

Warrant databases are notoriously inaccurate. Fourteen percent of the arrest warrants processed by the federal Warrant Information Network in 2004 were later dismissed by the court or returned unexecuted. The state of Alabama, even with an audit mechanism in place, reported a 13% error rate in its arrest warrant databases. Due to these kinds of inaccuracies, some people will have their SSI benefits cut off as a result of mistaken identity, or paperwork errors, which can take months or even years to resolve.

When this failed policy was previously implemented by SSA, many of those who had their benefits cut off had no arrest warrant outstanding against them. For example, Rosa Martinez, the lead plaintiff in *Martinez v. Astrue* was, in 2008, a 52-year old woman who received notice from SSA that she was losing her disability benefits because of a 1980 arrest warrant for a drug offense in Miami, Florida. Ms. Martinez had never been to Miami, never been arrested, never used il-

legal drugs, and is eight inches shorter than the person described in the warrant. Despite an obvious case of mistaken identity, Ms. Martinez was left without her sole source of income. It was only after filing a lawsuit in federal court that Ms. Martinez was able to have her benefits restored.

Resolving outstanding warrants can be very difficult and costly. People often must go before a judge in the issuing jurisdiction, and typically need counsel to assist them in navigating the process. Often, people have moved in the intervening years and live far away from the issuing jurisdiction. The proposed offset would cut off all SSI income. Losing this income will cause many people to become homeless and unable to meet their basic needs, much less resolve a warrant, a case of mistaken identity, or an error in the warrant database. Completely cutting off SSI benefits will leave people with little recourse to resolve an outstanding warrant, representing a step backward in bipartisan efforts towards criminal justice reform.

By relying on databases of outstanding arrest warrants, this proposal seeks to punish people by presuming their guilt, undermining the presumption of innocence that is the bedrock of our criminal justice system. The existence of an arrest warrant does not establish that any criminal conduct has occurred. Many arrests do not result in criminal charges, or the charges are eventually dismissed. Even if an individual is charged and subsequently prosecuted, he or she is presumed innocent until proven guilty.

The proposed offset also will have a disproportionate impact on people of color. People who are on probation are particularly susceptible to having an outstanding arrest warrant. Parolees and probationers are disproportionately people of color—in 2015, 13% of adults on probation were Hispanic, and 30% of adults on probation were African American.

Finally, the proposed offset could harm some of the very same children who we seek to help through home visiting. In any given month, approximately 2.7 million children are estimated to live with a family member who is a senior or adult with a disability who receives SSI. These children's families are overwhelmingly the same types of families served by the MIECHV program: over 3 in 5 families with a SSI recipient age 18 or older have a total family income below 150% of the federal poverty level, and SSI makes up on average about 40 percent of these families' income. Cutting off SSI income would put families at risk of being unable to keep a roof over their heads, put food on the table, and meet other basic needs—including children's and mothers' health needs.

H.R. 2824 would also harm Social Security beneficiaries—since over half of SSI recipients who are elderly, and almost one-third of SSI recipients with disabilities, are Social Security beneficiaries.

In closing, we reiterate that although the MIECHV program has demonstrated beneficial outcomes, and reauthorization must be a priority, it should not come at the expense of cuts to SSI, which would harm seniors, adolescents and adults with disabilities, and their families, and should not be raided as a pay-for for an unrelated program. We urge the U.S. Congress to reject any proposals to offset the costs of reauthorizing the MIECHV program by cutting SSI benefits.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

AFL-CIO; AFSCME; Aging Life Care Association; Alliance for Children's Rights; Alliance for Retired Americans; American Academy of Pediatrics; American Psychological Association; Association of Jewish Aging Services; Association of University Centers

on Disabilities; Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law; Center for American Progress; Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP); Coalition on Human Needs; Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities Social Security Task Force; Defending Rights and Dissent; Easterseals; Economic Policy Institute Policy Center; FedCURE; FORGE, Inc.; Gray Panthers.

