

STOP ADVERTISING VICTIMS OF EXPLOITATION ACT
OF 2014

MAY 15, 2014.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of
the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. GOODLATTE, from the Committee on the Judiciary,
submitted the following

R E P O R T

together with

DISSENTING VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 4225]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 4225) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a penalty for knowingly selling advertising that offers certain commercial sex acts, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

CONTENTS

	Page
The Amendment	3
Purpose and Summary	3
Background and Need for the Legislation	3
Hearings	4
Committee Consideration	4
Committee Votes	4
Committee Oversight Findings	7
New Budget Authority and Tax Expenditures	7
Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate	7
Duplication of Federal Programs	8
Disclosure of Directed Rule Makings	8
Performance Goals and Objectives	8
Advisory on Earmarks	8
Section-by-Section Analysis	8
Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported	9

Dissenting Views 10

The Amendment

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation Act of 2014” or the “SAVE Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. ADVERTISING THAT OFFERS CERTAIN COMMERCIAL SEX ACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in subsection (a)(1), by inserting after “obtains,” the following: “advertises,”

(b) MENS REA REQUIREMENT.—Section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in subsection (a), by inserting after “knowing, or” the following: “, except where, in an offense under paragraph (2), the act constituting the violation of paragraph (1) is advertising,”

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1591(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “or obtained” and inserting “obtained, or advertised”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “or obtained” and inserting “obtained, or advertised”.

Purpose and Summary

H.R. 4225, as amended, clarifies that 18 U.S.C. § 1591, which criminalizes the knowing sex trafficking of minors and others through force, fraud, or coercion, can be violated when a defendant knowingly advertises a victim for a commercial sex act. This provision requires the government to prove that defendants accused of benefitting financially through the sale of such advertising knew that the victim was a minor or a victim of force, fraud, or coercion. The bill is technology neutral and applies to both advertisements online, as well as traditional advertisements.

Background and Need for the Legislation

Pimps and traffickers sexually exploit children through street prostitution, in adult strip clubs, brothels, sex parties, motel rooms, hotel rooms, and other locations throughout the United States. The growth of the Internet and other technological advances, including mobile smartphones, has unfortunately been misused by these criminals to facilitate the commercial sexual exploitation of children. Specifically, criminals use these technologies as a convenient way to market these victims to potential purchasers. Individuals can now use websites to advertise, schedule, and purchase sexual encounters with minors. According to the Polaris Project, U.S. law enforcement has identified online advertisements as the primary platform for buying and selling sex with minors, and an FBI study found more than 2,800 minor victims were advertised on just one online advertisement service in 2008.¹ It is estimated that revenue from online advertisements of prostitution generally (not just involving minors) surpassed \$45 million last year.²

H.R. 4225 clarifies that the existing Federal sex trafficking statute, 18 U.S.C. § 1591, extends to traffickers who knowingly sell sex

¹POLARIS PROJECT, INTERNET BASED HUMAN TRAFFICKING, <http://www.polarisproject.org/human-trafficking/sex-trafficking-in-the-us/Internet-based>.

²AIM GROUP, ONLINE PROSTITUTION—AD REVENUE CROSSES CRAIGSLIST BENCHMARK, July 2013, available at <http://aimgroup.com/2013/07/10/online-prostitution-ad-revenue-crosses-craigslist-benchmark/>.

with minors and victims of force, fraud, or coercion through advertising, as well as people or entities that knowingly benefit from such advertising. The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that, when a Federal statute contains an explicit *mens rea* provision, that standard applies to every element of the offense.³ Under current law, the government can show that a defendant either knew or recklessly disregarded the fact that a victim was a minor or involved through force, fraud, or coercion. H.R. 4225 as reported requires the government to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a defendant who benefits from the advertising of a trafficking victim under 18 U.S.C. § 1591(a)(2) knew that the advertising involved a victim who the defendant knew was a minor or a victim of force, fraud, or coercion.⁴

H.R. 4225 clarifies that people who advertise sex trafficking can face *criminal* liability. The bill is technology neutral and applies to both advertisements online, as well as traditional advertisements. Under current law, Section 1595 of Title 18 extends the possibility of civil liability to defendants who violate Section 1591. However, under Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act,⁵ online publishers of third-party advertisements are generally immune from civil liability for such advertisements.⁶ H.R. 4225 does nothing to disrupt or modify the civil immunity already provided by Section 230.

Hearings

The Committee on the Judiciary held no hearings on H.R. 4225.

Committee Consideration

On April 30, 2014, the Committee met in open session and ordered the bill H.R. 4225 favorably reported with an amendment, by a rollcall vote of 24 to 3, a quorum being present.

