House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC, September 12, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable Frank D. Lucas to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

Paul D. Ryan,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

ARLINGTON CEMETERY’S HONOR GUARD NEVER LEAVE THEIR POST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Poe) for 5 minutes.

Mr. Poe of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the country is recovering from natural disasters that are taking place all over our land: on the West Coast and the Northwest, we have the wildfires; over the weekend, we had Hurricane Irma going through Florida, now through the Southeastern States causing havoc; and then, of course, we are still reeling from the hammering that we received in Houston and other areas because of Hurricane Harvey, where thousands have lost their homes, over a million cars are destroyed. Natural disasters are taking place.

In the midst of all this, yesterday was a day we should also remember, not because we had natural disasters, but because we had an attack on the United States 16 years ago. Yes, September 11, 2001.

All of us who are old enough remember exactly what we were doing, as we should always remember what we were doing that day—a defining moment in our personal lives.

I was a judge in Texas at that time. I was driving my Jeep—an old, red, beat up Renegade Jeep—to the courthouse, and I was listening to KILT Radio, Hudson & Harrigan in the morning, a country-western station. Robert B. McIntyre, the newscaster, came on and said that a plane had hit one of the towers in New York City. Like most folks, I didn’t know what to make of that. I thought maybe it was an accident. But a few minutes later, he was back on the air talking about a second plane crashing into the other tower in New York City.

I pulled over to the side of the road, as other people were doing, and listened to what was taking place in America as we were attacked. We all know the rest of the story about some wonderful people who were hijacked on a plane in Pennsylvania who took that plane down that apparently was headed for Washington, D.C., probably this building. They saved the lives of Members of Congress and people who worked in Washington. The fourth plane crashed into the Pentagon.

I would just like to talk about that fourth plane. That plane, American Airlines Flight No. 77, takes off from Dulles, takes to the air, in less than 50 minutes turns around, and is headed back to the Pentagon.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon is right next to Arlington Cemetery. At the top of the crest of Arlington Cemetery is the Tomb of the Unknown. I call it the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. It is the Tomb of the Unknown.

The Tomb of the Unknown is guarded 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, all of the time, by the United States Army 3rd Infantry Division. The oldest infantry division in the United States has the honor, the duty, and the privilege to guard the tomb of America’s unknown who died for us.

So what happened on September 11 when the two planes crashed into the World Trade Center and the other plane is headed toward the Pentagon? Yes, the soldiers are on guard. And did they leave their post? Absolutely not. In fact, they not only did not leave their post, Mr. Speaker, they called for reinforcements, and they had 30 other soldiers create a perimeter around the tomb to guard it from whatever may occur from that terror that hit in the skies. They were there on duty.

I assume, and I don’t know this, but I assume those guards that day knew about the first two planes that hit the World Trade Center. The sergeant major on duty did not want those soldiers to leave the post. He called for reinforcements to protect the tomb from that terror in the skies.

Remarkable stories that took place that day. Mr. Speaker, stories about Americans helping other Americans, just like Americans are helping Americans today with the wildfires and the hurricanes. There are many other stories that we will never know about.

We know that on that day, as the smoke was burning in New York and in Pennsylvania and at the Pentagon, our first responders, when that terror came to America, they didn’t run. They ran toward that terror in the skies. Those men and women in our law enforcement agencies, our fire departments, emergency medical technicians, and thousands of others ran to help other...
people, strangers, when those planes, those terrorists, attacked America.

We know that right down the street here at the Tomb of the Unknown where Arlington Cemetery is, where we bury our war dead, we know, of course, that those tombs are guarded, protected from that terror in the skies. Remarkable people, these Americans.

And that is just the way it is.

INCREDIBLE WORK DONE AT THE ALEXANDRIA MEGA SHELTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the incredible work performed by those running the Alexandria Mega Shelter in my district during the Hurricane Harvey evacuation.

In Louisiana, we know too well how devastating hurricanes and flooding can be. When our neighbors in Texas needed help, Louisiana answered the call. At its peak, the Alexandria Mega Shelter housed 1,800 people displaced by Hurricane Harvey. I visited with some of the victims and the workers, and I want to share with you some of the amazing work that went on there. The shelter provided a roof and a bed for people whose homes were flooded and destroyed; but as a medical school student, most impressed was the medical response that I saw at the shelter. On short notice, local healthcare providers banded together to set up a clinic to meet the health needs of these displaced people, including dialysis patients who could not miss treatments; if they did, they could die. The clinic allowed most patients to be treated in-house right there in the Mega Shelter, making their stay in the shelter easier than it might have been otherwise.

Additionally, the shelter was able to send 1,800 pounds of donated medications and medical supplies to patients in Beaumont, Texas, whose people were struggling in the aftermath of the storm just to get the medicines they needed to survive themselves.

Local pilots and aviators donated air time and resources to fly these medicines and these badly needed supplies to Beaumont where they could help these good people.

I want to specifically mention the efforts of the Louisiana National Guard; the Louisiana State Police, including Superintendent Kevin Reeves and his troopers; Rapides Parish Sheriff Willam Earl Hilton and his deputies; and Asmar Kayal and his staff at the Louisiana Department of Public Safety for their role in assisting the people at the shelter.

I also want to mention Dr. Spencer Tucker, Dr. Emily Smith Grezaffi, Laura DiGato, Marinda Sanders, Nol English, Dr. David Holcombe, and all those with the Louisiana Department of Health, and emergency and local pharmacies who helped meet the medical needs of all these people displaced at this one shelter. Recovery from Harvey will be difficult, and now our prayers and thoughts are also with our friends in Florida who are dealing with the effects of Hurricane Irma that just passed. As tragic as these storms can be, they also tend to bring out the best in us as Americans, who always answer the call to serve and help those who are suffering. We are all one big family when these disasters hit.

Thank you to all those at the Alexandria Mega Shelter who welcomed these displaced people in their time of need and hopefully made their ordeal a little better.

NEW JERSEYANS EMBODY THE BEST AMERICA HAS TO OFFER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, last week I was outraged when President Trump announced that he would be ending the DACA program. DACA recipients are contributing members of our society, have no criminal record, and have known only this country as home. They work at leading American companies. They have served our country in the military.

On the day of the President’s decision, I met with several young people at Rutgers University in my district who may now face deportation. I was impressed by their courage in coming forward to tell their stories and to challenge the President’s reckless action.

Some examples: Yeimi, a 17-year-old from Freehold, left Mexico when she was 1 year old. She said at the meeting I had: “I do want to become something in life, because that is why I am here. I do not want this dream to be shattered because DACA, apparently, is going to be killed.”

Then there is Alma, a 23-year-old from Perth Amboy in my district, who added: “DACA has opened doors for me that I never knew existed. The elimination of this executive order without an appropriate replacement would not only be devastating for DREAMers but to the country as a whole.” And I agree with Alma.

Mr. Speaker, these New Jerseyans embody the best America has to offer, and I will continue to stand by their side as we work together to protect their DACA status. We need to pass the Dream Act as quickly as possible.

JOLENE HERFEL, VICE PRINCIPAL OF THE YEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Randall and Sheryl Hubin, the owners of the Pizza Ranch in Andover, on being recognized as the Pizza Ranch Franchisee of the Year.

The Hubins received this award not just because of their dedication to the Pizza Ranch brand but also because of their commitment to the Andover community.

Randall and Sheryl have owned the Pizza Ranch for the past 4 years, and, as a direct result of its success, not only have they been named Franchisee...
of the Year, but they were also awarded the Community Impact Award last year.

Opening and operating a franchise business is not an easy job. We appreciate the jobs that people like Randall and Sheryl Hubin and the commerce they bring to our communities.

Congratulations, Randall and Sheryl, on your award, and thank you for your contribution to Minnesota’s Sixth Congressional District and the Andover community.

I often think of the brave first responders who ran towards danger with thought of little else other than to save their fellow Americans.

The terror attacks seemed surreal, yet the aftermath has a finality which does not disappear with time. As years passed, the shock of those attacks has diminished, but the memory of the feeling of hope that arose from the acts of selfless Americans is stronger.

In my mind, one of the very worst events in human history became overshadowed as a tragedy—as if a people—was made evident through countless acts of kindness and dignity. It is this dignity we must hold on to in order to honor the fallen.

From the first responders, citizens, volunteers, and, finally, the devoted souls on board Flight 93, I remember the moments in which the very best parts of Americans shone brightest. These moments include when our citizens were no longer categorized by their differences, but were defined by their shared determination not only to survive, but also to overcome an unthinkably tragedy.

If a student asks me about my memories of September 11, I always tell them honestly of the horror I felt, and I tell them of the hope that emerged as our people did their level best to turn evil into good.

While I will never forget September 11, 2001, and the lives that were forever lost to us on that day, 16 years ago, I take some comfort in knowing that a loving and never-changing God called them to Heaven to live in His presence forever.

Now, more than ever before, we must recall the sacrifices made by so many in the aftermath of September 11 and recall that freedom is never truly freely given. It is earned. It is hard-fought for, and it is something we must all work together to continue to achieve.

May God bless all of those who lost their lives on September 11, those who were left behind, and those who continue to fight for our freedom.

CLOSE WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH ISRAEL NEEDS TO CONTINUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FОXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the nearly 3,000 souls that were taken from us much too soon on September 11, 16 years ago.

Like many others, the events of September 11, 2001, are forever etched in my memory. On that day, I was in Raleigh, North Carolina, serving in the State legislature, and recall an aide coming in to share the news.

Naturally, when hearing about the first plane hitting the World Trade Center, we all thought it was a terrible accident that had occurred. My colleagues and I were in a state of shock and grief when we heard about the second plane and the subsequent attacks that followed.

What I remember most is the feeling of abject horror and disbelief that we experienced on that day. That horror is still felt by the family members who were left behind, robbed of their loved ones who were violently taken too soon.

I often think of the brave first responders who ran towards danger with thought of little else other than to save their fellow Americans.

The terror attacks seemed surreal, yet the aftermath has a finality which does not disappear with time. As years passed, the shock of those attacks has diminished, but the memory of the feeling of hope that arose from the acts of selfless Americans is stronger.

In my mind, one of the very worst events in human history became overshadowed as a tragedy—as if a people—was made evident through countless acts of kindness and dignity. It is this dignity we must hold on to in order to honor the fallen.

From the first responders, citizens, volunteers, and, finally, the devoted souls on board Flight 93, I remember the moments in which the very best parts of Americans shone brightest. These moments include when our citizens were no longer categorized by their differences, but were defined by their shared determination not only to survive, but also to overcome an unthinkably tragedy.

If a student asks me about my memories of September 11, I always tell them honestly of the horror I felt, and I tell them of the hope that emerged as our people did their level best to turn evil into good.

While I will never forget September 11, 2001, and the lives that were forever lost to us on that day, 16 years ago, I take some comfort in knowing that a loving and never-changing God called them to Heaven to live in His presence forever.

Now, more than ever before, we must recall the sacrifices made by so many in the aftermath of September 11 and recall that freedom is never truly freely given. It is earned. It is hard-fought for, and it is something we must all work together to continue to achieve.

May God bless all of those who lost their lives on September 11, those who were left behind, and those who continue to fight for our freedom.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 22 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.
As Members of the people’s House return to Washington, delayed by the storms that have blown through the Southeast, we ask Your blessing upon them that they might be all the more focused in their work and, as modeled by so many Americans in their efforts these past days in helping their neighbors, prepared to work together to address our Nation’s most pressing needs.

Continue to bless those who are recovering from hurricane destruction and those fighting, still, the storms of wildfire that plague our Western States.

Blanket those who fight to overcome these national disasters with Your spirit of strength and endurance, and preserve them all from harm.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day’s proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. McGovern led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

MEDIA Ignores FACTS ON DACA

(Mr. Smith of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Smith of Texas. Mr. Speaker, President Trump’s recent decision to end the unconstitutional DACA program has received unfair criticism by the liberal media.

When reporting on President Trump’s decision to end the DACA program, outlets such as The New York Times, The Washington Post, and CBS all included former President Obama’s criticism of the announcement. What is not being reported is that then-President Obama stated over 20 times before issuing DACA that executive amnesty is an overstep of executive authority and is unconstitutional.

To use former President Obama’s criticism of the termination of DACA without also noting that he, himself, considered DACA unconstitutional is biased reporting designed to promote a pro-amnesty agenda. It is no wonder that the media’s credibility with the American people is now at a record low.

END HUNGER NOW

(Mr. McGovern asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, as kids, we were taught that breakfast is the most important meal of the day. Still, far too many students—especially those living in poverty—arrive at school hungry each day. Congress can and must do more to bolster our school breakfast programs so that all students across the country have access to a nutritious breakfast to start the day.

I have joined my Republican colleague on the House Agriculture Committee, Congressman Rodney Davis, on a bill to expand commodity support to the School Breakfast Program. The bipartisan Healthy Breakfasts Help Kids Learn Act will enable schools with additional nutritious foods to ensure no student starts his or her day hungry. Importantly, this legislation will allow schools to expand their breakfast programs, improve their menus, and serve students nutritious, American-grown foods.

Mr. Speaker, school meals are just as essential as a textbook when it comes to helping our kids learn and succeed. I look forward to working with my colleagues to advance this bipartisan legislation that, combined with other anti-hunger safety net programs, will work to end hunger now.

RECOGNIZING ALLIANCE FOR A HEALTHIER GENERATION

(Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding work of the Alliance for a Healthier Generation in its mission to help our schoolchildren lead healthier lives. The alliance works closely with schools in Pennsylvania and nationwide to improve student health and wellbeing.

Over the past decade, Healthier Generation’s groundbreaking work with schools, communities, and businesses have benefited more than 25 million children across this country. More than 950 Pennsylvania schools have teamed with Healthier Generation, helping more than half a million children in the Commonwealth make healthier choices.

Since 2007, 18 Pennsylvania schools have been recognized with National Healthy School Awards for their exceptional work. The Healthy Out-of-School Time program has helped more than 11,000 Pennsylvania children have access to healthier foods and focus on more active community programs outside the classroom.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Nutrition, I am so proud of our schools and others who work to serve healthier meals and snacks, get students to move more, offer high-quality physical and health education, and empower school leaders to become healthy role models.

BRING UP THE DREAM ACT

(Mr. Kildee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. Kildee. Mr. Speaker, Congress—and, actually, Congress today—should act to pass the Dream Act. House Democrats are working to pass a permanent solution to protect 800,000 DREAMers, children who were brought here to the United States by their parents through no fault of their own, many of them as very young children. America is the only country they know. They have registered with the government. They pay their taxes. They make great contributions to our society.

We have to ask ourselves: Do we want to deport these youngsters from the only country they have ever known? Is that the morally right question?

We can argue the economics, and I can argue that it is an economic mistake to lose these individuals, but it is essentially a moral question. If a Member of Congress believes that we should deport 800,000 productive people who only know this country, who were brought here as children, then come to the floor of the House and put that on the record. Vote “yes” or “no,” but bring up the Dream Act.

This is an important question, and it is the work of Congress, and we should do it now.

HONORING THE BRAVERY AND SACRIFICE OF THE 442ND MISSION SUPPORT GROUP

(Mrs. Hartzler asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. Hartzler. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and thank the airmen of the 442nd Mission Support Group who returned home to Whiteman Air Force Base last month after a 6-month deployment. These dedicated reservists were deployed across six bases in support of Operation Resolute Support and provided vital base functions for our military overseas.

The reservists of the 442nd left their homes, jobs, families, and friends to travel overseas to support our military’s mission. I admire their commitment, their sacrifice, and dedication to our Nation. Their bravery and sacrifice deserve our appreciation and respect, and I am glad to welcome them home.
and thank them for their service to our country.

I would also like to take a moment to thank their families for their commitment to our country. America's military families say good-bye to their spouses, children, and parents for extended periods of time for the good of our Nation. They are our unsung heroes, and they, too, deserve our recognition for their sacrifice.

So today, as we honor the 42nd, you and your families have our undying gratitude. You are truly heroes. Welcome home, and thank you for your service.

IT IS TIME TO FUND WILDFIRES

(Mr. SCHRADE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCHRADE. Mr. Speaker, for the past few weeks, the country has tuned in to watch as catastrophic hurricanes pummel Texas and Florida, but out West we have been facing our own natural disaster, one that doesn’t get nearly as much attention but one that can be equally devastating and destructive. I am talking, of course, about wildfires raging, burning a total of 7.8 million acres. In my home State of Oregon, we currently have 26 active fires. As a member of this body, I have routinely supported emergency appropriations packages when national disasters strike this country. I have supported funding for Superstorm Sandy. I supported funding last week for Hurricane Harvey, and I will support funding for Hurricane Irma. I have done this because, as an American and as a Member of Congress, it is the right thing to do. I call on my colleagues, now, to also support us in the West. We need to change the way we pay to fight these wildfires.

My good friend from Idaho MIKE SIMPSON and I have once again introduced bipartisan legislation, H.R. 2862, the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act, that will begin to tackle the wildfires like the national disasters they are. The bill will create a fund dedicated to the costs of fighting wildfires so the Forest Service and BLM will no longer have to spend over 50 percent of their budget on fighting fires that should be spent on managing our forests and their sustainable health.

This is common sense, my friends. It is time to act, time for this body to recognize the importance of this issue, especially to those of us out West who face these infernos every year.

HUNGER ACTION MONTH

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, September is Hunger Action Month, a month where people all over America stand together with the nationwide network of food banks to fight hunger. Hunger can affect people from all walks of life.

Too many Americans are one job loss or one medical crisis away from food insecurity, and some people, like children and seniors, stand at a greater risk of facing hunger. That is why I am proud of the Bucks County Fresh Connect program, a free farmers market bringing fresh and healthy food to our hungry neighbors. The Fresh Connect program provides reliable and needed food to the 57,000 residents of Bucks County facing hunger, about a third of whom are children.

This month I participated in the Fresh Connect program at Solly Farm in Ivyland, where fresh produce was collected and delivered to the Bucks County Community College in Bristol for distribution.

I want to thank Philabundance, the Bucks County Opportunity Council, the Greater Philadelphia Coalition Against Hunger, St. Mary Medical Center, United Way of Bucks County, Rolling Harvest Food Rescue, and Solly Farm for all of their hard work in making this program possible. Mr. Speaker, these organizations and all of their generous volunteers are a tribute to our community and to our Nation.

HONORING SCHOOL NUTRITION PROFESSIONALS

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor school nutrition professionals across the country and in my congressional district located in central and southwestern Illinois from Monticello’s Washington Elementary School, to Edwardsville’s St. Boniface Catholic School, I have seen firsthand the great work they do in schools across my district.

Now, as summer comes to an end and children head back to school, these professionals will be working hard to ensure students receive healthy and appealing meals, which is not an easy task. Each school day, nearly 100,000 schools serve lunch to 30.4 million students. Nutritious meals at school are an essential part of the day and help to nourish children and enable them to learn.

This could never be possible without dedicated school nutrition professionals. School nutrition professionals are passionate about ensuring that students have access to the nutrition they need to succeed. I would like to take this opportunity to honor school nutrition professionals who should take pride in the work they do every single day.

Thank you, and keep up the great work.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5(c) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 11, 2017, at 7:58 p.m.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3732.

With best wishes, I am, Sincerely,
KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill was signed by the Speaker on Monday, September 11, 2017:

H.R. 3732, to amend section 1113 of the Social Security Act to provide authority for increased fiscal year 2017 and 2018 payments for temporary assistance to United States citizens returned from foreign countries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

JOINT COUNTERTERRORISM AWARENESS WORKSHOP SERIES ACT OF 2017

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3284) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3284

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 “Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. JOINT COUNTERTERRORISM AWARENESS WORKSHOP SERIES.
(a) IN GENERAL.—Title V of the Homeland Security Act (6 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new sec-
"SEC. 529. JOINT COUNTERTERRORISM AWARENESS WORKSHOP SERIES.

(a) In general.—The Administrator, in consultation with the Director of the National Counterterrorism Center and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall establish a Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series (in this section referred to as the ‘Workshop Series’) to address emerging terrorist threats and to enhance the ability of State and local jurisdictions to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks.

(b) Purpose.—The Workshop Series established under subsection (a) shall include the following components:

(1) Reviewing existing preparedness, response, and interdiction plans, policies, and procedures related to terrorist attacks, and identifying jurisdictions and identifying gaps in such plans, operational capabilities, response resources, and authorities.

(2) Identifying Federal, State, and local resources available to address the gaps identified in accordance with paragraph (1).

(3) Providing assistance, through training, exercises, and other means, to build or sustain, in accordance with the capabilities to close such identified gaps.

(4) Examining the roles and responsibilities of participating agencies and respective communities in the event of a terrorist attack.

(5) Improving situational awareness and information sharing among all participating agencies in the event of a terrorist attack.