Hand in Hand: The Domestic Employers Network; Harm Reduction Coalition; Institute for Science and Human Values; Justice in Aging; Justice Strategies; Latinos for a Secure Retirement; Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; League of United Latin American Citizens; Legal Services for Prisoners with Children; Lutheran Services in America Disability Network; NAACP; NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.; National Alliance on Mental Illness; National Association of Disability Representatives; National Black Justice Coalition; National Center for Lesbian Rights; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare; National Council of Churches; National Disability Rights Network.

National Employment Law Project; National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund; National Organization for Women; National Organization of Social Security Claimants' Representatives (NOSSCR); National Women's Law Center; Paralyzed Veterans of America; People Demanding Action; PolicyWorks, Inc.; Polio Survivors Association; Prison CONversation; Rainbow PUSH Coalition; Resources for Independent Living; Root & Rebound; Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law; Service Employees International Union; Social Security Works; StoptheDrugWar.org; The Arc of the United States; Union for Reform Judaism.

STATE/LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

2-1-1 California; ABD Productions/Skywatchers; ADAPT Montana; Alameda County Community Food Bank; Berkeley Food Network; BNICEH (Black Network In Children's Emotional Health); California Association of Food Banks; California Association of Public Authorities for In-Home Supportive Services; California Church IMPACT; California Council of the Blind; California Food Policy Advocates; California In-Home Supportive Services Consumer Alliance; California Office of the State Long-Term Care Ombudsman; California OneCare; California Partnership; Californians for Disability Rights, Inc.; Californians for SSI; Center for Independence of the Disabled, NY; Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organizations; Columbia Legal Services.

Community Legal Services of Philadelphia; Community Service Society of New York; Communities Actively Living Independent & Free; Disability Law Center, Massachusetts; Disability Law Center, Utah; Disability Policy Consortium of Massachusetts; Disability Rights California; Disability Rights Idaho; Disability Rights New Jersey; Disability Rights North Carolina; Disability Rights Wisconsin; Empire Justice Center; Friends In Deed; GetTogether Adult Day Health Care Center; Homeboy Industries; Hunger Action Los Angeles; IMPRUE (Independent Movement of Paratransit Riders for Unity, Vehicles, Equality); Jewish Family Service of Los Angeles; Kentucky Protection and Advocacy; Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County.

Legal Council for Health Justice; Little Tokyo Service Center; MFY Legal Services, Inc.; National Association of Social Workers, California Chapter; Northern California ADAPT; Ohio Association of Local Reentry Coalitions; Personal Assistance Services Council; Public Counsel; PUEBLO People

United For a Better Life in Oakland; Pushing Limits Radio (KPFA); Rubicon Programs; San Francisco Senior & Disability Action; Senior and Disabled Fund of San Bernardino County; Senior Services Coalition of Alameda County; Sonoma County Homeless Action!; St. Anthony Foundation; St. Mary's Center; UC Hastings Community Justice Clinics' Individual Representation Clinic; Urban Justice Center; Western Center on Law and Poverty.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. In addition, let me share with you the reality of this: Rosa Martinez. Yes, the Social Security Administration was doing this before, but they had to stop it.

We are now reigniting it because Rosa Martinez filed a suit in 2008. She was a 52-year-old disabled woman from Redwood, California, who received a notice from SSA last December that she was losing her only source of income, her disability benefits, because of a 1980 arrest warrant for a drug offense in Miami, Florida.

Ms. Martinez has never been to Miami, has never been arrested, and has never used illegal drugs. In addition, she is 8 inches shorter than the Rosa Martinez identified in the warrant.

Do you want this random, reckless cutting off of SSI benefits because of misidentification? Identity theft is rampant. So this bill is failed, it is a failure, and it has a number of Achilles' heels that will not work.

The bill will also increase mass incarceration. We should allow law enforcement to do their job. I don't mind giving them the tools that they need, but I refuse to allow individuals to suffer because of this very abusive bill.

I kneeled on this floor because of injustice. This is a bill that is full of injustices.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2792.

I oppose this bill for the following reasons: SSI is a needs-based program for people with limited income and resources.

It will terminate essential benefits of poor people.

It will deprive poor people of due process.

It will increase mass incarceration.