Committee Votes

In compliance with clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee advises that the following rollcall votes occurred during the Committee's consideration of H.R. 4225.

³ See, e.g., *Flores-Figueroa v. United States*, 556 U.S. 646 (2009); *United States v. X-Citement Video*, 513 U.S. 64 (1994).

⁴ "Knowingly" does not have a uniform Federal definition. The Fifth, Tenth, and Eleventh Circuits define "knowingly" as meaning a defendant committed a criminal act "voluntarily and intentionally, and not because of mistake or accident." Fifth Circuit Instruction 1.37; Tenth Circuit Instruction 1.37; Eleventh Circuit Instruction 9.1A. The Seventh and Ninth Circuits employ an instruction to the effect that "'knowingly' . . . means that the defendant realized what he was doing and was aware of the nature of his conduct, and did not act through ignorance, mistake or accident." Seventh Circuit Instruction 4.10; Ninth Circuit Instruction 5.6. Other circuits have taken a case-by-case approach to the definition of "knowingly."

⁵ 47 U.S.C. § 230.

⁶ Courts generally apply Section 230(c)(1) immunity where: (1) a defendant is a provider or user of an interactive computer service; (2) the defendant is being treated as a publisher or speaker of the challenged content for liability purposes; and (3) the content at issue is information provided by another information content provider. Courts have overwhelmingly found that defendants that provide access to online content are providers or users of an interactive computer service as broadly defined by section 230, and accordingly immune from civil liability. See *Chicago Lawyers' Comm. for Civil Rights Under Law, Inc. v. Craigslist, Inc.*, 519 F.3d 666, 668 (7th Cir. 2008).

1. An amendment by Mr. Scott to add a provision amending the potential penalties for offenses in this section involving advertising. Defeated 8–20.

ROLLCALL NO. 1

	Ayes	Nays	Present
Mr. Goodlatte (VA), Chairman		X	
Mr. Sensenbrenner, Jr. (WI)		X	
Mr. Coble (NC)		X	
Mr. Smith (TX)			
Mr. Chabot (OH)			
Mr. Bachus (AL)		X	
Mr. Issa (CA)		X	
Mr. Forbes (VA)		X	
Mr. King (IA)		X	
Mr. Franks (AZ)		X	
Mr. Gohmert (TX)		X	
Mr. Jordan (OH)		X	
Mr. Poe (TX)		X	
Mr. Chaffetz (UT)		X	
Mr. Marino (PA)		X	
Mr. Gowdy (SC)		X	
Mr. Labrador (ID)		X	
Ms. Farenthold (TX)		X	
Mr. Holding (NC)		X	
Mr. Collins (GA)		X	
Mr. DeSantis (FL)		X	
Mr. Smith (MO)		X	
[Vacant]			
Mr. Conyers, Jr. (MI), Ranking Member	X		
Mr. Nadler (NY)	X		
Mr. Scott (VA)	X		
Ms. Lofgren (CA)	X		
Ms. Jackson Lee (TX)	X		
Mr. Cohen (TN)	X		
Mr. Johnson (GA)	X		
Mr. Pierluisi (PR)			
Ms. Chu (CA)			
Mr. Deutch (FL)			
Mr. Gutierrez (IL)			
Ms. Bass (CA)			
Mr. Richmond (LA)			
Ms. DelBene (WA)	X		
Mr. Garcia (FL)			
Mr. Jeffries (NY)			
Mr. Cicilline (RI)			
Total	8	20	

2. Motion to report H.R. 4225 favorably, as amended. Approved
24-3.

ROLLCALL NO. 2

	Ayes	Nays	Present
Mr. Goodlatte (VA), Chairman	X		
Mr. Sensenbrenner, Jr. (WI)	X		
Mr. Coble (NC)	X		
Mr. Smith (TX)			
Mr. Chabot (OH)			
Mr. Bachus (AL)	X		
Mr. Issa (CA)	X		
Mr. Forbes (VA)	X		
Mr. King (IA)	X		
Mr. Franks (AZ)	X		
Mr. Gohmert (TX)	X		
Mr. Jordan (OH)	X		
Mr. Poe (TX)	X		
Mr. Chaffetz (UT)	X		
Mr. Marino (PA)	X		
Mr. Gowdy (SC)	X		
Mr. Labrador (ID)	X		
Ms. Farenthold (TX)	X		
Mr. Holding (NC)	X		
Mr. Collins (GA)	X		
Mr. DeSantis (FL)			
Mr. Smith (MO)	X		
[Vacant]			
Mr. Conyers, Jr. (MI), Ranking Member		X	
Mr. Nadler (NY)	X		
Mr. Scott (VA)		X	
Ms. Lofgren (CA)	X		
Ms. Jackson Lee (TX)	X		
Mr. Cohen (TN)	X		
Mr. Johnson (GA)		X	
Mr. Pierluisi (PR)			
Ms. Chu (CA)			
Mr. Deutch (FL)			
Mr. Gutierrez (IL)			
Ms. Bass (CA)			
Mr. Richmond (LA)			
Ms. DelBene (WA)	X		
Mr. Garcia (FL)			
Mr. Jeffries (NY)			
Mr. Cicilline (RI)			
Total	24	3	