(6) Identifying and sharing best practices and lessons learned from each Workshop Series established under subsection (a).

(c) Designation of Participating Cities.—The Administrator shall select jurisdictions to host a Workshop Series from those cities that—

(1) are currently receiving, or that previously received, funding under section 2003; and

(2) have requested to be considered.

(d) Workshop Series Participants.—Individuals from State and local jurisdictions and emergency response providers in cities designated under subsection (c) shall be eligible to participate in the Workshop Series, including the following:

(1) Senior elected and appointed officials.

(2) Law enforcement.

(3) Fire and Rescue.

(4) Emergency management.

(5) Emergency Medical Services.

(6) Public health officials.

(7) Private sector representatives.

(8) Other participants as deemed appropriate by the Administrator.

(e) Reports.—

(1) Workshop Series Reports.—The Administrator, in consultation with the Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and officials from the city in which a Workshop Series is held, shall develop and submit to the Administrator a report identifying gaps in the Workshop Series report after the conclusion of each such Workshop Series that addresses the following:

(A) Collaborate lessons learned and best practices from each such Workshop Series.

(B) Potential mitigation strategies and resources to address gaps identified in each such Workshop Series.

(2) Annual Reports.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section and annually thereafter for the next five years, the Administrator, in consultation with the Director of the National Counterterrorism Center and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall submit a report on the Workshop Series to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the House of Representatives and to the Joint Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a comprehensive summary report of the key themes, lessons learned, and best practices identified during the Workshop Series held during the previous year.

(f) Authorization.—There is authorized to be appropriated $1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 to carry out this section.

(b) Clerical Amendment.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 528 the following new item:

‘‘Sec. 529. Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series.’’

The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) and the gentleman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous matter on any of my consideration of this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as we gather this week and mark the 16th anniversary of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, we remember the nearly 3,000 innocent people lost in that heinous act—including 18 from my home of Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

Additionally, we honor the more than 400 first responders who perished and the countless more whose long-term health was impacted because of their courageous action. Each of us in this Chamber has heard stories of those brave firefighters, police officers, and EMTs who ran toward the danger and chaos on that Tuesday morning and made the ultimate sacrifice in the service of their community and their country. Today we remember them, and we recommence to recognize their efforts and the efforts of all first responders around our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, since 9/11, we have seen the devastating impact of coordinated terrorist attacks on civilian targets. In these cases, first responders—including local police, fire, and emergency medical personnel—are the main response force. It is critical that these men and women have the training and tools to operate in these planned attacks.

That is why I have introduced H.R. 3284, the Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series Act of 2017, to authorize a vital workshop series allowing State and local jurisdictions to prepare for coordinated terrorist attacks.

H.R. 3284, as amended, authorizes the Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series for 5 years and delineates the activities that are required to be part of each workshop, including a review of current plans, policies and procedures, and an examination of the roles and responsibilities of each participating agency.

This bill establishes that the whole community—from government officials, law enforcement, fire, EMS, and public health officials to the private sector—participates in the workshop.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, this bill allows the FEMA Administrator to select jurisdictions to participate in such workshops from jurisdictions that currently receive, or previously received, Urban Area Security Initiative funding and have requested to host a workshop.

Finally, H.R. 3284 requires the portion of material to develop a report after each workshop that includes the key findings and strategies to mitigate the identified gaps.

I introduced this bill with bipartisan support, and I am proud to have the backing of two first responder organizations that I have been working on this type of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter of support from the International Association of Fire Chiefs and a letter of support from the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association.

International Association of Fire Chiefs,

HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK,
Representative from Pennsylvania,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FITZPATRICK: On behalf of the nearly 12,000 fire and emergency service leaders of the International Association of Fire Chiefs (IAFC), I express our support for your legislation to authorize the Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series (JCTAWS). These multidisciplinary exercises prepare jurisdictions to respond for the threat of complex, coordinated terrorist attacks.

The terrorist threat continues to evolve. As terrorist incidents in Mumbai in 2008, Paris in 2015, and Brussels in 2016 demonstrate, complex, coordinated terror attacks using multiple teams and a variety of tactics are a growing threat that local jurisdictions will have to address. Local jurisdictions must be prepared to respond to multiple incidents at the same time involving active shooter incidents, explosives and the use of fire as a weapon.

The JCTAWS exercises provide an environment where local fire service, law enforcement and civilian service, private sector and other disciplines can plan for joint response to these incidents. The JCTAWS allows federal, state and local partners to collaboratively evaluate their options and learn how to best protect their communities. The exercises also bring together resources from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the National Counterterrorism Center, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to leverage the strengths of these major agencies. After a jurisdiction hosts a JCTAWS exercise, information on the lessons learned and best practices are communicated to the participants as well as mitigation strategies and resources to address gaps in preparedness.

IAFC endorses this legislation and thanks you for authorizing funding for this critical exercise program. We look forward
to working with you to pass this legislation this year.

Sincerely,
Fire Chief JOHN D. SINCLAIR, 
President and Chairman of the Board.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, 
Washington, DC.

PLEOA COMMENDS FITZPATRICK, MURRAY, DONOVAN FOR FIRST RESPONDERS BILL
WASHINGTON, DC.—The Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association (FLEOA) applauds Representatives Brian Fitzpatrick (PA–08), Stephanie Murray (FL–07), Dan Donovan (NY–11), and the members of the House Homeland Security Committee for expanding the unified training and collaboration of emergency first responders through introduction of H.R. 3284, the Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series (JCTAWS) Act of 2017. FLEOA is the non-partisan, not-for-profit professional organization representing more than 26,000 federal officers and agents from over 65 agencies.

FLEOA President Nathan Catura stated, “The horrific damage and loss of life caused by terrorists 16 years ago reminds us of the devastation into which first responders insert themselves on a regular basis. Whenever state, local, federal, and tribal first responders react as one unified team, the public benefits in countless ways.”

As a former law enforcement agent, Congressman Fitzpatrick knows the benefits H.R. 3284 will have by expanding the unified training and communication of responders,” Catura continued. “It is because of the previous JCTAWS training and the additional training H.R. 3284 will generate that the public safety community has made considerable progress since the 9/11 attacks.”

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Throughout our Nation’s history, our first responders have always stood for peace, security, and ordered liberty that make our communities great and our country strong. For this we are eternally grateful. As we remember those who gave their lives on September 11, we, unfortunately, recall that the threats of coordinated terrorist attacks are not going away. Today it remains critical that our responders have the resources and the tools needed to protect our communities. The Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series is one of these vital tools.

Mr. Speaker, as a first responder myself, I am proud to work with the House Committee on Homeland Security’s Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications on moving this meaningful legislation, and I urge all Members to join me in supporting our first responders by voting ‘yes.’

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3284, the Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, in a crisis like the attacks of September 11, 2001, our Nation’s first responders—police officers, firefighters, and emergency medical personnel—take on enormous responsibilities. They contain the situation, care for the injured, and keep people safe while putting their own lives at risk. These weighty responsibilities are central in terrorism-related crises.

Today there is an appreciation of the importance of the whole-of-Nation response where efforts among diverse stakeholders, including nontraditional and first responders, are well coordinated and thoroughly planned.

The Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series is a program where one-day events are hosted across the country that bring people together who play a critical role in keeping their city’s residents safe during a terrorist attack. The multiplicity series is a collaborative effort among Federal, State, local and private sector entities that empowers cities to provide the best response to an organized, coordinated, and multisite terrorist attack.

One of these workshops was conducted in Los Angeles, near my district, in a city that includes key ports: Los Angeles—America’s port. It touches every congressional district and faces a variety of threats that require coordinated preparation and response from Federal, State, and local agencies.

Enactment of H.R. 3284, the Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series Act, would codify this important program in law. Specifically, H.R. 3284 requires the FEMA Administrator, in consultation with the Directors of the National Counterterrorism Center and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to establish a Joint Counterterrorism Workshop Series.

Importantly, this bill requires that, at the conclusion of each event, the FEMA Administrator, in consultation with the NCTC and FBI Directors and officials from the participant city hosting the workshop series, provide all participants with an after-action report that includes key findings from Los Angeles—America’s port. It touches every congressional district and faces a variety of threats that require coordinated preparation and response from Federal, State, and local agencies.

Enactment of H.R. 3284, the Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series Act, would codify this important program in law. Specifically, H.R. 3284 requires the FEMA Administrator, in consultation with the Directors of the National Counterterrorism Center and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to establish a Joint Counterterrorism Workshop Series.

Importantly, this bill requires that, at the conclusion of each event, the FEMA Administrator, in consultation with the NCTC and FBI Directors and officials from the participant city hosting the workshop series, provide all participants with an after-action report that includes key findings from Los Angeles—America’s port. It touches every congressional district and faces a variety of threats that require coordinated preparation and response from Federal, State, and local agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3284 is an important piece of legislation that has strong support on both sides of the aisle. It empowers officials and individuals on the local level to come together to make their communities more secure.

This workshop series helps address new, evolving terrorist threats. It also enhances the ability of State and local jurisdictions to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks in this homeland.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3284, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I, once again, urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3284, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security, I rise in support of H.R. 3284, “Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series Act of 2017.”

This bipartisan bill would formally authorize the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to hold counterterrorism workshops for state and local officials so they can address emerging terrorist threats and to enhance the ability of state and local jurisdictions to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks.

The coordination program under the measure would include:

1. Reviewing existing preparedness, response, and interdiction plans, policies, and procedures related to terrorist attacks of the participating jurisdictions and identifying gaps in such plans, operational capabilities, response resources, and authorities;
2. Identifying Federal, State, and local resources available to address the gaps identified;
3. Providing assistance, through training, exercises, and other means, to build or sustain, as appropriate, the capabilities to close such identified gaps;
4. Examining the roles and responsibilities of participating agencies and respective communities in the event of a terrorist attack;
5. Improving situational awareness and information sharing among all participating agencies in the event of a terrorist attack; and
6. Identifying and sharing best practices and lessons learned from each Workshop Series.

I would like to take the time to thank FEMA for their response to Hurricane Harvey and their efforts with Hurricane Irma. Over 617,000 individuals have registered for assistance through FEMA with 13,585 interactions with survivors taking place. FEMA is an integral part of security for survivors of catastrophes. By providing these workshops, we will continue to provide security when our country is most vulnerable.

The bill would authorize $1 million a year from fiscal year 2018 through 2022 to establish the Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series.

This workshop series is intended to help local jurisdictions prevent and respond to coordinated terrorist attacks.

This bill would authorize funding for five years instead of the one-year authorization in the committee-approved version and would modify FEMA’s reporting requirements.

The series would provide training and other resources to close gaps in local counterterrorism preparedness plans, and to improve coordination among state and local agencies.

Participants would include state and local officials, law enforcement officers, first responders, public health personnel, and private-sector representatives.

The most chaotic times for first responders are in response to natural disasters, leaving little to no resources to respond to a potential terror attack.

Those who seek to do our nation harm can take advantage of the lack of available first responders trained to handle counterterrorism during a natural disaster, such as Hurricane Harvey and the flooding that took place in Houston.

During Hurricane Harvey, Texas first responders were facing double effort with both a hurricane and flood; preventing proper response to a homeland security event should it have happened.
It is important to include in their training, a resource for first responders to learn how to manage a terror threat during a catastrophic event such as Hurricane Harvey.

It is imperative to provide these resources to local law enforcement agencies in order to protect the United States when it is most vulnerable.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3284.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3284, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3284
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 referred to as the “DHS Intelligence Rotational Assignment Program Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. INTELLIGENCE ROTATIONAL ASSIGNMENT PROGRAM.

Section 844 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 414) is amended by adding at the end of the following new subsection:

“(b) INTELLIGENCE ROTATIONAL ASSIGNMENT PROGRAM.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish an Intelligence Rotational Assignment Program as part of the Rotation Program under subsection (a).

“(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The Chief Human Capital Officer, in conjunction with the Chief Financial Officer, shall administer the Intelligence Rotational Assignment Program established pursuant to paragraph (1).

“(3) ELIGIBILITY.—The Intelligence Rotational Assignment Program established pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be open to employees in existing analyst positions within the Department’s Intelligence Enterprise and other Department employees as determined appropriate by the Chief Human Capital Officer and the Chief Intelligence Officer.

“(4) COORDINATION.—The responsibilities specified in paragraph (3)(B) of subsection (a) that apply to the Rotation Program under such subsection shall, as applicable, also apply to the Intelligence Rotational Assignment Program under this subsection.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER) and the gentleman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Homeland Security currently has nine designated component intelligence programs with trained analysts who could benefit from an authorized, better organized rotation program. In order to truly develop homeland security intelligence expertise, the DHS has to develop and expand programs to cross-train their broad cadre of analysts.

One of the major lessons we learned from the September 11 terror attacks was the vital need to connect the dots by sharing information across analytical silos and across agencies. The bill we are considering today builds upon this foundation by authorizing a rotation program for intelligence analysts across the Department.

Having served as an intelligence analyst in the Marine Corps and in the intelligence community, including at the National Counterterrorism Center and the Drug Enforcement Agency, I know firsthand the value of analysts gaining experience in different mission areas and broadening their analytical skills.

H.R. 2453, the DHS Intelligence Rotational Assignment Program Act of 2017, supports the effort to develop an integrated workforce of analysts that will ultimately develop a homeland security intelligence expertise. The bill authorizes the Intelligence Rotational Assignment Program, or IRAP, and directs the Department to promote and reward participation.

There is an existing IRAP, but based on oversight efforts over the past year, it is clear the DHS needs a more integrated, coordinated, and transparent rotational program. For example, numerous intelligence components are not aware of the IRAP’s existence, and it is not being coordinated with other rotational programs offered by the Department or the Intelligence community at large.

Moreover, a recent joint inspector general review involving IGs from the intelligence community, the DHS, and the Department of Justice specifically referenced the creation of the IRAP as an important step to help unify the DHS intelligence enterprise, but noted the lack of incentives to encourage participation in this initiative. So this legislation seeks to address these shortcomings by authorizing the IRAP and providing the program with a management structure and participation incentives.

Having a robust analyst rotation program is important for a number of reasons. First, it offers key professional development opportunities to analysts by exposing them to the legal authorities, collection capabilities, and data sets associated with different intelligence offices across the DHS. It also is an important building block in the development of homeland security intelligence as a core competency above and beyond individual mission areas at the Department.

Finally, the IRAP enhances the cohesion of the DHS intelligence enterprise by exposing intelligence analysts to their counterparts in one of the eight other intelligence components, thus encouraging them to see themselves as part of the larger DHS intelligence enterprise.

In short, this bill promotes a more robust intelligence analyst rotation program to ensure the Department is building a network of employees with a true homeland security intelligence expertise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there any such bill is reported by the Committee on Homeland Security (DHS). Moreover, those provisions contained in H.R. 2825, the House-passed “Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act of 2017” for which I wrote to you about on June 27, 2017. Accordingly, since H.R. 2453, 2468, and 2470 implicate National Intelligence Program (NIP)-funded activities, I expect that they would be sequentially referred to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (the Committee).

As discussed in previous correspondence regarding H.R. 2825, we signed a Memorandum of Understanding Authorizing the Department of Homeland Security and exchanged letters on January 11, 2017 (January 2017 Exchange of Letters), to clarify the Committee’s exclusions of any such bill that authorizes any elements of DHS funded through the NIP, and that if any such bill is reported by the Committee.
on Homeland Security, this Committee will request a sequential referral of the bill.

In order to expedite the House’s consideration of H.R. 2455, 2468, and 2470, the Committee is prepared to consider all three measures. This courtesy, however, conditioned on our mutual understanding and agreement that it will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committees with respect to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matter contained in these bills or any similar measure. It is also conditioned on the Committees’ adherence to the agreement embodied in the January 2017 Exchange of Letters, including the Memorandum. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Best Regards,

DEVIN NUNES, Chairman.

Enclosure.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,

Hon. DEVIN NUNES,
Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NUNES: Thank you for your letter supporting the Committee on Homeland Security’s plans to conduct a comprehensive reauthorization of the Department of Homeland Security (“the Department”) in the 115th Congress, as expressed in the 2017 “Memorandum Regarding Authoriz- ation of the Department of Homeland Security.”

I appreciate your willingness to help ensure the Department is fully authorized, and recognize that there may be areas of jurisdictional interest to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (“Intelligence Committee”) in such an authorization. Rule X(j)(3) of the House of Representatives grants the Committee on Homeland Security jurisdiction over “the functions of the Department of Homeland Security,” including those functions related to the “integration, analysis, and dissemination of homeland security information,” while Rule X(i)(b)(1) grants the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence jurisdiction over “proposed legislation relating to the National Intelligence Program.”

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding and request that you include in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of any such legislation the text of any legislative provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS previously reported by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. If the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has not reported any provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS, I will not offer an amendment during consideration of the bill in the full House. That amendment will contain the text of any legislative provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS previously reported by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. If the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has not reported any provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS, I will not offer an amendment, and the DHS-wide authorization bill will not contain any provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS. We further agree that you may offer an amendment during consideration of the bill related to these other intelligence and intelligence-related activities of DHS, including, but not limited to, the Homeland Security Intelligence Program. In keeping with paragraph 5 of the January 2017 “Memorandum Regarding Authorization of the Department of Homeland Security,” our committees will work jointly to vet and clear the text of any legislative provisions related to these other intelligence and intelligence-related activities of DHS. Furthermore, I hope the staff of our committees can continue to closely and expeditiously conduct rigorous oversight of intelligence activities throughout DHS.

The understanding detailed by this letter is limited to the 115th Congress. It shall not constitute an understanding between our committees in any subsequent congress.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding. I look forward to working with you to continue congressional oversight of DHS intelligence activities, and I thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DEVIN NUNES, Chairman.

MEMORANDUM REGARDING AUTHORIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
SUBMITTED BY HON. PAUL D. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

We, the chairs of the committees with jurisdiction over the Department of Homeland
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Security or its components, are hereby recording our agreement on the following principles for the 115th Congress:

1. The Department of Homeland Security (‘the Department’) and its components should be authorized on a regular basis to ensure robust oversight and improve its operation.

2. Committees with jurisdiction over the Department and its components will prioritize the authorization of the Department and any unauthorized or expiring component in that committee’s authorization and oversight plan.

3. To the maximum extent practicable, the committees with jurisdiction over unauthorized or expiring components of the Department shall coordinate with the Committee on Homeland Security to produce comprehensive authorization bills for the Department.

4. The Committee on Homeland Security shall coordinate with the committees with jurisdiction over unauthorized or expiring components of the Department in the development of any comprehensive authorization bill for the Department.

5. The Committee on Homeland Security and the committees with jurisdiction over the Department shall jointly develop a process for the vetting and pre-clearance of bill text and amendments offered at subcommittee and full committee markups of a DHS authorization bill in the Committee on Homeland Security that fall within the jurisdiction of a committee other than or in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security.

6. The committees will expedite consideration of any comprehensive authorizing bill for the Department, including timely resolution of any matters subject to a sequential or additional referral.

7. To the extent that there are policy differences between the committees regarding a provision of the comprehensive authorization bill, the Department shall make best efforts to resolve any such dispute.

8. The Committee on Homeland Security Committee shall not include any provision in a comprehensive authorization bill that the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means has determined to be a revenue provision or a provision affecting revenue. If the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means makes such a determination, nothing in this agreement shall preclude the chair from exercising an additional or sequential referral over the measure, or a point of order under clause 5 (a) of Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

9. Nothing in this agreement shall be construed as altering any committee’s jurisdiction under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives or the referral of any measure thereunder.

10. Further, nothing in this memorandum precludes a further agreement between the committees with regard to the implementation of a process to ensure regular comprehensive authorizations of the Department.

Signed,

GREGG WALDEN,
Chair, Committee on Energy and Commerce
DEVIN NUNES,
Chair, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence
JASON CRAFFITTY,
Chair, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform
BILL SHUSTER,
Chair, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure
MICHAEL T. MCCaul,
Chair, Committee on Homeland Security
BOB GOODLATTE,
Chair, Committee on the Judiciary
LAMAR SMITH,
Chair, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
KEVIN BRADY,
Chair, Committee on Ways and Means

HOMESTEAD, September 12, 2017

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCaul:


The Department’s Intelligence and Analysis Program Act seeks to provide DHS employees with the opportunity to develop their intelligence and counterterrorism skills. Organizations with such programs find that they yield benefits far beyond what the individuals who participate learn.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my House colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Sincerely,

Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my friend’s bill, H.R. 2453, the DHS Intelligence Rotational Assignment Program Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, 16 years ago, Americans were jarred by the spectacle of the mighty Twin Towers collapsing and fires at the Pentagon and in a Pennsylvania field. The perpetrators of the attacks sought to bring the United States to its knees. While, without question, a deep wound that may never fully heal was inflicted on the heart of this Nation on that day, we remain strong and resolute.