My amendment would have remedied these criminal justice defects in H.R. 2792, which struck the arrest warrant language because (1) it recklessly targets vulnerable and innocent individuals; (2) this bill deprives citizens of due process, particularly where many poor individuals are completely unaware of any pending warrant, and (3) there have been cases in which warrants were either decades old or, in many instances, it was a matter of a mistaken identity.

The bill amends the Social Security Act (SSA) to make certain revisions that limit payment of benefits to fugitive felons under titles II, VIII, and XVI of the (SSA), by prohibiting Supplemental Security Income (SSI) payments to individuals with an outstanding felony warrant or parole or probation violation.

"Almost none of the individuals who would be affected by this provision are actual fugitives from justice and most of the warrants in question are many years old and involve minor infractions," the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities said in a letter to Senators who tried to implement this policy.

This bill is merely a continuation of President Trump's \$1.7 trillion budget cuts of programs designed to help the millions of poor and low-income families that need these programs for survival.

Plainly stated, this bill will terminate SSI benefits of very low-income seniors and people with disabilities, because SSI is granted based on financial need.

In creating this bill, the sponsors essentially agree that it is best to incarcerate economically vulnerable people in order to fund the Maternal Infant Early Childhood Home Visiting program (MIECHV).

As the Center for Law and Social Policy, a nonprofit group focused on low-income Americans, previously reported of the Trump's budget scheme, this bill would likewise, create an overall assault on a wide range of ordinary Americans for the purpose of providing tax cuts to the wealthiest.

My Democratic colleagues on Ways and Means offered amendments to fully pay for a 5-year reauthorization of the MIECHV program and doubling the funding by closing a tax loophole called the "stretch IRA". Republicans however, would not let my colleagues vote on those amendments.

My amendment and those of my colleagues would have made this bad bill a lot more palatable.

Instead, the Republicans have chosen, once again, to lock people up, and do so in a manner that deprives poor people of their sole source of income, while purporting to safeguard against fugitive felons that are recipients of these SSI benefits.

This bill is unnecessary because under current law, SSI and Social Security payments are already prohibited to people fleeing prosecution or confinement.

Most alarming, this bill will terminate these benefits without any judicial determination of guilt, and thus, usurping recipients' rights to due process.

The presumption of "innocent until proven guilty" is the constitutional principle at the bedrock of our criminal justice system. This principle guarantees that the government cannot deprive citizens of their rights without due process of the law.

The bill maintains that payments could be immediately restored once the individual resolves any outstanding issues, a potentially lengthy and time-consuming process.

Ask the thousands of individuals swept under this broad policy if that is true. SSA already tried to implement this very ill-advised policy and it resulted in thousands of court challenges in 2009 forcing the agency to repay billions of dollars it had withheld from people deemed fugitives.

For example, Miami resident Joseph Sutrynowics' Social Security Disability Insurance benefits were halted in 2008 because of a bad check he'd written to cover groceries in Texas more than a decade earlier.

Under this policy, SSA agreed to repay \$700 million in benefits that were withheld from 80,000 people whose benefits have been suspended or denied since January 1, 2007 in the Martinez v. Astrue case. SSA could also, reportedly, repay close to \$1 billion in benefits to 140,000 individuals in the Clark v. Astrue case.

We have already tried this before and failed miserably. Let us not waste tax payers' money in litigation, while causing poor folks to go

hungry. As the old adage says: “don’t continue to do the same thing and expect a different result, that’s insanity”.

Past experiences proved that this policy was detrimental then, and it is so now. It will further exacerbate the epic tragedy of mass incarceration, and the attendant costs incurred by taxpayers, particularly in the well-documented higher cost of incarcerating the elderly and those in poor health.

Even conservative coalitions like Freedom Works, American Conservative Union Foundation, Generation Opportunity, and Taxpayers Protection Alliance agreed that mass incarceration is extremely costly to taxpayers.

In addition to tax dollars in litigation fees, incarceration cost taxpayers \$407.58 per person per day and \$148,767 per person per year.

Criminalizing poor individuals, depriving them of their social security income benefits, and increasing the incarceration rate in this fashion will NOT solve the fugitive problem this bill purports it will do.

In fact, this bill will expand existing problems of mass incarceration by increasing the likelihood for recidivism. Statistics show that incarceration does not serve as deterrence, nor does it keep our communities safe.