Committee Oversight Findings

In compliance with clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee advises that the findings and recommendations of the Committee, based on oversight activities under clause 2(b)(1) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, are incorporated in the descriptive portions of this report.

New Budget Authority and Tax Expenditures

Clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is inapplicable because this legislation does not provide new budgetary authority or increased tax expenditures.

Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate

In compliance with clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee sets forth, with respect to the bill, H.R. 4225, the following estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2014.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE, CHAIRMAN,
Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 4225, the “Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation Act of 2014.”

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Mark Grabowicz, who can be reached at 226-2860.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF,
DIRECTOR.

Enclosure

cc: Honorable John Conyers, Jr.
Ranking Member

H.R. 4225—Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation Act of 2014.

As ordered reported by the House Committee on the Judiciary
on April 30, 2014.

CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 4225 would have no significant cost to the Federal Government. Enacting the bill could affect direct spending and revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures apply. However, CBO estimates that any effects would be insignificant.

H.R. 4225 would clarify the current laws against sex trafficking with regard to the advertising of such acts. As a result, the govern-

ment might be able to increase the number of successful prosecutions in these cases. CBO expects that the bill would apply to a relatively small number of offenders, however, so any increase in costs for law enforcement, court proceedings, or prison operations would not be significant. Any such costs would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

Because those prosecuted and convicted under H.R. 4225 could be subject to criminal fines, the Federal Government might collect additional fines if the legislation is enacted. Criminal fines are recorded as revenues, deposited in the Crime Victims Fund, and later spent. CBO expects that any additional revenues and direct spending would not be significant because of the small number of cases likely to be affected.

H.R. 4225 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on State, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Mark Grabowicz. The estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Duplication of Federal Programs

No provision of H.R. 4225 establishes or reauthorizes a program of the Federal Government known to be duplicative of another Federal program, a program that was included in any report from the Government Accountability Office to Congress pursuant to section 21 of Public Law 111–139, or a program related to a program identified in the most recent Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance.

Disclosure of Directed Rule Makings

No provision of H.R. 4225 directs a specific rule making within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 551.

Performance Goals and Objectives

The Committee states that pursuant to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, H.R. 4225 clarifies that 18 U.S.C. § 1591, which criminalizes the knowing sex trafficking of minors and others through force, fraud, or coercion, can be violated when a defendant advertises such a victim for a commercial sex act.

Advisory on Earmarks

In accordance with clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, H.R. 4225 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(e), 9(f), or 9(g) of Rule XXI.

Section-by-Section Analysis

The following discussion describes the bill as reported by the Committee.

Section 1. Short title. This section cites the short title of the bill as the “Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation Act of 2014.”

Section 2. Advertising that Offers Certain Commercial Sex Acts. This section expands 18 U.S.C. § 1591 to include the advertising of

commercial sex acts involving a minor or an individual engaged in such an act through force, fraud, or coercion. Additionally, this section adopts a knowing standard for those accused of benefitting financially or otherwise from the sale of advertising these individuals under 18 U.S.C. § 1591(a)(2).

Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

* * * * *

PART I—CRIMES

* * * * *

CHAPTER 77—PEONAGE, SLAVERY, AND TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS

* * * * *

§ 1591. Sex trafficking of children or by force, fraud, or coercion

(a) Whoever knowingly—

(1) in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, or within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, recruits, entices, harbors, transports, provides, obtains, *advertises*, or maintains by any means a person; or

* * * * *

knowing, or, *except where, in an offense under paragraph (2), the act constituting the violation of paragraph (1) is advertising*, in reckless disregard of the fact, that means of force, threats of force, fraud, coercion described in subsection (e)(2), or any combination of such means will be used to cause the person to engage in a commercial sex act, or that the person has not attained the age of 18 years and will be caused to engage in a commercial sex act, shall be punished as provided in subsection (b).