We emerged from that devastating experience more determined and with lessons learned about the need for better information sharing, interoperability, and coordination.

One major reform was the establishment of the Department of Homeland Security as a multimission agency, which today has 240,000 men and women serving in a range of capacities at our land, air, and seaports, as well as in the field, working to protect critical infrastructure from cyber and other attacks.

The DHS Intelligence Rotational Assignment Program Act seeks to provide DHS employees with the opportunity to develop their intelligence and counterterrorism skills. Organizations with such programs find that they yield benefits far beyond what the individuals who participate learn.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my House colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

HOMESTEAD, September 12, 2017

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCaul:

I understand H.R. 2453, H.R. 2468, and H.R. 2470 are slated for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, as such, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 2453, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for her hard work, and I, once again, urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2453, to bolster the Department of Homeland Security’s Intelligence Analyst Program and, thereby, strengthen the DHS intelligence enterprise.

Additionally, I want to thank Chairman Nunes and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for working with the Committee on Homeland Security to bring my bill, as well as H.R. 2468, offered by Representative Perry, and H.R. 2470, offered by Representative Rogers, to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
bills are virtually identical to specific provisions contained in H.R. 2655, the House-passed “Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act of 2017” for which I wrote to you on June 27, 2017. As noted since H.R. 2453, 2468, and 2470 implicate National Intelligence Program (NIP)-funded activities, I expect that they would be sequentially referred to the Committee on Intelligence (the Committee).

As discussed in previous correspondence regarding H.R. 2453, 2468, and 2470, the Committee on Homeland Security would request that you include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE H.R. 2453, 2468, and 2470 the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Intelligence Authorization Act (IAA) for the 115th Congress, as expressed in the January 2017 Exchange of Letters affirmed that, consistent with the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (the Committee). "NIP-funded elements of the Department of Homeland Security" is the vehicle that through which Congress authorizes annual appropriations for the NIP, including NIP-funded elements of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

In order to expedite the House’s consideration of H.R. 2453, 2468, and 2470, the Committee on Homeland Security would not refer any House bill that authorizes any elements of DHS funded through the NIP, and that if any such bill is reported by the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee will request a referral of the bill. In the interest of ensuring the most robust Department authorization possible, we further agree that you may offer an amendment during consideration of the bill in the full House. You are hereby notified that the Committee has not included Department-wide provisions that could affect Department elements that happen to include NIP-funded elements of DHS. As you also know, the Intelligence Authorization Program (IAA) is the vehicle for authorizations for appropriations for the NIP, including for elements of DHS that receive funding through the NIP. The IAA includes a classified schedule of NIP-funded elements of DHS.

Finally, we agree that if the Committee on Homeland Security reports a DHS-wide authorization bill to the House, I may offer an amendment during consideration of the bill in the full House. That amendment will contain the text of any legislative provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS previously reported by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. If the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has not reported any provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS, you will not offer an amendment. Understanding, however, that both of our committees have a jurisdictional interest in the Department of Homeland Security, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence will request a sequential referral of the bill. Under standing, however, that both of our committees have a jurisdictional interest in the Department's Office of Intelligence and Analysis, we agree to work together to ensure that the Office receives the most effective congressional guidance.

We further agree that if the Committee on Homeland Security reports a DHS-wide authorization bill to the House, I may offer an amendment during consideration of the bill in the full House. That amendment will contain the text of any legislative provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS previously reported by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. If the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has not reported any provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS, I will not offer an amendment, and the DHS-wide authorization bill will not contain any provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS. I will further agree that you will oppose as nongermane all amendments related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS in markup in the Committee on Homeland Security. If any amendments related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS are subsequently offered during consideration by the full House, you agree to consult with me before taking action.

Finally, we agree that you will support the amendment of the Chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to any committee of conference on a DHS-wide authorization bill that includes provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS.

In accordance with paragraph 5 of the January 2017 ‘Memorandum Regarding Authorization of the Department of Homeland Security’ I write to confirm our mutual understanding of the procedure through which the House will authorize the elements of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) funded through the National Intelligence Program (NIP). I appreciate your dedication to producing a comprehensive, constructive legislation that will improve congressional oversight of the Department. As you know, the Committee on Homeland Security supports the National Intelligence Program (NIP). I appreciate your dedication to producing a comprehensive, constructive legislation that will improve congressional oversight of the Department. As you know, the Committee on Homeland Security supports the National Intelligence Program (NIP).
related to these other intelligence and intel-
ligence-related activities of DHS. Fur-
thermore, I hope the staff of our committees can
continue to closely and expeditiously to con-
duct rigorous oversight of intelligence ac-
tivities throughout DHS.

The understanding detailed by this letter is
limited to the 115th Congress. It shall not con-
sist with the mutual understanding between our
committees in any subsequent congress.

I would appreciate your response to this
letter confirming this understanding. I look
forward to working with you to continue
congressional oversight of DHS intelligence
activities, and I thank you in advance for
your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by
the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER) that the House suspend
the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2435.

The question was taken; and (two-

The Chair recognizes the gentleman
from Wisconsin.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent that all Members
may have 5 legislative days within
which to revise and extend their re-
marks and to submit extraneous mate-
rials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
objection to the request of the gen-
tleman from Wisconsin?

There was none.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield
myself such time as I may con-
sume.

Mr. Speaker, the Pathways to Im-
proving Homeland Security at the
Local Level Act, sponsored by the gen-
tlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS),
provides that State and local law en-
forcement will continue to receive val-
uable information on DHS resources
and programs available to law enforce-
ment.

The bill requires the Office for State
and Local Law Enforcement to produce
and disseminate an annual catalog that
summarizes opportunities for training,
publications, programs, and services
available to non-Federal law enforce-
ment agencies from the Department of
Homeland Security, and to disseminate
the catalog to State and local law en-
forcement entities within 30 days of
production.

This also requires DHS to share the
catalog through the Homeland Secu-

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to
support the measure, and I reserve the
balance of my time.
Today, the Department of Homeland Security’s training catalog is a primary resource for State and local jurisdictions to find opportunities to enhance their counterterrorism and preparedness capabilities. H.R. 2427 seeks to ensure that, going forward, this vital resource remains available to the first responder community.

Specifically, H.R. 2427 directs DHS’ Office for State and Local Law Enforcement to produce and distribute an annual catalog of DHS’ training, programs, and services available to State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies from the Department and from each component and office of DHS.

Further, to ensure that this information is shared throughout the law enforcement community, the Pathways to Improving Homeland Security at the Local Level Act requires this comprehensive catalog be posted on the DHS website, as well as on the Homeland Security Information Network.

My district is home to the Coast Guard, DHS personnel, and officials from the Port of Los Angeles, who all have to work together to prepare and respond to threats. This bill would provide the information they need to work together and get the necessary training.

This measure, which was introduced by my Democratic colleague on the Homeland Security Committee, Representative VAL DEMINGS, highlights the importance of equipping law enforcement with necessary tools so that they can quickly adapt and discover new ways to work with the current terrorist threat landscape.

Enactment of this bill will further strengthen the Department’s partnership with State and local law enforcement to help protect the homeland.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2427 is an important piece of legislation that has strong support on both sides of the aisle.

Consideration of this measure today is particularly timely, as this week we remember those who sacrificed their lives and ran toward danger during the worst terrorist attack on U.S. soil. We owe it to their memory and to the men and women that today stand on the front lines to ensure that they have access to the training and tools they need to keep their communities secure.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 2427, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Once again, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2427 to ensure that State and local law enforcement continue to receive valuable information on the Department of Homeland Security’s services and resources.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security, I rise in support of H.R. 2427, Pathways to Improving Homeland Security At the Local Level Act.

This bipartisan bill would amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002, to direct the Assistant Secretary for State and Local Law Enforcement to produce and disseminate an annual catalog on Department of Homeland Security training, publications, programs, and services for State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes.

The coordination program under the measure would include:

1. Producing an annual catalog that summarizes opportunities for training, publications, programs, and services available to State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies from the Department and from each component and office of DHS;
2. Making such catalog available to State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies, including by posting the catalog on the website of the Department and cooperating with national organizations that represent such agencies;
3. Making such catalog available through the Homeland Security Information Network; and
4. Submitting such catalog to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

It is important to ensure our first responders and local law enforcement agencies are trained in homeland security programs, especially in times of natural disasters such as Hurricane Harvey and Hurricane Irma.

During relief efforts after Hurricane Harvey and the widespread flooding in Houston, Sgt. Steve Perez of the Houston Police Department drowned after his patrol car got stuck on a flooded road. It could have been prevented if first responders were given proper materials and training on how to manage crisis situations in rising flood water.

Currently, we fail to provide proper training for catastrophic flood events that would ensure greater safety of both citizens and first responders.

Programs and materials need to be created in order to train our responders in handling wide-spread flooding that simulate dangerous situations that could be encountered in their day-to-day life.

Over the past three years, Houston has experienced record-breaking flooding. If first responders were provided with proper tools and trainings in handling rescues in these conditions, we would see less of loss of life among both citizens and responders.

The most chaotic times for first responders are in response to natural disasters, and it is important to ensure that our nation is protected when we are the most vulnerable.

During Hurricane Harvey and the flooding that followed, if there were to have been a catastrophic flood event, the department’s Office for State and Local Law Enforcement would have to publish the catalogs on the DHS website within 30 days of production and distribute them through the Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN).

Sharing the catalog on the HSIN would allow the office to reach as many stakeholders as possible.

This catalog, through local law enforcement agencies would be able to ensure their first responders are aware of training programs over counterterrorism and homeland security.

It is vital to provide these resources to local law enforcement agencies in order to ensure they are aware of opportunities for their first responders, so they are trained to protect the United States and its citizens when it is most vulnerable.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2427.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2427, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOMELAND THREAT ASSESSMENT ACT

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2470) to require an annual homeland threat assessment, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows: H.R. 2470

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 “Homeland Threat Assessment Act”.

SEC. 2. ANNUAL HOMELAND THREAT ASSESSMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 311 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 210G. HOMELAND THREAT ASSESSMENTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section and for each of the next five fiscal years (beginning in the fiscal year that begins after the date of the enactment of this section), the Homeland Security Advisory Council shall submit to the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, and using departmental information, including component information, and information provided through State and major urban area fusion centers, shall conduct an assessment of the terrorist threat to the homeland.

(b) CONTENTS.—Each assessment under subsection (a) shall include the following:

“(1) Empirical data assessing terrorist activities and incidents over time in the United States, including terrorist activities and incidents planned or supported by persons outside of the United States targeting the homeland.

“(2) An evaluation of current terrorist tactics, as well as ongoing and possible future changes in terrorist tactics.
Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2470 received bipartisan support during consideration by the Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence in May, and was included in the Department of Homeland Security authorization bill, which passed the House floor in July.

H.R. 2470 requires the Department of Homeland Security to release an annual comprehensive homeland security threat assessment. This will provide a common threat picture across the Department and for Federal, State, and local partners.

This week, we are recognizing 16 years after the horrific events of 9/11. Sixteen years later, our ability to accurately identify and evaluate threats to the homeland remains stunted, in many ways.

Though talented professionals across Federal agencies and at the State and local level are hard at work gathering and analyzing Department of Homeland Security data in a strategic picture, by relying on information provided by the on-the-ground professionals, including State and local police and the Department’s operational component, this threat assessment will be a unique contribution to the intelligence community, policymakers, and other stakeholders.

By requiring the Department to consider specific cyber, transportation, and border security threats, in addition to traditional terrorism threats, H.R. 2470 ensures that DHS will focus on critical mission areas where it can provide real value.

Additionally, the threat assessment requirement by clarifying the nature and scale of the threats DHS was created to counter.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 2470, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consider.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2470, the Homeland Threat Assessment Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, since the attacks of September 11, 2001, which claimed the lives of over 3,000 innocent people, the terrorist threat that has metastasized and is decentralized. That was how then-DHS Secretary John Kelly described it in April. He went on to warn that “the risk is as threatening today as it was that September morning almost 16 years ago.”

Whereas, in 2001, there was a centralized, well-funded terrorist organization planning and carrying out major attacks, today the landscape is a patchwork of small cells and lone wolves eager to embrace violence in furtherance of their terrorist ideology.

Today, we consider H.R. 2470 a bill that requires DHS to conduct an assessment of the terrorist threat to the homeland on an annual basis. The factors to be considered include: data on terrorist incidents and activity in the U.S.; current and potential future terrorist tactics; cyber threats, particularly those to critical infrastructure networks; threats to surface and aviation transportation; and the efficacy of foreign terrorist propaganda.

In my district, these threats are an everyday reality for the Port of Los Angeles which has the largest container volume in the country and faces threats to their shipping, cybersecurity, and infrastructure. This bill will help DHS assess those threats and provide the right response after an incident.

We learned from the September 11 attacks about the importance of recognizing and analyzing the ever-evolving terrorist threat landscape. This annual assessment will ensure that DHS comprehensively examines all forms of terrorism and extremism that could damage the homeland today so that, as a nation, we can be vigilant.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to again express my support for this bill and highlight a particular provision that seeks to strengthen interagency collaboration on examining the threat.

The provision requires DHS’ Office of Intelligence and Analysis to continue working with fusion centers, which are the focal points for sharing threat-related information between Federal, State, local, and private sector partners.

DHS must continue to address and improve the nation’s fusion centers’ capabilities in gathering, analyzing, and sharing threat-related information between partners on every level.

I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) for sponsoring this legislation.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2470, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record the following exchange of letters:

H.R. 2470 received bipartisan support during consideration by the Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence in May, and was included in the Department of Homeland Security authorization bill, which passed the House floor in July.

Hon. Michael McCaul, Chairman, House Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

To: Speaker of the House

RE: H.R. 2470

I understand H.R. 2470, the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make careful improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Homeland Security by requiring the Secretary, acting through the Chief Intelligence Officer of the Department, to perform specific intelligence-related functions. All three bills are virtually identical to specific provisions contained in H.R. 3625, the House-passed “Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act of 2017” for which I wrote to you about on June 27, 2017. Accordingly,
since H.R. 2453, 2468, and 2470 implicate National Intelligence Program (NIP)-funded activities, I expect that they would be sequentially referred to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (the Committee).

As discussed in previous correspondence regarding H.R. 2453, we signed a Memorandum Regarding Authorization of the Department of Homeland Security and exchanged letters on January 11, 2017 (January 2017 Exchange of Letters), to clarify the Committee’s exclusive jurisdiction over NIP-funded elements of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS); The January 2017 Exchange of Letters affirmed that, consistent with the Rules of the House (X(11)(b)(1)) and the National Intelligence Authorization Act (IAA) is the vehicle that through which Congress authorizes annual appropriations for the NIP, including NIP-funded elements of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Moreover, those letters made explicit that the Committee on Homeland Security would not report to the House any bill that authorizes any elements of DHS funded through the NIP, and that if any such bill is reported by the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee will forego consideration of all three bills. You further agreed to include language in any such bill that could affect Department elements that happen to receive funding through the NIP. According to the NIP-funded elements of the Department, I further propose that you consider these matters.

In order to expedite the House’s consideration of H.R. 2453, 2468, and 2470, the Committee will forego consideration of all three bills or any similar measure. It is also conditioned on the Committee’s adherence to the agreement embodied in the January 2017 Exchange of Letters. I would appreciate your response to this letter and appropriate understanding that I would request that you include in the House’s consideration of all three bills, a copy of this letter, your response, and the January 2017 Exchange of Letters, including the Memorandum. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Best Regards,

DEVIN NUNES

Chairman.

Enclosure.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Committee on Homeland Security

Hon. DEVIN NUNES,
Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence
Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman NUNES: Thank you for your letter supporting the Committee on Homeland Security’s plans to conduct a comprehensive reauthorization of the Department of Homeland Security (the Department”) in the 115th Congress, as expressed in the 2017 “Memorandum Regarding Authorization of the Department of Homeland Security” alters the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security or the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. The Committee on Homeland Security appreciates the past success we have enjoyed working with the Intelligence Committee. I am grateful for your support and look forward to continuing to work together toward our mutual goal of ensuring that the Department and its components are authorized on a regular basis.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL
Chairman.

House of Representatives, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence
Washington, DC, September 8, 2017.

Hon. Michael McCaul,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman McCaul: I understand H.R. 2453, 2468, and 2470 are slated for consideration on the suspension calendar next week. All three bills amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (HSA), specifically, the laws administered by the Secretary of Homeland Security by requiring the Secretary, acting through the Chief Intelligence Officer of the Department, to perform specific intelligence-related functions. All three bills are virtually identical to specific provisions contained in H.R. 2453, the House-passed Department of Homeland Security and Authorization Act of 2017 for which I wrote to you about on June 27, 2017. Accordingly, since H.R. 2453, 2468, and 2470 implicate National Intelligence Program (NIP)-funded activities, I expect that they would be sequentially referred to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (the Committee).

As discussed in previous correspondence regarding H.R. 2453, we signed a Memorandum Regarding Authorization of the Department of Homeland Security and exchanged letters on January 11, 2017 (January 2017 Exchange of Letter), to clarify the Committee’s exclusive jurisdiction over NIP-funded elements of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). The January 2017 Exchange of Letters affirmed that, consistent with the Rules of the House (X(11)(b)(1)) and the National Intelligence Authorization Act (IAA) is the vehicle that through which Congress authorizes annual appropriations for the NIP, including NIP-funded elements of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Moreover, those letters made explicit that the Committee on Homeland Security would not report to the House any bill that authorizes any elements of DHS funded through the NIP, and that if any such bill is reported by the Committee on Homeland Security, this Committee will forego consideration of all three measures. This courtesy, is however, conditioned on our mutual understanding and agreement that it will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee with respect to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matter contained in these bills or any similar measure. It is also conditioned on the Committee’s adherence to the agreement embodied in the January 2017 Exchange of Letters. I would appreciate your favorable response to this letter confirming this understanding and would request that you include in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bills, a copy of this letter, your response, and the January 2017 Exchange of Letters, including the Memorandum. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Best Regards,

DEVIN NUNES
Chairman.

Enclosure.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Committee on Homeland Security

Hon. DEVIN NUNES,
Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence
Washington, DC.

Chairman NUNES: Thank you for your letter supporting the Committee on Homeland Security’s plans to conduct a comprehensive reauthorization of the Department of Homeland Security (the Department” in the 115th Congress, as expressed in the 2017 “Memorandum Regarding Authorization of the Department of Homeland Security.” I appreciate your willingness to help ensure the Department is fully authorized, and recognize that there may be areas of jurisdictional interest to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (“Intelligence Committee”) in such an authorization. Rule X(3) of the House of Representatives grants the Committee on Homeland Security jurisdiction over the “functions of the Department of Homeland Security,” including those functions related to the “integration, analysis, and dissemination of homeland security information,” while Rule X(3) grants the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence jurisdiction over “proposed legislation . . . relating to . . . the National Intelligence Program as defined in Section 3(6) of the National Security Act” and the National Intelligence Program (NIP) as defined in Section 3(6) of the National Security Act and any such bill that could affect Department elements that happen to receive funding through the NIP. According to the NIP-funded elements of the Department that are funded through the NIP, and that if any such bill is reported by the Committee on Homeland Security, this Committee will forego consideration of all three measures. This courtesy, is however, conditioned on our mutual understanding and agreement that it will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee with respect to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matter contained in these bills or any similar measure. It is also conditioned on the Committee’s adherence to the agreement embodied in the January 2017 Exchange of Letters. I would appreciate your favorable response to this letter confirming this understanding and would request that you include in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bills, a copy of this letter, your response, and the January 2017 Exchange of Letters, including the Memorandum. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Best Regards,

DEVIN NUNES
Chairman.
we both agree that the reported bill may include Department-wide provisions that could affect Department elements that happen to receive funding through the NIP. Accordingly, I will oppose non germane amendments which may be offered in my committee's markup related to the NIP-funded elements of the Department. I further agree to work together before taking any action on similar amendments which may be offered during consideration of the bill by the full House.

In the interest of ensuring the most robust Department authorization possible, we further agree that you may offer an amendment during consideration of the bill by the full House. That amendment will contain the text of any legislative provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS previously reported by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. If the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has not reported any provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS, you will not offer an amendment. Understanding, however, that both of our committees have a jurisdictional interest in the Department's Office of Intelligence, we agree to work together to ensure that the Office receives the most effective congressional guidance.

Finally, I reiterate my intention that nothing in the January 2017 "Memorandum Regarding Authorization of the Department of Homeland Security" alters the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security or the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. The Committee on Homeland Security appreciates the past success we have enjoyed working with the Intelligence Committee. I am grateful for your support and look forward to continuing to work together toward our mutual goal of ensuring that the Department and its components are authorized on a regular basis.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security, I rise in support of H.R. 2470, Homeland Threat Assessment Act.