For the reasons stated above, I oppose this bill.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 2792, the misleadingly titled Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act of 2017, which would prohibit the payment of Supplemental Security Income benefits to anyone with an unresolved arrest warrant for an alleged violation of a condition of probation or parole or an alleged felony offense.

H.R. 2792’s title falsely claims to target fugitive felons. In fact, fugitive felons are already prohibited from receiving benefits under current law. If this bill were enacted, some of our country’s most vulnerable low-income seniors and disabled Americans, who are neither fugitives nor felons, would not be able to get their SSI benefits.

While proponents of H.R. 2792 continue to claim that the bill only targets violent fugitive felons, H.R. 2792 threatens many other individuals, like those who received arrest warrants because of an inability to pay court fines or fees. Just last week, the United States Commission on Civil Rights published a report, titled, “Targeted Fines and Fees Against Low-Income Communities of Color: Civil Rights and Constitutional Implications,” which found that many local jurisdictions rely on court fees or other fines to support their municipal budgets, including fees charged to those under court supervision.

Some of the people charged with these fees are elderly or disabled SSI beneficiaries who are unable to work and have no way to pay court costs. When they cannot pay, a warrant is

routinely issued for their arrest. If this bill were enacted, these people would lose their SSI benefits, which is the only source of income for many of these low-income disabled individuals.

During the markup of H.R. 2792, I offered a commonsense amendment which would have prevented SSI benefits from being cut off if the result would be the loss of benefits for individuals whose arrest warrants were issued for nonpayment of court costs. Unfortunately, my Republican colleagues rejected the amendment, as well as all other Democratic amendments to this bill.

I stand united with over 119 national, State, and local organizations who oppose efforts to cut SSI benefits, and I urge opposition to the final passage of this bill.

Further, I would like to go on the record to say that we should have a clean reauthorization of the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program, MIECHV, which expires on September 30. The majority’s decision to tie home visiting to this harmful cut for our most vulnerable citizens only makes this harder to accomplish.

MIECHV programs are proven programs, evidence-based programs that work. We actually should reauthorize these programs, but we should not tie it to this horrible bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the bill.

□ 1015

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2792 is a harsh, unfair bill. It would undermine the foundation of American justice, innocent until proven guilty, and it would do so for Americans who are impoverished and already at a severe disadvantage because of age, disability, education, race, and ethnicity. It would strip people of basic income, in many cases all they have to live on, based on a mere accusation.

I reject the majority’s contention that people in nursing homes, people with dementia and cognitive impairments, and others with nowhere else to turn will not be harmed by this bill because of the very limited authority current law gives the Social Security commissioner to issue good cause exemptions.

We know the good cause process is complicated and very difficult to navigate. Not surprisingly, the last time the policy was in effect, only a tiny fraction of the people who lost their basic income were able to follow the instructions in the six-page letter from SSA and apply for relief, the good cause process that the majority repeatedly touts, as few as 10 days before benefit termination. SSI recipients have extremely limited financial resources and are severely disabled, elderly.

Resolving errors within the criminal justice system is a long process that typically must be done in the geographic jurisdiction of the court and necessitates legal costs.

The goal of H.R. 2792 is the same: raise \$2.1 billion by cutting off benefits for tens of thousands of impoverished, elderly, and disabled people, be they cognitively impaired, victims of mistaken identity, facing homelessness, those who committed minor offenses, or those who are too poor to pay their court fees and fines.

Mr. Speaker, there are no protections in this bill. There is no reason, no rational benefit, but there are instances where individuals will be forced to suffer even more than they currently do, so let’s not cut off their Social Security Income benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, the CUFF Act is commonsense. The American taxpayer should not subsidize individuals who are fleeing from law enforcement.

Because the Social Security Administration already possesses in place processes that will ensure due process and protect beneficiaries, claims about this bill are overblown and, quite frankly, they are wrong.

I am proud that this bill is supported by the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs’ Association, and the South Dakota Sheriffs’ Association.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 533, 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.

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

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. 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.

DISASTER TAX RELIEF AND AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3823) to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the