(b) The punishment for an offense under subsection (a) is—

(1) if the offense was effected by means of force, threats of force, fraud, or coercion described in subsection (e)(2), or by any combination of such means, or if the person recruited, enticed, harbored, transported, provided, **[or obtained]** *obtained, or advertised* had not attained the age of 14 years at the time of such offense, by a fine under this title and imprisonment for any term of years not less than 15 or for life; or

(2) if the offense was not so effected, and the person recruited, enticed, harbored, transported, provided, **[or obtained]** *obtained, or advertised* had attained the age of 14 years but

had not attained the age of 18 years at the time of such offense, by a fine under this title and imprisonment for not less than 10 years or for life.

* * * * *

Dissenting Views

INTRODUCTION

H.R. 4225, the “Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation Act of 2014,” amends the Federal sex trafficking statute¹ to prohibit the advertising of certain commercial sex acts. We agree with the bill’s laudable goal of prosecuting those who facilitate sex trafficking, but disagree with its mandatory minimum sentencing provisions because of the serious public policy concerns it presents. While the acts prohibited by the legislation will often warrant long sentences, mandatory minimum sentences are the wrong way to determine the punishment under this or any other criminal statute. Specifically, mandatory minimum sentencing distorts rational sentencing, wastes taxpayer money, and even when applied to serious offenses, often leads to sentences that are not appropriate under the facts of particular cases.

No matter how well-intentioned H.R. 4225 may be, we do not believe these significant public policy concerns can be disregarded. An amendment rejected during the markup would have ameliorated our concerns by clarifying that mandatory minimum sentences would not apply to the new offense, while still providing that offenders could be punished under the maximum penalty. Unfortunately, without this important change, we remain unable to support this legislation and accordingly we dissent from the Committee views on this legislation.

DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

H.R. 4225 is primarily intended to prevent the advertising of acts of commercial sex trafficking using the Internet. The bill amends section 1591 of title 18 of the United States Code, which deals with the Federal crime of sex trafficking, to include advertising of certain commercial sex acts as a punishable offense. Section 1591 currently prohibits actions such as recruiting, enticing, harboring, transporting, and providing victims or benefitting financially from commercial sex acts involving minors, or adults who are forced or coerced into participating in the acts. H.R. 4225 amends section 1591 to include advertising in its penalty provisions, which impose mandatory minimum sentences of ten or 15 years, depending on the circumstances of the crime.

An amendment agreed to in the markup clarified that the mens rea standard for the newly-created offense of advertising would require that the offender must have acted “knowingly” with respect to whether the victim was a minor or, if an adult, the adult’s participation in the acts were forced or coerced. For other offenses under the statute, one may be punished for acting “knowingly” or “in reckless disregard” of these facts related to the victim.

¹ 18 U.S.C. § 1591 (2014).

CONCERNS WITH H.R. 4225

By adding advertising to the list of prohibited conduct related to sex trafficking, H.R. 4225 may subject a range of communications providers and facilitators to mandatory minimum sentences. Regardless of the nature and circumstances surrounding the offense, the role of the offender in the particular crime, and the history and characteristics of the offender, H.R. 4225 would require a judge to impose a 10- or 15-year sentence. Even if everyone involved in a case, from the arresting officer, prosecutor, judge, and victim, believes that the mandatory minimum would be an unjust sentence for a particular defendant in a case, H.R. 4225 would require that it must be imposed.

The imposition of a mandatory minimum sentence of ten or 15 years is particularly troublesome when one considers the possible scope of defendants who could be prosecuted under H.R. 4225. Notably, the prohibition on advertising does not explicitly apply only to a sex trafficker who places an ad, and could conceivably be applied to individuals and entities who facilitate, but have a minor role in, publishing the ad. Those who are employed by a venture that benefits financially from the ad, but whose role in the organization does not place them in the chain of decisionmaking with respect to acceptance or publishing of illegal ads could also be prosecuted under the bill.² As some Members discussed at the markup of the bill, there may be circumstances in which all of the employees of a communications company, including receptionists and maintenance workers, know that the venture publishes such advertisements but look the other way, and could be held liable under these provisions but whose culpability would certainly not warrant a mandatory minimum sentence of 10 or 15 years.

Mandatory minimum sentences are the wrong way to determine punishment under the Federal sex trafficking statute, or any other statute. Mandatory minimums not only lead to unjust outcomes for individuals, but also have serious systemic consequences by contributing to the problem of overincarceration. As of September 2010, 75,579 Federal prisoners— more than one-third (39.4%)— were serving mandatory minimum sentences.³ This represents a 155% increase from the number of Federal prisoners serving mandatory minimum sentences in 1995 (29,603).⁴ Since Congress enacted harsh mandatory minimums in the 1980s, the Federal prison population has exploded by over 800% to more than 216,000 inmates today.⁵

In addition, higher than warranted sentences resulting from mandatory minimum sentencing strain public finances. For example, the average cost of incarceration for a Federal inmate in fiscal

² 18 U.S.C. § 1591(a)(2) (2014) subjects to liability “whoever knowingly—(2) benefits, financially or by receiving anything of value, from participation in a venture which has engaged in an act described in violation of paragraph (1).”