This bipartisan bill the Homeland Security Department (DHS) would conduct annual terrorist threat assessments for the next five years using information from DHS offices and fusion centers.

The assessment under this measure would include:

1. Empirical data assessing terrorist activities and incidents over time in the United States, including terrorist activities and incidents planned or supported by persons outside of the United States targeting the homeland.
2. An evaluation of current terrorist tactics, as well as ongoing and possible future changes in terrorist tactics.
3. An assessment of criminal activity encountered or observed by officers or employees of components in the field which is suspected of financing terrorist activity; and
4. Detailed information on all individuals denied entry to or removed from the United States as a result of material support provided to a foreign terrorist organization (as such term is used in section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189);
5. The efficacy and spread of foreign terrorist organization propaganda, messaging, or recruitment;
6. An assessment of threats, including cyber threats, to the homeland, including to critical infrastructure and Federal civilian networks;
7. An assessment of current and potential terrorism and criminal threats posed by individuals and organized groups seeking to unlawfully enter the United States; and
8. An assessment of threats to the transportation sector, including surface and aviation transportation systems.

During natural disasters such as Hurricane Harvey and Hurricane Irma, the United States is vulnerable to terror attacks due to the lack of first responders available.

It is important to ensure our first responders and local law enforcement agencies are aware of the terror threats that would be reported in each assessment in order to provide continued support, especially during vulnerable situations such as Hurricane Harvey and the Southeast Texas floods.

The most chaotic times for first responders are in response to natural disasters and it is important to ensure that our nation is protected when we are the most susceptible.

During Hurricane Harvey and the flooding that followed, if there had been a homeland security incident, Texas would have been left vulnerable due to the chaos surrounding our first responders.

It is important to equip our first responders and local law enforcement agencies with these assessments in order to offer greater protection and heightened security during vulnerable situations such as natural disasters.

Additionally the assessment may incorporate relevant information and analysis from other agencies of the Federal Government, agencies of State and local governments (including law enforcement agencies), as well as...
the private sector, disseminated in accordance with standard information sharing procedures and policies.

Fusion centers were established administratively after the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks to serve as focal points at the state and local levels to receive, analyze, and share threat-related information with the federal government and the private sector.

The assessments would have to utilize data collected from the field and could incorporate relevant information from other government agencies and the private sector.

During recovery efforts for incidents such as Hurricane Harvey, having terrorist threat assessments would be valuable in keeping vulnerable citizens secure.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2470.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2470.

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.

* * *
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**UNIFYING DHS INTELLIGENCE ENTERPRISE ACT**

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2468) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a homeland intelligence doctrine for the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2468

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 “Unifying DHS Intelligence Enterprise Act”.

SEC. 2. HOMELAND INTELLIGENCE DOCTRINE.

(a) In General.—Subtitle A of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**SEC. 210G. HOMELAND INTELLIGENCE DOCTRINE.**

“(1) In General.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Chief Intelligence Officer of the Department, in coordination with intelligence components of the Department, the Office of the General Counsel, the Privacy Office, and the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, shall develop and disseminate written Department-wide guidance for the processing, analysis, production, and dissemination of homeland security information (as such term is defined in section 892) and terrorism information (as such term is defined in section 1016 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (6 U.S.C. 210(c))).

“(b) CONTENTS.—The guidance required under subsection (a) shall, at a minimum, include the following:

“(1) A description of guiding principles and purposes of the Department’s intelligence enterprise.

“(2) A summary of the roles and responsibilities of each intelligence component of the Department and programs of the intelligence components of the Department in the processing, analysis, production, or dissemination of homeland security information and terrorism information, including relevant authorities and restrictions applicable to each intelligence component of the Department and programs of each such intelligence component.

“(3) Guidance for the processing, analysis, and production of such information.

“(4) Guidance for the dissemination of such information, including within the Department, among and between Federal departments and agencies, among and between State, local, tribal, and territorial governments, including law enforcement, and with foreign partners and the private sector.

“(5) An assessment and description of how the dissemination to the intelligence community (as such term is defined in section 3(d) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403(d))) and to the intelligence community is protected.

“(6) A description of how the Department’s intelligence enterprise (as such term is defined in section 3(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 210(a))) is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 210G. Homeland intelligence doctrine.

SEC. 3. ANALYSTS FOR THE CHIEF INTELLIGENCE OFFICER.

Paragraph (1) of section 201(e) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 210A the following new sentence: “Sec. 210G. Homeland intelligence doctrine.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Perry) and the gentlewoman from New York (Miss Rice) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

* * *

**GENRAL LILAVE**

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 minutes to address the House.

The Speaker granted unanimous consent.

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

Mr. Speaker, 16 years ago, an unprecedented attack against the United States revealed immense gaps in how the United States supported domestic security and information sharing. As a result, the Department of Homeland Security was established to consolidate 22 existing Federal agencies and reshape the domestic intelligence and counterterrorism structure in the United States.

Over the years, DHS has matured and refined its Intelligence Enterprise, or IE, to better support joint operations. Even now, however, the Department has struggled to fully unify the various intelligence offices within the component agencies. This has limited the value DHS provides to the intelligence community and its State and local partners. Disparate intelligence components within DHS undermines the Department’s ability to fully utilize important data and conduct analysis.

DHS needs to follow the model of many other members of the intelligence community and produce an intelligence doctrine that clearly articulates roles and priorities across the DHS Intelligence Enterprise. The lack of this internal structure reflects a painful legacy from the pre-911 era in which bureaucracies operated as silos and were poorly coordinated.

H.R. 2468 empowers DHS to address this continued failure. By requiring the Department to produce guidance to all its components on the processing, analysis, production, and dissemination of information and intelligence, this bill helps to professionalize the DHS Intelligence Enterprise. Such a doctrine will guide how operational information flows from DHS into a wider strategic Homeland Security picture. This will increase the use of Department-specific information in its analytic products and processes.

H.R. 2468 also takes another step in strengthening the Department’s Intelligence Enterprise by formalizing the Department’s existing support for the DHS Chief Intelligence Officer, or the CINT. Though the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, or the I&A, serves as the Department’s Chief Intelligence Officer, these two roles carry different statutory authorities and distinct missions.

Therefore, Congress should support both functions by authorizing staff support for the CINT. H.R. 2468 does not authorize new hiring but, rather, reauthorizes the Department’s existing staff assignment and, most importantly, makes those assignments permanent.

It is now time to hold the Department accountable for developing a common foundation among members of the Department’s Intelligence Enterprise. By requiring DHS to produce these guidelines and by ensuring the Department’s leadership is properly and reliably supported, H.R. 2468 helps us to work to fulfill the promises made to the American people 16 years ago: Never again.

I am very pleased the text of H.R. 2468 was included in the larger DHS authorization bill, which passed this very House in July. I urge my colleagues to support the standalone measure to improve the quality of DHS’ analytical
Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Miss Rice of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2468, the Unifying DHS Intelligence Enterprise Act of 2017, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this measure seeks to help safeguard our Nation’s homeland security information. Specifically, it requires the Department of Homeland Security to develop and distribute Departmentwide guidance on the proper procedures for handling and sharing information related to homeland security and terrorism.

The 9/11 Commission Report found that the U.S. Government did not fully share or pool intelligence information prior to the attacks. In response, policies and procedures were reformatted at all levels to ensure that critical national security information is properly shared.

Intelligence sharing is critical to terrorism prevention, but it must be carried out in a manner that ensures that sensitive information is properly handled and distributed. H.R. 2468 seeks to do just that.

The bill requires the establishment of rules and regulations for the dissemination of such information both within DHS and with homeland security stakeholders at the State and local levels as well as in the private sector.

I urge my House colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2468 has strong support on both sides of the aisle. Effective security measures to improve our intelligence systems and mechanisms are critical to the mission of protecting the homeland.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Perry) for his work on this important legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. Perry. Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2468, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Perry) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2468, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2468, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Perry) and the gentlewoman from New York (Miss Rice) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Mr. Perry. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. Perry. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.
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to ISIL used virtual currency to fund attacks in Indonesia.

Virtual currencies offer high-speed and low-cost networks and access to users all over the world, which creates significant potential appeal to terrorists. They are low-cost because of the nominal cost often associated with carrying out that type of attack.

Research suggests that terrorists’ use of virtual currencies has so far been limited to a handful of instances, two of which I have mentioned. But with groups like ISIL becoming more technologically sophisticated and virtual currencies becoming more widely accessible, the table is set for this threat to grow significantly in a very short time. That is why it is critical that we act now to assess and understand this emerging threat.

My bill requires DHS’ Office of Intelligence Analysis to develop and disseminate a threat assessment of the use of virtual currencies to support terrorist activities. Further, to ensure that this information is shared throughout the law enforcement community, this bill requires the assessment to be shared with State, local, and Tribal law enforcement, including those offices that operate within State, local, and regional fusion centers.

Enacting this bill will give counterterrorism and law enforcement officials at all levels the information they need to evolve ahead of this threat and help keep Americans safe. I urge my House colleagues to support my bill.

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

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, has no other speakers. If the gentlewoman is finished, I have time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, my friend from New York (Miss RICE), has no other speakers, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, my friend from New York (Miss RICE), has no other speakers, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. HURD of Texas (Mr. HURD) and the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE) each will have 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back self such time as I may consume.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) and the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.
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The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) and the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.
most Americans would be dismayed that information-sharing stovepipes still exist.

While information sharing since that fateful day has improved dramatically, we still have work to do at the Department of Homeland Security. When the DHS was created, 22 component agencies were brought together with different missions, databases, and legal authorities.

The DHS personnel have to deal with a costly, cumbersome process to search and verify security versus civil liberty issues as well as the Federal Government’s history of delays and cost overruns on IT projects, it is critical that this program receive congressional oversight.

This bill provides the first authorization of the data framework, mandates privacy and security safeguards, as well as training for Department personnel with access to the system.

In addition to the personnel training and privacy safeguards, this bill also requires the Secretary to ensure information in the framework is both protected and auditable.

I was pleased that the Committee on Homeland Security included this bill in the DHS authorization bill, which passed the floor in July, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2454, the Department of Homeland Security Data Framework Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Homeland Security Data Framework Act directs the DHS to consolidate existing intelligence databases and systems at the Department in order to establish a data framework.

Specifically, H.R. 2454 requires the DHS to ensure that the data framework is accessible to DHS employees who the Secretary determines have an appropriate security clearance, have responsibilities that require access to framework information, and are trained in applicable standards for safeguarding and using such information.

By strengthening the DHS data framework, authorized personnel from each of the components and offices at the Department will have easier access to the data that they need in a timely manner.

Additionally, the DHS Security Data Framework Act of 2017 allows the DHS Secretary to incorporate into the data framework capabilities for auditing and ensuring the security of information within the framework. Such capabilities include mechanisms for identifying insider threats and security risks, and safeguards for privacy, civil rights, and liberties.

The anniversary of 9/11 is a time for reflection and remembrance, and also a time to enhance our defenses. We cannot allow weak data infrastructure to leave the homeland vulnerable to attacks, and I thank my good friend and colleague from Texas, Mr. Hurd, for introducing this commonsense legislation, and I urge my House colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, this is an important bill that has strong support on both sides of the aisle. It maintains effective security measures while consolidating systems, creating a more feasible way for the men and women at the DHS to access the data that they need to fulfill their critical mission. I thank Mr. Hurd for his diligence on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 2454, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York (Miss RICE), for her work on these initiatives. And I thank Chairman McCaul and the ranking member for the bipartisan way in which we focus on these important issues of homeland security.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2454, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2454—Department of Homeland Security Data Framework Act of 2017, which is the first authorization bill for the Department of Homeland Security since its creation.

I thank Chairman McCaul and Ranking Member THOMPSON for working diligently to bring this suspension bill before the House of Representatives.

H.R. 2454 directs the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to:

1. develop a data framework to integrate existing DHS datasets and systems for access by authorized personnel consistent with relevant legal authorities and privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties policies and protections;

2. ensure that all information of a DHS office or component that falls within the scope of the information sharing environment, and any information in interim systems relevant to priority mission needs and capability requirements of the homeland security enterprise, is included; and

3. ensure that the framework is accessible to DHS employees who have an appropriate security clearance, who are assigned to perform a function that requires access, and who are trained in applicable standards for safeguarding and using such information.

The bill excludes information that could:

1. jeopardize the protection of sources, methods, or activities;
2. compromise a criminal or national security investigation;
3. be inconsistent with the other federal laws or regulations; or
4. be duplicative or not serve an operational purpose.

DHS shall incorporate into such framework systems capabilities for auditing and ensuring the security of information.

Few can image how complex the federal government response to a Hurricane can be.

For example the need for information sharing is crucial to effect disaster response prior to, during and after Hurricanes Harvey and Irma.

U.S. cooperation with the European Commission, facilitated by the Department of State, allowed for rapid activation of the Copernicus Emergency Management Service (EMS) over the Texas and Louisiana coasts affected by Category-4 Hurricane Harvey, the largest recorded rainstorms ever to hit the contiguous United States.

This setup has provided local, state, and federal disaster managers with free, real-time, all-weather radar satellite images of the affected areas; we are grateful to our European partners, including the European Space Agency and the European Organization for the Exploitation of Meteorological Satellites, for their assistance during this challenging time.

Since August 25, Europe’s Copernicus EMS, at no cost to the United States, has generated up-to-date, satellite-based maps of the flood extent.

In combination with U.S. satellite data, these maps are critical tools for relief operations by U.S. federal, state, and local disaster responders.

First responders were in critical need of accurate information on persons who were trapped by Hurricane Harvey flood waters.

The statistics are staggering.

21 trillion gallons of rainfall fell in Texas and Louisiana in the first five days of the storm.

The estimated maximum sustained winds exceeded 130 miles per hour as the hurricane made landfall near Rockport, Texas on August 25.

A record 4,323 days, which is nearly 12 years, elapsed since a major hurricane (Category 3 or above) made landfall in the United States prior to Hurricane Harvey; the last Category 3 hurricane to hit the United States was Hurricane Wilma in 2005, the same year Hurricane Katrina destroyed much of New Orleans.

The city of Cedar Bayou received 51.88 inches of rainfall, breaking the record for rainfall from a single storm in the continental United States; my city of Houston received more than 50 inches of rainfall.

More than 13,000 people have been rescued in the Houston area and more than 30,000 persons are expected to be forced out of their homes due to the storm.

More than 8,800 federal personnel were staff deployed to help respond to Hurricane Harvey, supplying approximately 2.9 million meals, 2.8 million liters of water, 37,000 tarps, and 130 generators.

In the first three days of the storm, more than 49,000 homes had suffered flood damage and more than 1,000 homes were completely destroyed in the storm.

And today, two weeks later, thousands of Texans are still without permanent and stable housing situations.
That is why the additional $7.4 billion in CDBG funding provided in the legislation is desperately needed.

Mr. Speaker, valiant emergency responders in my state worked to exhaustion, with an invaluable assist from citizen volunteers, to rescue their neighbors and save lives.

That is who Texans are and this is what we do.

We do not yet know the full cost in human lives exacted by Hurricane Harvey.

But what we do know is that the costs of recovery and reconstruction will far exceed any natural disaster in memory; best estimates place the cost in the range of $150–$200 billion.

Mr. Speaker, there is much more work to be done in my city of Houston, and across the areas affected by the terrible, awesome storm that will be forever known simply as Hurricane Harvey.

This same resource was put into use for Hurricane Irma to support response to that major storm.

This string of important satellite data is provided by the United States-European Commission Cooperation Agreement on Earth Observation Data Related to the Copernicus Program.

The Department of State’s Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs negotiated the data sharing agreement, which has been in effect since October 2015.

The arrangement reflects a shared U.S.-E.U. vision to pursue full, free, and open data policies for government Earth observation satellites, fostering greater scientific discovery and encouraging innovation in applications and value-added services for the benefit of society at large.

I offer the thanks and appreciation for our nation—its people—especially the residents along the Gulf Coast including the residents of the 18th Congressional District in Houston and the surrounding communities for the support from our Allies in our nation’s time of need.

The Suspension before the House will facilitate data sharing among law enforcement agencies in the mission of the Department of Homeland Security to develop and maintain a unity of effort approach to security our nation from terrorist threats.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 2454.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2454, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL INFORMATION RESOURCE TO STRENGTHEN TIES WITH STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2442) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require an annual report on the Office for State and Local Law Enforcement, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2442
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 “Federal Information Resource to Strengthen Ties with State and Local Law Enforcement Act of 2017” or the “FIRST State and Local Law Enforcement Act”.

SEC. 2. ANNUAL REPORT ON OFFICE FOR STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.

Section 2006(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 607(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph (5):

“(5) ANNUAL REPORT.—For each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022, the Assistant Secretary for State and Local Law Enforcement shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report on the activities of the Office for State and Local Law Enforcement. The annual report shall include, for the fiscal year covered by the report, a description of each of the following:

(A) Efforts to coordinate and share information and enhance cooperation between DHS and law enforcement agencies.

(B) Efforts to improve information sharing through the Homeland Security Information Network by appropriate component agencies of the Department and by State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies.

(C) The streamlining and performance metrics within the Office of State and Local Law Enforcement to evaluate the effectiveness of efforts to carry out responsibilities set forth within the subsection.

(D) Any feedback from State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies about the Office, including the mechanisms utilized to collect such feedback.

(E) Efforts to carry out all other responsibilities of the Office of State and Local Law Enforcement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) and the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2442, the Office for State and Local Law Enforcement Information Sharing Review Act, introduced by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The Office for State and Local Law Enforcement is authorized in section 2006(b) of the Homeland Security Act and is located within the DHS Office of Partnership and Engagement. The office largely serves as a source of information on DHS resources available to State and local law enforcement partners, as well as a point of contact for questions regarding DHS policies and programs.

This bill requires a report on the activities of Office of State and Local Law Enforcement within the Department of Homeland Security. The report must include how the office is working to improve information sharing between DHS and law enforcement agencies, an overview of the performance metrics used by the office to measure success, feedback from State and local stakeholders, and an overview of ongoing activities.

This reporting requirement will ensure the office is continually identifying areas for improvement in the Department’s information-sharing efforts with State and locals, and coordinating with relevant DHS component agencies to close these gaps.

I applaud the gentlewoman from Texas for including a sunset on the reporting requirement after 5 years. While the information gathered through this report will be valuable for congressional oversight, it is important that we do not continue to require never-ending reporting requirements from the Department.

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

HOUSe OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COnMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,

WASHINGTON, DC, SEPTEMBER 5, 2017.

Hon. Michael T. McCaul,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEar CHAIRMAN MCCaUL, I write with respect to H.R. 2442, the “Federal Information Resource to Strengthen Ties with State and Local Law Enforcement Act.” As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions within H.R. 2442 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I forego any further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 2442 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 2442 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this bill.

Sincerely,

BOB Goodlatte,
Chairman.
Mr. Speaker, in closing, the FIRST with State and Local Law Enforcement Act seeks to ensure that, for years to come, State and local law enforcement know that the DHS is a full partner in their efforts to keep their communities secure.

As such, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill, H.R. 2442, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues once again to support H.R. 2442, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2442, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY CLASSIFIED FACILITY INVENTORY ACT

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2443) to require an inventory of all facilities certified by the Department of Homeland Security to host infrastructure or systems classified above the Secret level, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2443

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 “Department of Homeland Security Classified Facility Inventory Act”.

SEC. 2. INVENTORY. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall, to the extent practicable—

(1) maintain an inventory of those Department of Homeland Security facilities that the Department certifies to house classified infrastructure or systems at the secret level and above;

(2) update such inventory on a regular basis; and

(3) share part or all of such inventory with—

(A) Department personnel who have been granted the appropriate security clearance;

(B) non-Federal governmental personnel who have been granted a Top Secret security clearance; and

(C) other personnel as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(b) INVENTORY.—The inventory of facilities described in subsection (a) may include—

(1) the location of such facilities;

(2) the attributes of such facilities (including the square footage of, the total capacity of, the number of workstations in, and the number of conference rooms in, such facilities); and

(3) the entities that operate such facilities; and

(4) the date of establishment of such facilities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) and the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today we are advancing another bill to support the men and women who answer the call to keep their neighbors safe.

Yesterday we honored the first responders and countless other Americans who were murdered in the September 11 terrorist attacks. We will never forget them, nor their great sacrifices of their families and loved ones.

I come from Pennsylvania, which has a proud history of service, from the National Guard to police, to fire houses, to EMTs. Even one of our former Governors, Tom Ridge, was a key player in setting up the Department of Homeland Security.

Today, we, in Congress, continue to work to reduce the blind spots that led to 9/11, and ensure our Nation’s newest Department is able to get local law enforcement officers the resources that they need to keep our communities safe.

Having served as mayor of Hazelton, Pennsylvania, I have long known that it will be the police officer on the streets of Hazelton, Shamokin or Shippensburg, not some analyst in Harrisburg; Delaware Valley Intelligence Center in Philadelphia; and Western PA Region 13 Fusion Center in Pittsburgh.

This bill is part of my efforts to make the DHS share information with its State and local partners.
Mr. Speaker, I urge my House colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Homeland Security is charged with protecting classified facilities. This legislation will enhance Congressional ability to assist DHS with protecting classified facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my House colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2443 is an important piece of legislation. It has strong support on both sides of the aisle.

Extensive efforts have been made to enhance the Secretary's ability to establish the DHS intelligence enterprise, and support the National Network of Fusion Centers. It is important that DHS' partners at all levels know where to go to access classified information, particularly when a terrorist or other national security incident occurs.

Specifically, this bill requires greater transparency and information sharing on the locations of all facilities certified by DHS to store classified infrastructure or systems above the secret level, commonly known as SCIFs. This will give local law enforcement the tools that they need to protect their communities and our Nation as a whole.

Additionally, by requiring DHS to maintain an updated list of all of these facilities, this bill will ensure that the Department does not invest in new facilities in areas already covered, in turn, reducing the chances of wasteful spending.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure, which passed the House once already as part of the larger DHS authorization bill in July. I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will realize the critical need for my bill and will act quickly so that President Trump can sign it into law.

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

Miss Rice of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2443, the Department of Homeland Security Classified Facility Inventory Act of 2017.

This measure addresses a concern to many of us in the counterterrorism arena—the absence of a centralized inventory of classified systems within DHS.

DHS is the third largest Federal agency and has a vast footprint, yet DHS does not maintain a centralized list of all the spaces around the country where individuals with clearances can access classified information.

H.R. 2449 tackles this issue by requiring DHS to maintain an inventory of all DHS certified facilities that house classified systems above the secret level on a regular basis. It requires DHS to share part or all of the inventory, in accordance with standard information-sharing procedures and policies. This legislation will enhance Congress' ability to assist DHS with protecting classified facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my House colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2443 is an important piece of legislation. It has strong support on both sides of the aisle.

Extensive efforts have been made to enhance the Secretary's ability to establish the DHS intelligence enterprise, and support the National Network of Fusion Centers. It is important that DHS' partners at all levels know where to go to access classified information, particularly when a terrorist or other national security incident occurs.

Specifically, this bill requires greater transparency and information sharing on the locations of all facilities certified by DHS to store classified infrastructure or systems above the secret level, commonly known as SCIFs. This will give local law enforcement the tools that they need to protect their communities and our Nation as a whole.

Additionally, by requiring DHS to maintain an updated list of all of these facilities, this bill will ensure that the Department does not invest in new facilities in areas already covered, in turn, reducing the chances of wasteful spending.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure, which passed the House once already as part of the larger DHS authorization bill in July. I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will realize the critical need for my bill and will act quickly so that President Trump can sign it into law.

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

Miss Rice of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2443, the Department of Homeland Security Classified Facility Inventory Act of 2017.

This measure addresses a concern to many of us in the counterterrorism arena—the absence of a centralized inventory of classified systems within DHS.

DHS is the third largest Federal agency and has a vast footprint, yet DHS does not maintain a centralized list of all the spaces around the country where individuals with clearances can access classified information.

H.R. 2449 tackles this issue by requiring DHS to maintain an inventory of all DHS certified facilities that house classified systems above the secret level on a regular basis. It requires DHS to share part or all of the inventory, in accordance with standard information-sharing procedures and policies. This legislation will enhance Congress' ability to assist DHS with protecting classified facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my House colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2443 is an important piece of legislation. It has strong support on both sides of the aisle.

Extensive efforts have been made to enhance the Secretary's ability to establish the DHS intelligence enterprise, and support the National Network of Fusion Centers. It is important that DHS' partners at all levels know where to go to access classified information, particularly when a terrorist or other national security incident occurs.

Specifically, this bill requires greater transparency and information sharing on the locations of all facilities certified by DHS to store classified infrastructure or systems above the secret level, commonly known as SCIFs. This will give local law enforcement the tools that they need to protect their communities and our Nation as a whole.

Additionally, by requiring DHS to maintain an updated list of all of these facilities, this bill will ensure that the Department does not invest in new facilities in areas already covered, in turn, reducing the chances of wasteful spending.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure, which passed the House once already as part of the larger DHS authorization bill in July. I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will realize the critical need for my bill and will act quickly so that President Trump can sign it into law.

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

Miss Rice of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2443, the Department of Homeland Security Classified Facility Inventory Act of 2017.

This measure addresses a concern to many of us in the counterterrorism arena—the absence of a centralized inventory of classified systems within DHS.

DHS is the third largest Federal agency and has a vast footprint, yet DHS does not maintain a centralized list of all the spaces around the country where individuals with clearances can access classified information.

H.R. 2449 tackles this issue by requiring DHS to maintain an inventory of all DHS certified facilities that house classified systems above the secret level on a regular basis. It requires
Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2471, the Terrorist Release Announcements to Counter Extremist Recidivism Act, or TRACER Act.

Mr. Speaker, today we consider H.R. 2471, a narrowly tailored bill that seeks to ensure that certain local authorities are notified when convicted terrorists who have completed their prison terms are expected to be released into their communities.

This legislation was drafted in response to testimony received by our committee about the need for such information to be shared for situational awareness. The bill requires DHS, in coordination with appropriate Federal partners, as well as State and local law enforcement, to conduct periodic threat assessments regarding the overestimated terrorist threats and take action to prevent at-risk terrorist threats. I urge passage of H.R. 2471.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2471 will further enhance the ability of law enforcement, particularly those participating in the National Network of Fusion Centers, to monitor potential terrorist threats and take action to prevent attacks.

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

The Speaker pro tempore. The question being taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The question was taken: and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2471, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
(v) a list of additional risk factors, including smoking or drug use, as determined relevant by the Secretary; and
(vi) other physical examination and medical history relevant to a cancer incidence study or general health of firefighters not available in existing cancer registries.

(2) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—In carrying out the collection for purposes of inclusion in the Firefighter Registry, the Secretary shall enable the Firefighter Registry to link to State-based cancer registries, for a purpose described by clause (vi) or (vii) of section 399B(c)(2)(D) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280(c)(2)(D)), to obtain information on:

(A) administrative information, including date of diagnoses and source of information; and

(B) pathological data characterizing the cancer, including cancer site, state of disease (pursuant to Staging Guide), incidence, and type of treatment.

(d) METHODS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes described in subsection (c), the Secretary is authorized to incorporate questions into public health surveys, questionnaires, and other databases.

(2) REQUIRED STRATEGY.—The Secretary shall develop a strategy, working in consultation with the stakeholders identified in subsection (e), to maximize participation in the Firefighter Registry established under this section, there are authorized to be

(3) Additional steps that may be required to ensure the equitable representation of groups identified in paragraph (5).

(4) Information on how the Secretary will store, use, and disclose the data described in subsection (c)(1) and provide links to relevant health information described in subsection (c)(2).

(5) Working in consultation with the experts described in subsection (e), the Secretary shall develop a standardized method for estimating the number of fire incidents attended by a firefighter as well as the type of fire incident so attended in the case such firefighter is unavailable to provide such information.

(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit the strategy described in paragraph (2), in consultation with the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate not later than 60 days after the date of the completion of the strategy.

(4) GUIDANCE FOR INCLUSION AND MAINTENANCE OF DATA ON FIREFIGHTERS.—The Secretary shall develop, in consultation with the stakeholders identified in subsection (e), State health agencies, State departments of homeland security, and volunteer, paid-on-call, combination, and career firefighting agencies, a strategy for inclusion of firefighters in the registry that are representative of the general population of firefighters, that includes the following:

(A) How new information about firefighters will be submitted to the Firefighter Registry for inclusion.

(B) How information about firefighters will be maintained and updated in the Firefighter Registry over time.

(C) A method for estimating the number of fire incidents attended by a firefighter as well as the type of fire incident so attended in the case such firefighter is unable to provide such information.

(D) Further information, as deemed necessary by the Secretary.

(5) ENSURING REPRESENTATION OF UNDER-REPRESENTED GROUPS IN REGISTRY.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall take such measures as the Secretary deems appropriate to encourage the inclusion of data for firefighters in a manner that appropriately represents the utility of the Firefighter Registry established under this section.

(6) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall, on a regular basis, consult with the stakeholders identified in subsection (e) to ensure the equitable representation of minority, female, and volunteer firefighters in the Firefighter Registry.

(6) Privacy.—In carrying out this Act, the Secretary shall apply to the Firefighter Registry established under subsection (a) data security provisions and privacy standards that comply with the best practices of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and provide for data privacy and security standards similar to those in the HIPAA privacy regulation, as defined in section 1180(b)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320d-9(b)(3)).

(b) Authorization of Funds.—To carry out this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated $2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2018 through 2022.

SEC. 3. CUT-GO COMPLIANCE.

Subsection (f) of section 319D of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-4) is amended by striking “through 2013” and inserting “through 2017, and $128,300,000 for fiscal year 2018”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD on the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?
events on that day exhibited the her- 
olm our firefighters and other first re-
sponders display as they run toward 
disaster while everyone else runs away.

The long-term health consequences on 
September 11, including several forms of cancer and chronic respiratory 
conditions among first responders, also 
serve as a reminder of the unique 
health risks firefighters face. As fire-
fighters run into burning buildings and 
other environments, they often do not 
know whether carcinogens or haz-
ardous materials are present. Such ex-
posures have resulted in cancer becom-
ing the leading cause of line of duty 
death among firefighters. My grand-
father was a captain in the Houston 
Fire Department and died of cancer.

We still do not fully understand 
the relationship between firefighters 
and cancer risk. That is why a more 
comprehensive approach is needed to 
understand this relationship. H.R. 931, the 
Firefighter Cancer Registry Act, will 
create a voluntary cancer registry of 
firefighters to collect data on their 
cancer risks and outcomes related to 
their job exposures. This registry will 
inform research into the health risks 
facing firefighters, as well as ways to 
mitigate them. That evidence will 
allow us to implement new practices 
and develop new tools to protect the 
health of individuals who courageously 
put their lives at risk to protect the 
public.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 
minutes to the gentleman from New York 
(Mr. COLLINS), the author of this 
very important legislation and an 
important member of our committee.

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. 
Speaker, I come before you in support 
of my bill, H.R. 931, the Firefighter 
Cancer Registry Act.

Sixty-five of us, on yesterday, on Sep-
tember 11, 2001, we witnessed a horrible 
tragedy that will leave an impression 
on generations of Americans forever. 
Through this tragedy, we witnessed the 
heroic actions of America’s brave first 
responders working and volunteering 
in the days and weeks that followed.

We lost many first responders during 
those attacks of 9/11, and we continue 
to lose more every year from ongoing 
health effects.

All firefighters across our Nation 
sacrifice their health every day to face 
the dangers of smoke inhalation and 
toxic chemicals. These dangers cannot 
be entirely avoided, which is why this 
bill, H.R. 931, is so important. This 
bi-partisan legislation takes an important 
first step towards addressing the detai-
mental health impacts faced by our Na-
tion’s firefighters.

The career of firefighting is a dan-
gerous one. There are nearly 1.2 million 
men and women serving as firefighters 
in the United States. With every single 
fire they fight, these heroes take their 
lives into their own hands. Firefighters 
bravely risk their safety to protect our 
families, our homes, and our commu-
nities.

Unfortunately, the risks of fire-
fighting surpass the scene of the fire. 
These men and women are exposed to 
dangerous smoke and chemicals that 
pose a threat not just to their health 
trouble. We see firefighters all across 
the United States with higher rates of 
cancer than the general population, 
and it is vital that we learn more about 
this correlation.

That is why I, along with my col-
league, Representative BILL PASCRELL, 
introduced the Firefighter Cancer Reg-
istry Act. This bill will require the 
CDC to establish a registry to track 
cancer incidence in the firefighting 
service. This registry will work with fire 
departments across our Nation to include the 
important variables of a firefighter’s career, 
including years of service, number of 
fires attended, and the types of fires 
attended. This is essential to the 
development of future protocols, 
safeguards, and the development of 
equipment that will better protect 
these men and women.

Firefighters put their lives at risk 
every day, and Congress should do all it 
can to shed light and reduce the 
health hazards they face. I would like 
to commend Chairman WALDEN and 
Ranking Member PALLONE of the full 
committee, and Chairman BURGESS and 
Ranking Member GREEN of the Health 
Subcommittee for a bipartisan showing 
of support during both markups of this 
law. Further public health research on 
the nature of the problem.

The first step to finding solutions is 
understanding the nature of the prob-
lem. Further public health research on 
this topic is needed so we can start 
looking to find ways to alleviate this 
risk.

I am pleased that H.R. 931 is on the 
floor today. It would create a national 
cancer registry for firefighters diag-
nosed with this deadly disease. The cre-
ation of a specialized firefighter cancer 
registry will provide scientists and 
medical professionals with the detailed 
information we need to understand the 
relationships between firefighters’ 
exposure to dangerous fumes and 
smoke and the increased cancer risk for several major cancers. In the 
future, this information could also 
allow for better protective equipment 
and prevention techniques to be devel-
oped.

This bill enjoys strong support from 
many fire service organizations across our 
Nation, including the International As-
ciation of Firefighters, the Congress-
ional Fire Services Institute, the Na-
tional Volunteer Fire Council, the 
International Association of Fire 
Chiefs, the National Fallen Fire-
fighters Foundation, the New Jersey 
State Firefighters’ Mutual Benevolent 
Association, and the International Fire 
Service Training Association.

Taking care of the brave men and 
women of the fire service is an impor-
tant task. We cannot delay in getting 
them the help they need. Mr. Speaker, 
I urge my colleagues in the House to 
heed this legislation and to ensure that 
firefighters are provided with the best 
possible care when it is needed.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 
minutes to the gentleman from Texas 
(Mr. BURGESS), the chairman of the
Subcommittee on Health, the gentleman who helped move this legislation forward, and leads our committee on matters of health.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 931, the Firefighter Cancer Registry Act.

In 2015, a 5-year study of nearly 30,000 firefighters found that these individuals had a greater number of cancer diagnoses and cancer-related deaths than matched controls in the general population.

While this built upon prior studies that have examined the link between firefighting and cancer, our understanding of this connection is still limited. To improve our ability to alleviate the health risks that these public servants face, Representatives COLLINS and PASCRELL introduced H.R. 931. This will authorize funding for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to create a national registry for the collection of data pertaining to cancer incidence among firefighters.

This national registry will fill the void in our understanding of the health risks that our firefighters face and better prepare us to care for them.

Yesterday marked the 16th anniversary of September 11 attacks. We are reminded of the firefighters’ willingness to run toward danger to help anyone who is in harm’s way. Across our country, firefighters answer the call whenever our families or our communities are in need. Supporting these important public health data is one way we can give back to these heroes, and I urge all Members to join me in supporting H.R. 931.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO), who also had constituents who were very affected by the events of 9/11.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman’s yielding of time.

As we take this week to somberly remember those who lost their lives on September 11, 2001, it is equally important that we remember the first responders who bravely ran towards the tragedy of 16 years ago, who woke up the next day, on September 12, 2001, still beaten, tired, and bruised but, again, walked towards those tragedies. Still, today, these first responders heroically risk life and limb to run toward tragedies.

As Americans, we owe our first responders a great debt. For this reason, I ask my colleagues to support Mr. COLLINS’ bill, H.R. 931, the Firefighter Cancer Registry Act, which makes important first steps in lifesaving cancer research and future medical advancements for firefighters, who have disproportionately higher cancer risks.

I would like to thank all of our first responders and urge passage of this important legislation, and I thank the bipartisan cosponsors of this legislation as well.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, we all join in thanking our first responders. This is the least of the things we can do to show how much we care about our firefighters, and I would encourage our colleagues in the House to support this very important legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCLENTOCK). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 931, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LITTLE ROCK CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE BOUNDARY MODIFICATION ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2611) to modify the boundary of the Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

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 “Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site Boundary Modification Act”.

SEC. 2. LITTLE ROCK CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.

Section 2 of Public Law 105-356 (112 Stat. 3528) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.—The boundary of the historic site is modified to include the 7 residences on South Park Street in Little Rock, Arkansas, consisting of 1.37 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Central High School National Historic Site Proposed Boundary’, numbered 05730.001, and dated August, 2004.”;

(3) in subsection (d) (as redesignated by paragraph (1))—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “(1) The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “(2) The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(2) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS FOR THE PRESERVATION AND INTERPRETATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the owners of the 7 residences referred to in subsection (b) pursuant to which the Secretary may use appropriated funds to mark, interpret, improve, restore, and provide technical assistance with respect to the preservation and interpretation of the properties.

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—An agreement entered into under subparagraph (A) shall include a provision specifying that no changes or alterations shall be made to the exterior of the properties subject to the agreement, except by the mutual agreement of the parties to the agreement.”;

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), the sponsor of this excellent piece of legislation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, 60 years ago today, all eyes were on South Park Street that fronts the beautiful facade of Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas. Just days before, Arkansas Governor Orval Faubus had called out the National Guard to prevent nine Black students from entering the school on September 4, Central High and its beautiful neighborhood had become ground zero in the march to end the five-decade legacy of Plessy v. Ferguson, “separate but equal,” to bring it to reality.

Now, just over 3 years after the Brown decision, it was time for action. In a few days, on the 25th of this month, we will celebrate the successful integration of Central High School, when the Little Rock Nine entered the school escorted by the troops of the 101st Airborne.

It is fitting today, Mr. Speaker, that we pay tribute to the Little Rock Nine, their defenders, and the successful end to separate but equal. We recognize this important milestone today on this House floor by passing a bill on the suspension calendar that expands the park boundary of the national historic site at Little Rock Central High School. This is a historic and important touchstone for all of those modern-day history travelers retracing the steps of the civil rights movement.

The Little Rock National Historic Site Visitor Center was opened in 2007 on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the integration of Central High. Today’s measure, H.R. 2611, is a single one: to expand the park boundaries to take in the houses that fronted the school along beautiful South Park Street so that future generations will be able to picture this tranquil street, an architecturally significant facade of Central High, and reflect back on those 21 days of trauma in September 1957.

I thank my colleague who is in our Chamber today, civil rights pioneer and courageous actor John Lewis, for his cosponsorship.

I thank our majority leader, Chairman BISHOP, and the Natural Resources Committee for their expeditious treatment of this important measure, and I salute Senator Cotton for his leadership in advancing this important legislation changed the United States Senate.

I look forward to President Trump signing this bill and again recognizing that we have to embrace our past and learn from our history.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor at this time to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Lewis), a civil rights pioneer and legend.

Mr. Lewis of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlemwoman from Hawaii for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield strong support of this bill. I am proud to join the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Hill) in sponsoring this legislation to update the Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site.

In 1954, the Supreme Court issued a historic decision in the Brown v. Board of Education case, which desegregated our Nation’s public schools. Unfortunately, the law of the land did not become the practice of its people overnight. It took the will of brave men and women and some very brave children, like the Little Rock Nine.

Parents swallowed the fear for their children. Strong, innocent little children put their bodies on the line to force the change that justice demands. They gave us the courage and the resolve. It became the soul of our Nation, and we must admit today that our country is a better country and we are a better people because of these children, the mothers and fathers, the teachers, and many of our citizens.

When Little Rock, Arkansas, leaders attempted to desegregate Central High School, the Governor fought back. He chose to stand on the side of hate and bigotry. It took a determined mayor, a strong Governor, and the Arkansas National Guard to protect these nine teenagers as they entered the school.

In 1957, Mr. Speaker, I was 17 years old, and I vividly remember those days. These young people inspired all of us to stand up, to speak up, and to speak out. And many of us started saying: If the children in Little Rock can do what they are doing, we, too, can do it.

For those of us watching on television, listening to the radio, and reading the newspapers, we were deeply inspired. We were moved to do something, to say something. I said to myself: We need to stand up the same way the people and students in Little Rock are standing up. I remember thinking that I could—that I must—find a way to get in the way.

Mr. Speaker, Central High is part of our history that must be preserved for a generation yet unborn.

I remember a few years ago, I visited that school and walked through the halls with a young African-American student who was president of the student body, who the principal asked to escort me through the school. I felt like I was walking in a special place, almost a holy place. It brought tears to my eyes.