³ United States Sentencing Commission, Report to Congress: Mandatory Minimum Penalties in the Federal Criminal System, at 148 (Oct. 2011), available at http://www.ussc.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/news/congressional-testimony-and-reports/mandatory-minimum-penalties/20111031-rtc-pdf/Chapter_07.pdf.

⁴ *Id.* at 81, available at http://www.ussc.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/news/congressional-testimony-and-reports/mandatory-minimum-penalties/20111031-rtc-pdf/Chapter_04.pdf.

⁵ Bureau of Prisons, Historical Information, at <http://www.bop.gov/about/history/> and Inmate Statistics: Offenses, at http://www.bop.gov/about/statistics/statistics_inmate_offenses.jsp.

year 2011 was \$28,893.40.⁶ In fact, the U.S. Department of Justice has referred to the increased year-to-year spending on Federal prisons as “unsustainable” and a threat to public safety.⁷ For fiscal year 2014, close to a third (28.8%) of the Justice Department’s \$27.7 billion budget is earmarked for Federal prisons and detention.⁸ Every dollar expended on lengthy mandatory minimum incarcerations is a dollar that cannot be spent on crime prevention, victim services, training, investigation, and prosecution.⁹ Absent smarter sentencing policies and reformation of mandatory minimum sentences, prison populations and their associated costs will continue to escalate.¹⁰ We need to take steps to ensure that sentences are appropriately severe, but are not set beyond levels that no longer serve legitimate criminal justice purposes.

This is one reason why the Committee’s bipartisan Over-Criminalization Task Force was authorized in 2013 to “assess our current Federal criminal statutes and make recommendations for improvements.”¹¹ While the Task Force considers a range of issues related to the criminal justice system, including the penalties in the Federal criminal code, we should not, as this bill would do, expand mandatory minimum sentencing at a time when reform is necessary.

An amendment offered by Representative Robert C. “Bobby” Scott (D-VA) that would have addressed these significant concerns was defeated by a vote of 8 to 20 during the markup. The amendment would have removed application of the statute’s mandatory minimum prison sentences to advertising and instead allow a judge to apply an appropriate sentence under the circumstances of the case up to the statutory maximum of life in prison. Given the complicated nature of internet communications networks and other forms of advertising, which would be affected by this bill, the role of the judge in evaluating each case is particularly important. While long sentences may be appropriate under the facts of a particular case, Congress cannot know the facts of every case in advance. Removing mandatory minimums while still permitting the lengthy statutory maximum penalty of life imprisonment, as Representative Scott’s amendment would have done, would provide the appropriate spectrum of sentences for culpability and proportionate punishment.

CONCLUSION

We must do more to combat sex trafficking by taking steps such as strengthening our laws and providing additional resources for law enforcement and victim services. In our haste to combat this tragic crime, however, we must also consider the public policy implications of our legislative actions. Unfortunately, the mandatory

⁶ Bureau of Prisons, Annual Determination of Average Cost of Incarceration, 78 Fed. Reg. No. 52 at 16711 (Mar. 18, 2013), available at <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2013-03-18/pdf/2013-06139.pdf>.

⁷ Michael E. Horowitz, Inspector General, Top Management and Performance Challenges Facing the Dep’t of Justice—2013, at <http://www.justice.gov/oig/challenges/2013.htm>.

⁸ U.S. Senate Committee on Appropriations, Summary: Fiscal Year 2014 Omnibus Appropriations Bill 5-7 (Jan. 13, 2014), at <http://www.appropriations.senate.gov/news.cfm?method=news.view&id=5aa8e660-f52e-4074-945f-9618eb963ae9>.

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ Horowitz, *supra* n.7.

¹¹ U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on the Judiciary, Press Release, Feb. 5, 2014, available at <http://judiciary.house.gov/index.cfm/2014/2/house-judiciary-committee-reauthorizes-bipartisan-over-criminalization-task-force>.

minimum penalties provided in H.R. 4225 would make it an inflexible and often inappropriate means of addressing the range of those who could be prosecuted under the statute.

For the foregoing reasons, we must respectfully dissent.

JOHN CONYERS, JR.
ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT.
HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