During those dark and difficult times, the national historic site became a beacon of hope, an inspiration that we can never give up, that we can never give in as we strive towards equal rights and justice for all.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for introducing this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to stand with the gentleman from Arkansas and the gentlewoman from Hawaii and support this piece of legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Westerman), also a member of our committee and who has helped shepherd this bill through our committee and here on the floor.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my colleague from Congresswoman Frenchie Hill’s bill, H.R. 2611, that will modify the boundary of the Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site to include seven residences on South Park Street in Little Rock, Arkansas.

While this bill would authorize the National Park Service to enter into cooperative agreements with private property owners of the South Street properties, H.R. 2611 will do more. It will also help us to remember. It will help us to remember that on September 25, 1957, nine young people, with Federal troops for escorts, bravely walked past crowds of hatred, bigotry, emotional degradation, and even physical abuse to desegregate Little Rock Central High School.

On that historic day in 1957, nine young people showed the United States and the world that we were and are better than segregation and better than racism and injustice. They proved to the world that, as Americans, we really do believe the Declaration of Independence when it says that all men are created equal.

I believe that allowing the historical residences surrounding Little Rock Central High School to slip into disrepair or oblivion would be a severe injustice to those who served themselves to further the cause of civil rights and equality.

I would like to thank my colleague from Arkansas (Mr. Hill) and the distinguished gentlewoman from Georgia (Mr. Lewis) for their work on this important issue, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. H.R. 2611, introduced by Representative Hill and cosponsored by civil rights pioneer and legend, Representative Lewis of Georgia, amends Public Law 105-356, which established Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site.

H.R. 2611 would modify the park’s boundary and expand the park’s authority to enter into cooperative agreements. The proposed boundary modification would include seven privately owned residences on South Park Street, consisting of 1.47 acres. The cooperative agreement authority provided by the bill will allow the National Park Service to give financial aid to the homeowners to preserve the facades and maintain the ambience of a 1957 historic scene.
Images of the South Park Street properties are inextricably associated with the 1957 events. As images of the Little Rock Nine, crowds of protesters, the public, and the National Guardsmen appeared in newspapers across the Nation and were broadcast through the medium of television, the neighborhood became recognizable as the high school itself.

Because South Park Street in front of Central High School retains a high degree of historical integrity, this legislation would provide a unique opportunity to preserve a setting that will allow visitors to more accurately visualize the events that occurred there in 1957 when the Little Rock Nine attempted to attend Central High School.

In 1946, the surrounding neighborhood, including these seven privately owned homes, was listed on the National Register of Historic Places as the Central High School Neighborhood Historic District. The designation recognized the neighborhood’s association with the significant events of 1957 as well as the architectural characteristics and qualities that remain relatively unchanged from that period.

All the property owners and several community members have expressed their support for this proposal, including Central High Neighborhood, Inc., and Preserve Arkansas.

As we move forward in these turbulent times, it is important that we do not forget the struggles of the Little Rock Nine and the neighborhood that moved America forward towards an integrated education system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, to me, is an extremely important bill. Sixty years ago, in September of 1957, nine extraordinary students attended Little Rock, Arkansas’ Central High School. They were kids picked for their academic ability and their maturity level because they were going to go through a year that no one had seen before and, hopefully, will ever see again.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps because I taught high school for almost 30 years, I understand the environment that took place here, and I have a great deal of empathy for these nine kids who went there. They could have easily been my students.

This becomes a significant concept that on September 4, 60 years ago, the Governor of Arkansas ordered the National Guard to bar these nine kids from entering into Central High School in Little Rock; then, after some pressure, he withdrew the protection so the kids were subject to the mobs and the violence that took place there at that time.

On September 25, 60 years ago, Dwight Eisenhower had the courage and leadership—one of the reasons I respect him so much as a President—to order the Army 101st Airborne Division to go down to Little Rock to Central High School and to escort these nine kids through that first year and lead them to a school year like no other has ever been.

This situation was, in my estimation, a pivotal moment in our Nation’s civil rights history as well as our education history. We have often talked about how buildings and monuments are used to interpret history. That is exactly what Mr. Hill is attempting to do here and, so I applaud the House’s history, to make sure that it is preserved—and not just the high school itself, but the seven residences that are across the street on South Park Street. Those residences have part of the historical landmark which was made and designated in the Reagan administration. They are part of the designation on the National Register of Historic Places.

Finally, in 1998, the high school and some surrounding areas were established as a National Historic Site. Those buildings still have significant historical integrity. They add to the definition and the story of history which must—which must—be remembered and preserved.

This bill expands the boundaries of this National Historic Site to include those residences so the National Park Service can, in cooperative agreements with the residents who still live there, makemaking the area can always be preserved as a place to interpret, improve, and provide the technical assistance to make sure this story of American history is not forgotten. It is part of the milieu.

As the gentlewoman from Hawaii said, when you see pictures of these kids giving press conferences, you see these homes in the background. It is part and parcel to this story. The residents who live across the street are a part of the late landmark events in September of 1957 and provide the backdrop for this particular element.

I am appreciative of Mr. Hill of Arkansas for leading forth with this particular bill, realizing the significance, and I am happy that today, on the very month this was happening 60 years ago, we actually are talking about this particular event and desiring to secure these areas so that the history of this country will be remembered to its fullest extent.

One of our staffers in the committee who helped in the drafting of this bill had the opportunity of having lunch with one of those Little Rock Nine. His essay won, and his reward was to have a chance to actually meet one of these heroic young men who went to Little Rock’s Central High School 60-plus years ago.

This is significant, and I cannot think of this story without in some way feeling choked up inside because I know what it must have been like for those kids to go there, and I know what it must have been like to be part of that milieu. This was heroic. They were true heroes. They were truly brave kids who took this event on and did it with such aplomb. They need to be remembered.

That is why I am happy that this bill is coming forward, so that we can expand the horizon of what we can expand the horizon of this historic site so that we can make sure that this will be a protected area, so that the history will not be forgotten and so that what these kids did in that very historic year of 1957 and 1958 in Little Rock will not be forgotten, and so the significance and the conviction those kids had and the experience they had to go through can be remembered and that we can never again go back there. We could never again replicate that area, and we will move forward in the area of civil rights as well as education.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here to support this bill. I am going to ask my colleagues to support this bill because it says so much about us, about our priorities, about what we want to do, and it says so much about what is good in this country. This is the primary example of what we are attempting to do.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate those whose been spoken on behalf of this particular bill, those who have worked on this bill, and those who have sponsored this bill. This bill is something I think is really significant. It says something that is very positive about this country and helps us to remember that which is positive about this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am urging all my colleagues to support this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2611.

The question was taken. The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. 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 motion will be postponed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 3354.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 504 and rule
Mr. CULBERSON of Texas, Mr. Chairman, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 504, as the designee of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, I offer amendments en bloc No. 3 as part of consideration of division C of H.R. 3354.

The list of amendments included in the en bloc, Mr. Chairman, is at the desk and has been agreed to by both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The Acting CHAIR. The Acting CHAIR.

Amendments en bloc No. 3 consisting of amendment Nos. 61, 62, 64, 66, 68, 69, 90, 92, 93, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 102, 103, 107, 110, and 111 printed in House Report 115–297 offered by CULBERSON of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. CULBERSON OF TEXAS

Page 251, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $13,000,000)" (increased by $13,000,000)."

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. REICHERT OF WASHINGTON

Page 249, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $1)".

Page 250, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $1)".

Page 269, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $10,000,000)".

Page 291, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $1,000,000)".

Page 292, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $10,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MRS. DEMINGS OF FLORIDA

Page 252, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $5,000,000)".

Page 264, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $5,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY OF CONNECTICUT

Page 258, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $1,000,000)" (increased by $1,000,000)."

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI OF ILLINOIS

Page 260, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $10,100,000)" (increased by $10,100,000)."

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. BONAMICI OF OREGON

Page 260, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $21,775,000)" (reduced by $21,775,000)."

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI OF OREGON

Page 260, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduce by $5,000,000)" (increase by $5,000,000)."

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN OF FLORIDA

Page 260, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $5,000,000)".

Page 260, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $8,000,000)".

Page 264, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $8,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MRS. DEMINGS OF FLORIDA

Page 260, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $5,000,000)".

Page 269, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $5,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS

Page 260, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $2,500,000)".

Page 269, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $2,500,000)".

Page 269, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $7,000,000)".

Page 291, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $5,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS

Page 260, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $2,500,000)".

Page 269, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $7,000,000)"

Page 291, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $7,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MS. MICHELLE LUIAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

Page 260, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $5,000,000)"

Page 269, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $5,000,000)"

Page 291, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $5,000,000)"

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. SERRANO OF ARIZONA

Page 260, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $5,000,000)"

Page 269, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $5,000,000)"

Page 291, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $5,000,000)"

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 269, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $7,000,000)"

Page 291, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $10,000,000)"

Page 291, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $10,000,000)"

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MR. ISSA OF CALIFORNIA

Page 276, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $10,000,000)"

Page 291, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $10,000,000)"

Page 291, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $10,000,000)"

Page 292, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $10,000,000)"

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN OF NEW JERSEY

Page 280, line 21, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by $4,000,000)"

Page 286, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $4,000,000)"

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MS. BROWNLEY OF CALIFORNIA

Page 280, line 21, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by $3,000,000)"

Page 291, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $3,000,000)"

Page 294, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $3,000,000)"

Page 294, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $3,000,000)"

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MS. J. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Page 282, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $500,000)"

Page 286, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $500,000)"

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE OF RHODE ISLAND

Page 294, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $100,000,000)" (increased by $100,000,000).

AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 285, line 1, strike "$12,000,000" and insert "$14,000,000.""

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I am in support of the en bloc amendments. We have worked on it jointly, and I support all of the amendments that are included in the en bloc.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN).

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my colleague Congresswoman JULIA BROWNLEY’s amendment to increase funding for veterans treatment courts.

Veterans courts keep our heroes struggling with addiction or a mental health condition from going to jail, instead providing them with the care they need and a second chance. Our Nation’s military is returning home from a decade and a half of war with invisible wounds: PTSD, depression, TBI, trauma, and more. Researchers are continuing to find links between substance abuse and combat-related mental health struggles.

Specialized drug court participants are significantly less likely than non-participants to relapse or later commit crimes. By keeping veterans out of prisons, focusing on rehabilitation and sobriety, these programs offer long-term solutions rather than short-sighted punishments.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting “yes” for this amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to seek support for my en bloc amendment to H.R. 3354.

As we all know, drug overdose deaths in our country have dramatically increased since the turn of the century. Over the past decade alone, overdose deaths have increased by more than 400
percent. In 2015, more Americans died from opioids than in the Vietnam war. Mr. Chairman, that is astonishing.

This is a national emergency. I have seen the effects firsthand in my district. In 2016, nearly one-fifth of all opioid-related deaths in South Carolina took place in my district. My amendment would provide more funds to opioid prevention by transferring $7 million from the DOJ General Administration account to the opioid abuse reduction activities. More than ever, we need as much funding as possible to defeat this national epidemic.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in combating this crisis.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the en bloc amendment, which includes amendments to increase funding for the ocean acidification program and increase coastal monitoring and assessment of algal blooms.

Oregon’s economic vitality is dependent on the ocean economy. Ocean acidification and harmful algal blooms threaten ocean health, the tourism industry, and our valuable fisheries.

Communities along the coasts are vulnerable to the effects of our changing climate. I applaud NOAA’s acidification and coastal monitoring and assessment programs that give our coastal community the tools they need to understand and address these threats.

I thank the chairman and ranking member for including these amendments and for their hard work on this bill.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address the gentlewoman’s comments, very briefly. I want to thank the gentlewoman for bringing this matter to the House’s attention. Harmful algal blooms are an important issue, especially to the State of Florida. We know how dangerous they are and the terrible effect they have had on our friends in Florida, who are already suffering the effects of this hurricane. Our prayers and thoughts are with them. All of us in Houston understand the severity of the problem they face, and we are praying for their recovery. I yield back to the gentleman.

I will certainly continue to work with the gentlewoman on this issue that she brings to the House’s attention.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the chair for yielding and for all his hard work in working together with us to address the issue of gun crime in this country. As everyone knows, over the last several years especially, high-profile shootings and violent crime have caught the attention of Americans all across this country and sparked a debate about what should be done to reduce gang violence and gun crime in the United States.

Well, the truth is, there is an answer and a proven solution that actually worked. That was the program that mayor David T. Toulson, sheriff in King County in Seattle, Washington. It is a program called Project Safe Neighborhoods. It was first the Safe Cities Initiative by the Clinton-Gore administration and then continues to be known as Project Safe Neighborhoods under George Bush.

Through strong partnerships, Federal, State, and local governments created local gun crime reduction task forces and form coalitions with other agencies, community groups, and citizens committed to reducing gun crime. Between 2001 and 2009, when data was collected on the program, cities that were first to implement the program achieved a significant decline in violent crime.

We need to fund this program. The data and the statistics that were collected that show this is a proven solution we ignore at our peril. Administration. Despite the high rates of success for cities that have implemented the program, funding for the program has steadily decreased.

My amendment to increase funding for Project Safe Neighborhoods is fully offset by a reduction to the General Administration account at the Department of Justice.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to take a moment to say to my friend that my prayers and my thoughts are with him, his family, his constituents, Texas, Florida, the Caribbean, South Carolina, my birthplace of Puerto Rico, and all the other folks who have been through this very difficult time.

I intend to use my vote on appropriations in whatever way it can to serve to help those folks get back on the road to recovery.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the en bloc amendment. It is made up of noncontroversial items that we have worked out with the minority, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. Lipinski. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my two amendments included in the en bloc package being considered for Division C of H.R. 3354. I want to thank Chairman CULBERSON and Ranking Member SERRANO for their leadership on this division, and for including these amendments in the package.

These bipartisan amendments, cosponsored by me and my friend Mr. LOBIONDO of New Jersey, protect critical functions at the National Weather Service. The Weather Service is essential to so much of what we do. From its critical functions like helping us predict, prepare for, and respond to extreme weather events to its everyday functions like telling us whether or not to carry an umbrella, life without up-to-date weather information is hard to imagine.

My first amendment (No. 89) directs the National Weather Service not to cut $1.2 million from the Climate Prediction Center. One of its National Centers for Environmental Protection. The Service is further directed not to consolidate the functions of the Climate Prediction Center and the Weather Prediction Center. Keeping these functions recognizes the essential and very different services each one provides. The medium- and long-term predictions offered by the Climate Prediction Center are used for planning by diverse industries including transportation, agriculture, and public health. Global datasets are used by the Department of Defense and the U.S. Agency for International Development to understand international phenomena like flood and drought that could impact food supplies and regional stability.

My second amendment (No. 88) directs the National Weather Service not to cut $10.1 million from its budget for Information Technology Officers, and to maintain an on-site IT Officer at each Weather Forecast Office. These officers do software maintenance, technical support, and disaster recovery. The IT officers are trained, experienced meteorologists who can augment the forecasting staff during extreme weather.

While all of my colleagues can agree that supporting the National Weather Service is more important now than ever and I urge support for these amendments and for the en bloc package.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Minority Business Development Agency, the MBDA. My amendment, number 84, which is included in the en bloc amendment, would increase funding for the MBDA by $5 million in Fiscal Year 2018.

With three MBDA Business Centers in Florida and being one in my district, we in Florida understand the value the MBDA provides. In 2012, Florida had the third highest number of minority-owned businesses in the country, with a high concentration of: African American-owned firms; Native American-owned firms; Asian American-owned firms; Hispanic American-owned firms; and Native Hawaiian & Pacific Islander-owned firms. All of us respect the assistance of the MBDA.

For 48 years, the MBDA has been the only government agency focused solely on fostering the growth and development of minority-owned businesses; identifying and working to overcome the barriers to economic growth.

According to the 2007 U.S. Census Bureau’s Survey on Business Owners, minority-owned businesses contributed $1 trillion in economic growth, the $16 trillion U.S. economy, and employed 6 million Americans. Additionally, minority-owned businesses are twice as likely to generate sales through exports, compared to non-minority owned firms, due to their language and cultural ties.

While their economic contributions are significant, minority-owned businesses struggle in accessing private capital and securing government contracts at disproportionate rates, compared to non-minority owned businesses.
Studies have also shown that minority loan-seekers are given less information on loan terms and offered less help with their loan applications. They are also denied loans at three times higher than non-minority firms.

The MBDA assists minority-owned businesses in: financing, joint ventures, and more. Firms assisted by MBDA receive an average of $5.4 billion dollars in contracts and investments. Given this significant contribution to the U.S. economy, it is vital to support the work done by the MBDA to grow our nation’s 8.5 million minority-owned businesses.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) and a Democratic member of the Appropriations Committee, the COPS program is funded in conference. The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 83 printed in House Report 115–297. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 85 printed in House Report 115–297.

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment. The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 258, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $5,000,000)”.

Page 258, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $5,000,000)”.

Page 259, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $5,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California. Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my amendment to this appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, since I have been in Congress, I have been working with manufacturers in my congressional district to ensure that we are doing all we can in Congress to support them in creating good-paying, high-skilled jobs right here at home.

Last month, I took a “Made in the 35th” tour and traveled across my district, meeting with manufacturers who are creating jobs here in the U.S. They told me about how they are competing with importers from Asia and an unfair playing field created by how our trading partners support their manufacturers.

I continued my tour to the Port of Los Angeles, where it became clearer where this unfair playing field has left us. Ships from Asia come in full and leave empty.

Mr. Chairman, the ships that leave Los Angeles should be full of American-made goods. This is the goal of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, or MEP: supporting American businesses through expanding markets and supporting innovation.

Two of the nine MEP success stories in California have happened in my congressional district. Insulfoam in Chino used the MEP to increase production by 20 percent, while reducing their energy costs by more than 5 percent.
Mr. Chairman, this amendment is common sense. For every dollar of MEP investment, we can generate nearly $20 million in new sales growth and $20 in new client investment. That is a $100 million return on my amendment. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment because that investment could end up in one of our communities.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the congresswoman from Connecticut (Ms. Esty).

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to increase funding for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, the MEP program. This amendment would restore $5 million to MEP, which has helped U.S. manufacturers create and retain good jobs in Connecticut and in every State in the country over nearly 30 years. Connecticut’s MEP, the Connecticut State Technical Extension Program, or CONNSTEP, works with facilities in Connecticut advising them on ways to grow their businesses. And thanks to partnerships with CONNSTEP, in my district alone, Metalicon in Thomaston has increased new sales by nearly a half a million dollars, Metallurgical Processing in New Britain increased production by 20 percent, and RTR Technologies in Canaan increased sales by $5 million.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reserve funding to MEP by $5 million, because passing a budget that grows the economy and retains and brings good jobs to our communities is exactly what we were sent to Washington, D.C., to do.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support Representative TORRES’ amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the balance of my time in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have a particular objection to the amendment other than I am concerned about the offset. We need to make sure the Department of Justice has all the resources they need in order to protect this country. I am concerned about taking it out of General Administration. However, I am prepared to let the amendment go.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, and I commend the authors for offering it. This effective program funds a series of centers that help small- and medium-sized manufacturers to develop new products, attract new customers, and reduce production costs. Because this bill received an inadequate allocation, the chairman was forced to partially agree with the President’s efforts to undermine our manufacturing sector, and the bill currently contains a cut of $30 million from the MEP program. This amendment provides an important downpayment in restoring funding for this important program. We will have to do better down the line, but this is a good start.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to support the amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Chairman, this is a $5 million investment for manufacturers in the U.S., and I strongly ask for the support of my colleagues in passing this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. Torres).

The question was taken, and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read the text of the amendment as follows:

Page 360, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $10,000,000) (reduced by $8,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from West Virginia (Ms. ROSEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Environmental Security Computing Center within NOAA—the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—utilizes high-performance computing technology to quickly process information and to predict the path of a hurricane or the extent of damage a wildfire can create. As recent events have shown, weather events can have a devastating impact on the lives of our fellow Americans. In late July, northern West Virginia experienced unexpected flooding that placed eight counties under a state of emergency. Nearly 1,000 homes and businesses were damaged or destroyed, and, tragically, two individuals lost their lives. This was an unexpected flow of water.

Recently, Hurricanes Harvey and Irma have destroyed thousands of homes and communities, which will require a massive influx of Federal resources to rebuild. This Congress has the responsibility to ensure the accuracy and viability of the weather and climate monitoring work performed by the security center.

One of the most important systems NOAA uses to process this data is its high-performance computing assets, such as NOAA’s Environmental Security Computing Center. My amendment provides funding to complete the build-out for that facility that NOAA has initiated. Completing the build-out will support the supercomputer systems that NOAA uses to process and report this important and critical weather model data.

What we are witnessing during this hurricane season, Mr. Chairman, demonstrates just how important passage of this amendment is to our Nation, and we are going to have reliable information provided to us. So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. McKinley).

The amendment was agreed to.

Amendment No. 94 offered by Ms. Rosen. The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 94 printed in House Report 115–297.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 264, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $18,000,000)”.

Page 344, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $18,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to increase funding for the National Science Foundation’s Computer and Information Science and Engineering research directorate, commonly known as CISE. CISE supports research in computing, communications, information systems, and cybersecurity. Through their NSF-supported work, our Nation’s scientists have been able to develop innovative solutions to energy,
advanced manufacturing, national security, healthcare, and personal communications.

CISE also provides advanced cyber infrastructure for all areas of science and engineering, and it contributes to the education and training of computer engineers. Our nation’s future depends on having a workforce that is well equipped with the skills they need in an increasingly competitive global market.

In Nevada and across the country, we are continuing to see a huge demand for workers in the tech industry, including software developers, analysts, engineers, and computer programmers like myself. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the computing industry’s rate of job creation in the U.S. is now three times the national average. In order for our workforce to continue to push the boundaries, we must invest in research and training programs at NSF.

CISE is particularly important because it provides funding for cutting-edge computing and information science research, which is critical to innovation in nearly all lines of work from business to government.

Simply put, the 21st century runs on constantly evolving technologies. As one of the few women in Congress to build her career in STEM, I know all too well the demand for talent in STEM is real, and we must make smart investments now.

Current CISE projects across the country include developing unmanned aerial systems technology to help reduce wildfires, creating new clinical modeling techniques to use electronic health records for personalized patient care, and strengthening our cyber infrastructure.

In my district, the University of Nevada, Las Vegas is using CISE funding for several groundbreaking initiatives. One of their projects focuses on increasing the graduation of students with disabilities in computer science courses by creating accessible tools and curricula, preparing professors for diverse students.

UNLV is also partnering with the local Clark County School District to mentor high school teachers on computer science, cybersecurity, and big data.

Mr. Chairman, this current bill maintains fiscal year 2017 level funding for NSF and related activities, which CISE is funded through. That is admirable, given the fact that President Trump’s proposed budget slashed NSF research. Maintaining level funding shows shared, bipartisan support for scientific research right here in Congress.

I thank the majority and the subcommittee chairman for recognizing the importance of supporting computer and information science. However, even with this funding level, according to agency leadership, the NSF has had to deny over $2 billion worth of excellent proposals every year, indicating the fact that it is underfunded.

If we are going to be serious about competing in the economy of tomorrow and the economy of today, then we must continue funding programs that help our country to remain the global leader in innovation, productivity, economic growth, and provide good-paying jobs for the future.

My amendment would increase funding to CISE by 2 percent, allowing it to keep up with year-over-year inflation and fund the same number of grants as previous years. This level funding in real dollars can do to remain globally competitive in computer science and engineering.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting “yes” for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, we have, as you know, an extremely difficult budget year. Our constituent’s hard-earned tax dollars are being stretched farther and thinner than ever, particularly in light of the disasters that struck Texas and southwest Louisiana this year.

We have, in our Commerce, Justice, Science bill, protected America’s investment and basic research through the National Science Foundation and its main grant account, the Research and Related Activities account. We have funded the Research and Related Activities account at $672 million this year. We recognize that America’s leadership in the world is grounded, in large part, on the innovations and discoveries that are made by unrestrained scientific research.

I am a very strong supporter of the National Science Foundation’s scientific research. And while we would like to see higher levels of funding for the National Science Foundation for NASA, we have funded the Research and Related Activities account at $672 million this year, until the Congress comes to an overall budget agreement.

Mr. Chairman, we simply do not have additional funds, and we must live within our means.

The proposed offset that is offered by this amendment would seriously hinder program and financial oversight over the Department of Commerce and could result in professionals being let go.

Further, with respect to the gentleman’s statement, I believe it is important that we defer to the National Science Foundation to distribute any additional funds according to the highest priority needs identified by the scientific community and not designate them for a specific directorate.

Should the gentleman’s amendment pass, the funds will be added to the budget account for the National Science Foundation’s research and related activities account, in general. It will then be up to NSF to determine how those additional funds are spent according to the needs of the scientific community, that the offset is very damaging to the Department of Commerce and the important work they do, in fact, the constitutionally mandated work that they do, to provide for the decennial census of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN). The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 105 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 101 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 277, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $10,000,000)”.

Page 328, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by $10,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in support of our bipartisan amendment, which would increase Legal Services funding by $10 million. I am willing to withdraw this amendment after my colleagues and I take a brief moment to speak about Legal Services. I know that the chair and the ranking member support Legal Services and may be able to help, but at some time in the future.

Our justice system is the envy of the world. Whenever we travel, people say what they really respect about America is the rule of law and our justice system, but it takes professional help to help them. They need help. If they don’t have legal training—they are not going to be able to successfully compete against a private attorney on the other side. They need help. If they don’t have that help, the justice system is not fair.

Legal Services helps ensure equal justice under the law. It helps all kind of folks: military families, homeowners and renters, families with children, the disabled, and the elderly.

It is vital all over the country, but in places like Houston, residents struggle from Hurricane Harvey. Lone Star Legal Aid, which is partially funded by Legal Services, is helping people navigate the legal hurdles when people need them most so that they can get their lives back.

Mr. KENNEDY has been a strong supporter of this. He was supposed to be here today, but I think he has been delayed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).
Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, every year for 42 years, Congress has funded the Legal Services Corporation so that low-income Americans might realize our country’s solemn pledge of justice for all. For military families, homeowners and renters, families with children, the elderly, and nearly 112,000 veterans, investment in civil legal aid is one of the most effective ways to help Americans navigate the justice system.

The Legal Services Corporation allows all Americans to safeguard their basic legal rights at a minimal cost to the Federal Government. As the late Justice Antonin Scalia emphasized in 2014: “. . . this organization pursues the most fundamental of American ideals, and it pursues equal justice in those areas of life most important to the lives of our citizens.”

This organization provides direct grants to legal aid providers across our Nation, including eight organizations in my home State of Pennsylvania. I am proud to support the Legal Services Corporation, which allows people access to justice even when they cannot afford representation. We must continue this program.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his help.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services.

Mr. SERRANO has helped me on other amendments as well as this one.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I feel comfortable with Mr. COHEN withdrawing his amendment because I know the chairman, Mr. CULBERSON, is very supportive of this program.

It is interesting to note that this program was born in a bipartisan fashion, with the late Senator Bill Bradley and an advocate to that time, being the main supporter of it.

The bill only provides $300 million for Legal Services, which is a cut of $85 million from fiscal year 2017. This amendment provides a downpayment towards restoring these cuts, and I commend the authors for offering it.

We should not be cutting LSC funding at a time when more people than ever qualify for these services. Legal aid providers always must turn away more than half of eligible applicants. They are doing that, and these cuts would only create a bigger problem.

Very briefly, in closing, there are a lot of issues that we can discuss that make America great. One of them is the right to legal representation. If you can’t afford it, then this is where programs like Legal Services come in and support.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), my good friend and colleague.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman from Tennessee’s amendment.

As a democracy founded on the belief in the rule of law, I am a proud co-chair of the House Access to Civil Legal Services Caucus with my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

I believe we have an obligation to ensure that all Americans have access to legal representation in order to uphold the values upon which our Nation was founded: equality and justice under our laws. This amendment will ensure that Legal Services Corporation can continue supporting those values by providing legal support to the millions of Americans who would otherwise go without it whenever they might face serious legal challenges.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman withdrawing his amendment. I must ensure they have the funds that they need to do their vital work to defend abused women, veterans, and members of the military who need assistance. They do important work. As soon as we find some extra room, I will work with you in conference to find them some extra support.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. CULBERSON for his help, and Mrs. BROOKS for her leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and I withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows: Page 231, line 11, insert “(reduced by $61,688,800)” after the dollar amount.

Page 237, line 16, insert “(increased by $61,688,800)” after the dollar amount.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3554.

Since we last met, we began spending, I guess, a new $15 billion on the tragedies in Florida and Texas. I haven’t had a chance to see how all of my colleagues are doing, but I sure hope that we are getting nothing but amendments designed to reduce spending to make up for the difference. I hope that is so.

I am looking at the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. I am on the Government Oversight Committee. We recently had another hearing on Fast and Furious. I don’t think there has been enough consternation there at all. This was, I think probably the biggest scandal in my lifetime, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives has to consider themselves to be a big part of that scandal.

Being from Wisconsin, I am also familiar with a local scandal we had there. If you google “ATF” and “Milwaukee,” you will find a situation in which they were selling guns which they shouldn’t have been selling and then they were selling guns which they shouldn’t have been buying. So there is another reason why we should look at the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives.

Despite these scandals, their funding has risen but up over the last few years. We are, in this budget, looking to borrow between 13 to 14 percent of this budget, and that is before we begin to have to spend money on the Florida and Texas hurricanes.

I am introducing a bill which is an $5 million. I think that is very appropriate given that we are borrowing 14 percent of our money. In the same world, we would almost take every agency down 14 percent. We don’t have time for that, but this agency, based on their behavior, seems in favor of that.

I know some people are going to probably not want to cut anything here. We just heard in the last amendment that it appears like some people want to go up, I think this is a modest decrease, and I think they should have to program finding this small amount of money.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment, remembering that, first and foremost, the appropriations amendment being considered by the United States represents only 30 cents out of every dollar spent by the Federal Government.
I am keenly aware of how precious and hard-earned and scarce every dollar earned by our constituents is. We need to focus on the 70 percent: the automatic pilot programs, the looming insolvency of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. That is how we can really keep our balanced budget.

We have done our part on the Appropriations Committee to bring down annual spending every year, and the ATF, in particular, plays an important role in protecting America’s Second Amendment rights. You must remember that the ATF is now under the direction of Attorney General Jeff Sessions, who shares with us a passion for protecting Americans’ Second Amendment rights.

This amendment would cause serious damage to ATF’s ability to end the backlogs. The ATF would not be able to speed up the processing of the National Firearms Act applications. The ATF would not be able to beef up the National Ballistic Information Network, which is so vital to help police officers identify the source of the bullet used in a crime.

This amendment would injure an agency that is doing good work today under the leadership of Attorney General Jeff Sessions to protect our Second Amendment rights. Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to oppose it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), my colleague, the ranking member on the Commerce-Justice-Science Subcommittee.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This reduction would have a significant impact on public safety. The ATF would be investigating fewer firearm traffickers and violent gangs. They would be unable to respond effectively to theft burglaries from Federal firearms businesses. These cuts would weaken the ATF’s ability to do its primary responsibilities: combat violent crime and regulate the firearms and explosive industries.

Not surprisingly, a reduction of this magnitude would result in approximately 400 employees being laid off. According to the ATF, that means they would have to eliminate approximately 200 special agents, 65 industry operations investigators, and 135 professional technical positions. The elimination of these positions at ATF directly degrades the Department’s capacity to combat violent firearm crimes and regulate the firearms and explosives industries.

I just think that this is not a proper amendment at this time or, for that matter, at any time, and I join the chairman in agreeing on this.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am going to disagree a little bit with one of the previous statements.

We have heard the statement made, sometimes behind closed doors by a lot of people, and that is we have an increase of discretionary spending over the last 3 years. This is a mild cut this year, but over the last 3 years, collectively, it is an increase, 3 or 4 years.

There are some people who feel that we shouldn’t scrutinize that spending because so much of our budget is mandatory spending. I do feel that we need a larger mandatory spending than the rather modest cut that came out of the Budget Committee, and I hope everybody in our Conference will demand a more significant cut in mandatory spending.

But, nevertheless, discretionary spending is 30 percent of the budget. Common sense will tell you that, as things become more technology oriented, it should be easier for an agency that possesses data, like the ATF, to do their business with a little bit less money.

And one more time I will emphasize that there haven’t been cuts to reflect these scandals in the ATF, and I think that, if we are kind of slap them on the wrist now, when will we?

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to oppose this amendment.

ATF is doing a good job of protecting our Second Amendment rights, and this amendment would injure them severely.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

☐ 1500 AMENDMENT NO. 106 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 106 printed in Volume 115-297.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 281, line 17, strike "none of the" and insert "such".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, as mentioned, this amendment was actually drafted by Representative BUCK from Colorado. I understand this amendment passed on a voice vote last time.

I do have a nice speech that Representative BUCK’s office has prepared for me, but I am not going to read a speech that is not my speech. I am sure it is a wonderful speech.

I hope the chairman allows this amendment.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this very misguided amendment. The amendment would allow felons and other dangerous individuals to try to regain the ability to own guns by sending an application to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives.

I am not sure why the Member would offer an amendment that makes it easier for felons to get guns. Most Americans would be shocked by such a proposal. Each year since 1993, Congress has prohibited ATF from processing applications from felons seeking to have their gun rights restored, and with good reason.

Prior to 1993, there were numerous examples of felons who had their gun rights restored by ATF only to go on to commit further crimes later. For example, in 1977, Michael Paul Dahnt of Wisconsin was convicted of burglary. In 1986, he was granted relief and allowed to own firearms. Two months later, he was rearrested and charged with first degree sexual assault and four counts of second degree sexual assault, for which he received 5 years in prison.

In 1977, James Morgan was convicted of perjury to a grand jury. In 1988, he was granted relief and allowed to own firearms. He was arrested that same year for first degree wanton endangerment and was sentenced to 6 months confinement and 2 years probation.

These are only a few examples. It is important to point out that the gentleman, who has leadership of the number one, and he doesn’t know as far as the seriousness of the offense for which the individual was initially denied a firearm, and ATF would need to investigate all applications for gun rights restoration. Furthermore, simply processing the applications would require significant ATF agent resources and would divert ATF away from its core law enforcement mission of fighting firearm offenses.

Since 1998, when the National Instant Criminal Background Check System was put in use, well over 1 million firearm transfers have been denied after background checks established that the individuals attempting to purchase the firearms were prohibited from processing firearms.

Even if only 20 percent of the denied individuals file an application with the ATF to have their gun rights restored, this would require the processing of hundreds of full-time ATF agents to perform background checks of these individuals. The agents would be diverted...
from their primary law enforcement investigation.

Even though ATF is legally required to ensure that the applicant "will not be likely to act in a manner dangerous to public safety," we know that this process is not perfect, as evidenced by the examples I just gave.

The bottom line is that this amendment would give guns back to felons and, at the same time, sharply reduce ATF's resources for pursuing violent crime investigations. Both of these outcomes would seriously harm public safety, and for these reasons, I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chair, I thank the Chairman for the opportunity to speak about my amendment to the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Division of H.R. 3354.

Mr. Chair, the right to bear arms is ingrained in our nation's founding. These rights are given to us by God and guaranteed by the Constitution.

But for many Americans, this right has been forfeited. And their only option for recourse has been taken away.

When I was District Attorney in Northern Colorado I met a man who told me that when he was in college he bounced a check to his landlord. He pleaded guilty to a felony.

Since that day, he has been a model citizen. He finished college. He worked hard and raised a family.

This man made a mistake that is still haunting him nearly 40 years later. He wants to take his grandchildren hunting. But he can't possess a firearm because he made a mistake in his youth.

The worst part of this situation is that the law allows the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives to consider petitions to restore this man's right to possess a firearm.

However, for 25 years, the underlying bill has included a provision authored by then-Rep. GROTHMAN prohibiting ATF from processing these applications.

America is a land of second chances. We restore civil rights for those who have made mistakes in their past, including the right to vote in many states. We help our neighbors find employment after incarceration.

Why should non-violent individuals who made a mistake in their past be prohibited from having their case heard?

This amendment simply seeks to remove a 25-year-old ban on the ATF's legal function to hear petitions from non-violent individuals like the man mentioned earlier.

To be clear, my amendment would not act as a rubber stamp on every application. The ATF must weigh the merits of each individual case.

Why should non-violent individuals who made a mistake in their past be prohibited from having their case heard?

This amendment simply seeks to remove a 25-year-old ban on the ATF's legal function to hear petitions from non-violent individuals like the man mentioned earlier.

To be clear, my amendment would not act as a rubber stamp on every application. The ATF must weigh the merits of each individual case.

The burden is on the applicant to prove that he or she is nonviolent and does not pose a threat to the community.

Any American who can prove to ATF they do not pose a danger to society should be allowed to state their case. They should be allowed to advocate for their rights.

It is about time that we give these individuals that opportunity again.

Mr. Chair, my amendment is simple. It would give nonviolent individuals who made a mistake in their past the opportunity for a second chance.

It would allow a grandfather the opportunity to take his grandchildren hunting and provide a way for a mother to protect her home.

To be clear, this amendment does not guarantee that an individual will have their rights restored. But it does give them hope, a chance to once again possess their Second Amendment rights.

After all, America is the land of second chances.

I thank the Chairman and urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 108 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 108 printed in House Report 115–297.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, as the designer of the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 282, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $10,000,000)".

Page 291, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $20,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the text of the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment that Ms. JACKSON LEE has designated the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 282, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $10,000,000)".

Page 291, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $10,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment was agreed to.

There are a lot of conservative coalitions, like FreedomWorks, American Conservative Union Foundation, and Taxpayers Protection Alliance that agree that mass incarceration is extremely costly to taxpayers.

Our Federal prisons are presently funded $7 billion for administration, operations, and maintenance. Twenty million dollars of that is made up for contract confinement.

This amendment would reduce the account by $10 million and put it into juvenile justice programs that would reduce recidivism, gang violence, and gun crime.

These juvenile justice programs that would get the benefit of this money would protect our most vulnerable children through treatment and mentoring programs. According to the Justice Policy Institute, locking up juveniles costs an average of $407 a day and $148,000 per person per year.

There is a lot of conservative coalition that these programs are successful, they are effective, but the Department of Justice is not even finished awarding the grants from fiscal year 2017, and this program is very healthy.

This program would also, Mr. Chairman, eliminate a longstanding authority the Bureau of Prisons has had for...
Mr. CULBERSON. I urge Members to vote “no” on this amendment.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, I understand Mr. Culberson’s position and look forward to his help with legal services that will help juveniles, too.

Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment to offer. It is H. Amendment No. 109 offered by Mr. Pascrell. The amendment is as follows:

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the COPS Hiring Program, 50 percent is distributed to the states while 50 percent is distributed to the jurisdictions.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 109 OFFERED BY MR. PASCRELL

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the COPS Hiring Program, 50 percent is distributed to the states while 50 percent is distributed to the jurisdictions.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time, and I withdraw the amendment.

For example, Cure Violence, a health-based organization that operates in, several cities and states, has shown great success in the intervention and prevention of violence in places like, Chicago, Baltimore, New York, Philadelphia and others. They have also shown great success in Puerto Rico. Statistics show that 80 percent of homicide in Chicago, and a 41–73% drop in shootings in 5 of 8 communities; in Baltimore, up to 56% drop in killings; and 44% drop in shootings; in New York, 20% lower level of shootings; and in Philadelphia, reduction of shootings by 28%. The reduction is significantly larger than any reduction compared to non-program police districts.

Unlike incarceration cost of $407.58 per person per day and $148,767 per person per year, these alternative measures cost significantly less to serve a much larger population than what it cost to incarcerate one person, while reducing shootings and killings by 50–70% in 15 of the most highly impacted large cities in the U.S. Hence, programs such as Cure Violence, Safe Streets and others show that alternative methods to incarceration are effective.

Both sides of the aisle agree that our juvenile justice system is in desperate need of repair. Incarceration at alarming numbers does not solve this problem.

Statistics show that incarceration does not serve as deterrence, nor does it keep our communities safe. Rather, it increases the likelihood for recidivism and thus, increases crime rates and mass incarceration.

For those who say juvenile justice is a state problem and not a federal problem because we don’t have many youths in federal custody, I say even if there is but one juvenile in our prison system, we have one too many.

I saw many young faces during the horrific tragedy in Houston’s vicious storm that claimed so many lives.

I do not ever want to see that look of despair and hopelessness again if we can do something to prevent that.

While some may say that juvenile justice is already funded, it is not enough. We need to invest more in the protection of our juvenile justice system and the crisis that follows thereafter—economic hardships, lack of education and inadequate job training.

For all the reasons stated above, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time, and I withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 109 OFFERED BY MR. PASCRELL

The Acting CHAIR. It is in order to consider amendment No. 109 printed in House Report 115–297.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 291, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $100,000,000) (increased by $100,000,000).”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the COPS Hiring Program, 50 percent is distributed to the states while 50 percent is distributed to the jurisdictions.

Mr. Chair, I include these letters in the RECORD.
NAPO urges you to support this amendment and ensure that the COPS Hiring Program remains strong and robust.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM J. JOHNSON, Esq., Executive Director.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL OргANIZATIONS, INC.,

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN O. MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. STENTY H. HOYER,
Minority Whip, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEar Mr. Speaker and Representatives

MCCARTHY, PELOSI AND HOYER: I am writing on behalf of the National Fraternal Order of Police, I appreciate your considerations for the hiring program administered by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) at the U.S. Department of Justice.

Martha in funding for the Community Oriented Policing Strategy for nearly 25 years and the hiring program is the reason this strategy works.

However, today, we have less police on our streets and neighborhoods than we did even a decade ago, making the community policing strategy very difficult to pursue. It is no surprise to our profession that crime, particularly violent crime, is on the rise. There are less men and women policing our streets, keeping the peace and interacting positively with the communities they protect. If we are serious about stemming the rise in crime and if we want to give our communities a sustainable policing strategy, then we must continue to fund the COPS hiring program.

It is for these reasons we urge you and all Members of Congress to support the Reichert-Pascarella amendment providing resources to the COPS hiring program.

On behalf of more than 390,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I appreciate you considering our views on this important issue. If you need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me or my Senior Advisor Jim Pasco in my Washington office.

Sincerely,
CHUCK CANTERBURY,
National President.

Mr. PASCARELL. Hiding behind pro-
cedural shenanigans to dodge support for our Nation’s law enforcement of-
cers and then pontificating when you come to the floor, that doesn’t settle right with me or a lot of other people.

You have done it year after year. You are not going to do it this year? I am sorry. You can’t have your cake and eat it.

I want to say this in closing. I want all of my colleagues to reflect on how, on the one hand, you can claim support for law enforcement while, at the same time, cutting the resources you need to hire brave men and women who keep the neighborhood safe. I do not know the answer to that question, but I do know that, during this year’s National Police Week, I was honored to honor the brave men and women who lost their lives while serving in the line of duty, my friend and the chairman of the subcommittee—and I consider him a friend—stood on the House floor and said:

As the chairman of the Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Subcommittee, it is and continues to be my top priority to ensure that our law enforcement officers have the resources that they need.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of Mr. PASCARELL’s amendment to increase grant funding. The COPS program works. These resources have saved the lives of police officers and the citizenry they are tasked with protecting.

These funds often bridge the gap between the policing services a community requires and the capabilities of its existing force. These funds are merit based, prioritizing hiring and equipment where they are most needed and for the best use of the taxpayers' public. In these challenging times for law enforcement, I believe we need to keep this program operational for our Nation’s crime challenges.

Earlier today, we discussed legislation critical to the health and safety of our Nation’s firefighters, and now we consider this important priority for our Nation’s police officers.

I commend Mr. PASCARELL and Mr. REICHERT for their leadership in the Law Enforcement Caucus. I am proud to be a member of the caucus, and I join in their efforts to provide continued support for COPS funding and for expanding the capabilities of law enforcement to do their jobs and protect the public and themselves, which is critical to every officer in the Nation.

The Acting CHAIR, Mr. chairman of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I have no objection to this amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chair, I share my colleagues’ support for law enforcement and have no objection to this amendment; and I will work with the gentlemen to ensure that the COPS program is funded when we get to conference, we have a budget agreement across the Congress, and additional funds are made available. The COPS program is an essential one that will be at the top of the list.

My support for law enforcement is reflected in the $100 million increase seen in the Byrne JAG Program, which is a
very flexible grant program for local law enforcement to use for a variety of reasons, including hiring police officers, forensic science work, and eliminating the backlog of rape kits, which is so important to getting dangerous criminals off the streets.

The Byrne JAG Grant Program is one that is increasingly popular and successful among the men and women of law enforcement, and that is why we have increased it by $100 million in this year's Commerce, Justice, Science bill to keep the men and women of America safe, to support our law enforcement officers of whom we could not be prouder.

We are immensely grateful for the work of our first responders and law enforcement. The people of Houston, the people of southwest Louisiana, the people of Florida have all relied on them in this time of crisis with these terrible floods in Houston, the hurricane in Florida. I don't know what we would do without our first responders and men and women in uniform in the law enforcement community protecting us every day.

Mr. Chair, I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Pascrell).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 112 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 112 printed in House Report 115–297.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 314, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "appropriated by $30,200,000" (increased by $30,200,000)².

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Smith) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Smith).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill and endorse division C, the CJS appropriations bill developed by Chairman CULBERTSON. The appropriations included in division C implement the Science Committee's authorizations that have been enacted into law or passed by the House.

I offer an amendment today to simply increase physical and biological sciences research by one-half of 1 percent, or $30.2 million, over the current funding within the $6 billion National Science Foundation research account. Total spending is not increased, as NSF will adjust other areas of spending accordingly.

I ask the chairman and members to support the amendment and endorse this increase for the basic research that produces the scientific breakthroughs that fuel technological innovation, new industries, economic growth, and good jobs.

I yield to the chairman, Chairman CULBERTSON, for his support of this amendment.

Mr. CULBERTSON. Chairman SMITH, I support your amendment to increase the physical and biological sciences and will fight for it in conference.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman CULBERTSON for his support and every much appreciate his help along the way.

On a separate matter, can the chairman assure me that the funding in the bill is fully consistent with the Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act enacted into law earlier this year?

Mr. CULBERTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERTSON).

Mr. CULBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I can. It is fully consistent with the authorization.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee, for his support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Smith).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 113 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 113 printed in House Report 115–297.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Pascrell). The amendment was agreed to.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 346, strike line 18 and all that follows through line 2 on page 347.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Scott) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Scott).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DeLauro), and I have an amendment at the desk, No. 113.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 346, strike line 18 and all that follows through line 2 on page 347.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, every one here appreciates concerns about the ways of discrimination. The question is how to collect the data in an efficient way, and the new EEOC–1 form is certainly not the way to collect that data.

What do I mean by that, Mr. Chairman?

You have to compare apples to apples and oranges to oranges. It is not like we don't collect data already. We have 140 different data points on the EEOC–1 form. This would increase the number of data points to 3,306 that an employer potentially would have to report.

Mr. Chairman, if we had better data, that is all right, but let's take a specific example: a large hospital. The new form groups all professionals together. A hospital would have to report what it pays its professionals in the same category, what it pays its female professionals and its male professionals. But, Mr. Chair, it includes nurses and surgeons in the same category. They are all professionals. In fact, in the United States, for instance, among registered nurses, we have about 3 million—89 percent—are females.

Now, in the United States, we have an estimated number of physicians and surgeons of about 900,000; 65 percent are males, only 35 percent females. They are all grouped in the same category for the EEOC–1 form. So what would the result be? If you were in a hospital and you had nurses and you had employees, it would look like you were discriminating against women because the nurses get paid less, and your average salary is going to be lower for your women because you have grouped surgeons in with nurses. Only a Federal Government bureaucrat could come up with an idea like that in order to gauge whether wage discrimination occurs.

The fact of the matter is even worse, Mr. Chairman, because, based on the reporting of these results, EEOC can go on a fishing expedition against the race, sex, and ethnicity of those employed, but we do not have the pay data, and the pay data would expose the pay disparities where all the women are paid less than men. You don't find that on the present EEOC–1 form.

Recently, the OMB, without warning or transparency, rescinded the EEOC's plan to collect the data, which was to begin in March. This amendment would make it clear that Congress should honor the purpose and spirit of title VII and permit the EEOC to carry out its statutory obligation to collect necessary data needed to enforce civil rights laws.

Mr. Chair, I would hope that we would adopt this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, everyone here appreciates concerns about the ways of discrimination. The question is how to collect the data in an efficient way, and the new EEOC–1 form is certainly not the way to collect that data.

What do I mean by that, Mr. Chairman?

You have to compare apples to apples and oranges to oranges. It is not like we don't collect data already. We have 140 different data points on the EEOC–1 form. This would increase the number of data points to 3,306 that an employer potentially would have to report.

Mr. Chairman, if we had better data, that is all right, but let's take a specific example: a large hospital. The new form groups all professionals together. A hospital would have to report what it pays its professionals in the same category, what it pays its female professionals and its male professionals. But, Mr. Chair, it includes nurses and surgeons in the same category. They are all professionals. In fact, in the United States, for instance, among registered nurses, we have about 3 million—89 percent—are females.

Now, in the United States, we have an estimated number of physicians and surgeons of about 900,000; 65 percent are males, only 35 percent females. They are all grouped in the same category for the EEOC–1 form. So what would the result be? If you were in a hospital and you had nurses and you had employees, it would look like you were discriminating against women because the nurses get paid less, and your average salary is going to be lower for your women because you have grouped surgeons in with nurses. Only a Federal Government bureaucrat could come up with an idea like that in order to gauge whether wage discrimination occurs.

The fact of the matter is even worse, Mr. Chairman, because, based on the reporting of these results, EEOC can go on a fishing expedition against...
Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Culberson), chairman of the subcommittee, and I want to thank the chairman for attaching this section to the bill. It is an important section for our employers.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Harris) in opposing this amendment because the EEOC, under the previous administration, has created this monstrosity of a burden on small businesses, and they did such a poor job of it that the Office of Management and Budget actually put the requirement under review and suspended it.

Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment. I join the gentleman in seeking to go after employers that they want government because, again, they use this tool with which to investigate and protecting people from discrimination where they actually already have a real complaint, not looking for needles in haystacks.

Mr. Chair, I urge Members to join us in opposing this amendment, and I recommend a “no” vote.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. Frankel).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chair, thank the gentleman from New York for his remarks. No one is naive enough to think that discrimination doesn’t exist. The question is: What tools should the Federal Government use?

And this certainly is not the tool that is helpful. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the form is not a complaint. We know that there are pay disparities. This would allow the EEOC to notice gruesome problems and disparities and address them where appropriate.

In that hospital situation, it is obvious the situation is not appropriate, but we do know that pay disparities exist, and this would be information that would allow the EEOC to address them.

I would hope that we would allow the EEOC to do its job.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chair, I agree with the gentleman. Pay disparities exist, but we need a precise tool. If we are going to give the Federal Government a tool with which to investigate and punish employers, it should be a surgical tool. This is not a surgical tool. This is an imprecise tool.

The EEOC, again, Mr. Chair, has 3,360 data points. It groups high-wage professionals with low-wage professionals, and has nothing to do with discrimination. It is an imprecise tool. We should retain the language in the bill.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The question was taken; and the Acting CHAIR announced that the nays appeared to have it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 114 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 115 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 115 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title) insert the following:

Snc. . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Marine Fisheries Service to enforce Executive Order 13449 or section 697.7(b) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, in the Block Island Sound Transit Zone (as that term is defined in section 697.7(b)(3) of such title).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3354 on behalf of the hardworking fishermen of Long Island and our entire region who are suffering more than ever under confusing and unfair regulations that are threatening to put them out of business.

This amendment is nearly identical to one I offered to the DHS division of this bill that unanimously passed by voice vote last week that related to the Coast Guard.

Today’s amendment would bar the National Marine Fisheries Service from enforcing the ban on striped bass fishing in the Block Island Sound Transit Zone, a 15-mile stretch of water between Montauk Point, New York, and Block Island, Rhode Island.

No other species of fish are subject to an arbitrary ban in this section of Block Island Sound, famous for fishing and recreational boating.

The fact that the transit zone is considered a part of the EEZ means the ban on striped bass fishing extends into this local waterway. This means hardworking commercial fishermen, charter boat captains, and recreational anglers enjoying a day on the water with their family can suddenly go from fishing for striped bass legally to committing a Federal crime because they are drifted over the 3-mile line.

This ban was meant for the high seas, not a local waterway. It was arbitrarily declared to be part of the EEZ due to a boundary drawn on a map by a bureaucrat in Washington, D.C.
Every other species of fish popular in this area—scup; eel; squid; bluefish; even striped bass’ cousin, black sea bass—are not subject to an unfair ban in this area. Just like they can legally feed with proper permits and allocations in adjacent State waters, local fishermen should be able to legally fish for striped bass in this area after State waters end and the transit zone begins.

Mr. Chairman, on the East End of Long Island, the coastal economy is our economy. So when unfair regulations impact fishermen, it also hurts the other local businesses like tackle shops, restaurants, gas stations, and hotels.

No one is more invested in protecting this important fishery to ensure it is there for the next season and the next generation than the hardworking men and women from my district who rely on fishing as a way of life.

This amendment does not create open season on stripers or lift the need for quota allocations or permits. In addition to a nearly identical amendment passing on a voice vote last week, last Congress, my standalone bill to address this issue, H.R. 3070, the EEZ Clarification Act, passed the House with another voice vote.

This amendment is supported by the Recreational Fishing Alliance, the Long Island Commercial Fishing Association, and the Montauk Boatmen and Captains Association.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN). Mr. Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON). Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the gentleman’s amendment. Mr. Chair, I appreciate bringing it to our attention. I understand similar language has already passed the House. I have no objection to him, and I urge Members to support it.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I wish to speak in favor of the amendment. How much time is remaining?

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, if the gentleman had brought some cooked fish, I probably wouldn’t read this.

Mr. Chair, this is not an appropriate amendment for inclusion in an annual spending bill. Congress should not be in the business of micromanaging fish conservation in this manner.

The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission is an interstate compact that was established in 1942 as a mechanism to allow Atlantic coastal States to join forces in managing their shared fishery resources.

For over 75 years, this Commission has served as a body for the Atlantic coastal States, coordinating the conservation and management of 27 nearshore fish species. Each State is represented on the Commission by three representatives who participate in deliberations and interstate fisheries management, fisheries science, habitat conservation, and law enforcement.

Through these activities, the States collectively ensure the sound conservation of management of their shared coastal fishery resources. We should allow the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission to do its job in managing fish stocks. We must not allow the House to be in the business of second-guessing them and micromanaging fish regulations in particular locations.

There is a process currently in place for addressing these issues at the regional level, and we should allow that process to work. A stock assessment for striped bass is planned for next year. The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission can make a determination as to whether it intends to ask the Federal Government to open up the Block Island Transit Zone to striped bass fishing.

Currently, the consensus position of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission is that the fishing restrictions should remain in place. I believe that this is a bad precedent for Congress to interfere with this State-driven process.

For that reason, I oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON). Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the gentleman’s amendment. Mr. Chair, my colleague on the other side speaking in opposition actually made a great argument for exactly why the amendment needs to be passed.

I completely agree, we should not be micromanaging the local fishery. And the best way to ensure that we are not micromanaging the local fishery is to pass this amendment.

The amendment is empowering the local regional council to be able to manage the fishery. If we don’t pass the amendment, then we are micromanaging and we are taking away power from the local council managing the fishery.

So by passing this amendment, we are encouraging that regional council to manage the striped bass fishery in that area. Without passing the amendment, then we are micromanaging and we are not allowing any striped bass fishing at all.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, the hardworking men of Long Island’s East End, our entire region, and our entire country are struggling. The special interest groups, knowing nothing about the East End, may incorrectly disagree. Fish do not adhere to arbitrary man-made boundaries drawn by bureaucrats.

This amendment, by no means, removes the management of this species, including the quotas or allocations meant to protect against overfishing. Now, more than ever, we should be taking commonsense steps to help our fishermen get back to work. This simply allows for local fishermen to not be treated like criminals when they drift across an arbitrary boundary.

Mr. Chair, I encourage support from my colleagues for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN). The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands amendment No. 116 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 116 OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 117 printed in House Report 115-297.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. 3622. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out section 3622(c)(2) of title 18, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment prohibits the Federal Bureau of Prisons from using Federal funds to carry out a law that requires individuals in halfway houses or on home confinement to pay a subsistence fee.

Currently the subsistence fee for residents of halfway houses is 25 percent of income. This criminal justice reform amendment would improve re-entry and reduce recidivism among the Nation’s returning citizens.

Out of prison and almost always without a job or ability to support themselves, returning citizens have no ability to pay counterproductive subsistence fees while in halfway houses or on home confinement any more than they could have paid for their subsistence while in prison.

For the limited time individuals spend in halfway houses—up to 12 months—or on home confinement—up to 6 months—the subsistence fee requirement is a substantial burden on them and de minimis on the BOP, witness that the Congressional Budget Office concluded that this amendment would have no budgetary effect.

If returning citizens are lucky enough to find work at all, it would almost certainly be in minimum wage jobs and thus begin their paychecks to subsistence fees would be a significant hurdle to successful re-entry—which is what we are after—
making it extremely difficult to pay rent, child support, or fines and fees associated with their conviction, such as restitution.

Far from promoting financial responsibility, subsistence fees, while in custody, actually prevent returning citizens from meeting their financial obligations. Congress surely did not mean to impose additional burdens on returning citizens, setting them up to fail. Jobs and affordable housing are crucial to reentry but rare for returning citizens. Charging subsistence fees is antithetical to these goals.

The Department of Justice itself has recommended eliminating this fee. A November 2016 DOJ memorandum recommended developing a plan to limit the use of "counterproductive subsistence fees imposed on indigent residents."

It further stated:

The Bureau of Prisons' process for collecting subsistence fees is costly and administratively burdensome on both half-way houses and the Bureau. And these fees make it difficult for residents who typically earn minimum wage, if anything, to meet their other financial obligations, including restitution fines and child support. It was a step in the right direction.

My amendment would continue this trend and eliminate the fees for those in halfway houses as well. My amendment provides a critical reform that would help improve reentry and reduce recidivism.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think it is entirely appropriate to make inmates help pay for some of the cost of their time in a halfway house. This program helps make inmate reentry into the community as seamless as possible. It has been a successful one. We want to reduce obstacles to make that transition without unnecessary burdens. However, this proposal would cut the Bureau of Prisons' operations by $20 million. It would be forced to be absorbed by the Bureau of Prisons, that money that they are now receiving in reimbursement from transitioning inmates.

The Bureau of Prisons' resources are already stretched very thin. Mr. Chairman, and this money would come out of other programs such as reentry services, antirecidivism, counseling, and inmate health and safety that are needed for inmate welfare and a successful transition into society.

While I appreciate the intent of the gentlewoman's amendment, if the Bureau of Prisons were to have a cut of $30 million, then prison safety and prison services would be severely compromised, and that won't help inmates or officers.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to join me in opposing this amendment. I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, my friend suggests that the BOP actually collects this $20 million. I would submit to him and challenge him to show me that the burden of trying to collect these fees does not outweigh any actual reimbursement. These people have no jobs. If they had jobs, they would almost surely be minimum wage jobs.

I want to ask my friend if he would rather the BOP be paid the de minimis cost to the government—which they can hardly ever collect, I am almost sure— or would they rather this money go to child support, or go to pay subsistence fees?

This is a cruel burden for people getting out of prison at a time when the crime rate sends inmates back to the streets, which is the only recourse they have for gaining money.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. LATTA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 118 printed in House Report 115–297.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. 13. None of the funds made available by this Act to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives may be used to reclassify M855 ammunition as armor-piercing ammunition. The limitation described in this section shall not apply in the case of the administration of a tax or tariff.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a commonsense amendment that prevents the Federal Government from infringing on the Second Amendment rights of sportmen and sportswomen in Ohio and from around the country.

Under the Obama administration, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives—the ATF—proposed a new framework for interpreting a Gun Control Act and for determining which projectiles should qualify for the sporting purpose exemption. This framework would have created exceptions for certain 5.56-millimeter ammunition, including the M855, because the ATF felt that they should be classified as armor-piercing ammunition. The M855 is one of the most commonly used ammunitions in the United States and is widely used by target shooters and hunters. Ultimately, due to overwhelming public opposition, the ATF withdrew their proposal.

In order to guard against new attempts to ban this popular and commonly used ammunition, I am offering this amendment, which prohibits the ATF from using funds to reclassify M855 ammunition. Again, this amendment is codifying the ATF's own stance.

As a lifetime hunter and competitor at the National Rifle and Pistol Championship matches at Camp Perry in Ohio, I fully support our Second Amendment right to bear arms, and I oppose any efforts to intrude on these rights. I believe that is what the ATF attempted to do in 2015.

I also thank the gentleman from Texas for his work on this issue in the previous Congress. I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment to protect the rights of sportsmen and sportswomen.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. This amendment is very inappropriate for this bill and sets a bad precedent. We should not be tying the hands of the ATF as it attempts to keep our law enforcement officers safe.

The Law Enforcement Officers Protection Act established a process to ensure that police officers do not face a threat of armor-piercing capable of being fired from concealable semiautomatic handguns. This law passed the House of Representatives in 1985 by a vote of 400–21. Then it later passed the Senate by a vote of 97–1. Far too long we have dealt with irresponsible riders on appropriations bills that put limits on our ability to keep our communities and our law enforcement officers safe. This is just one more example.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

I may say to my colleagues that this is one of the issues that baffles me the
most. I don’t hunt, but I respect people who do. I don’t target practice and target shoot, but I respect people who do. But it seems that more and more every day, as we have more and more violence, we want more and more stronger weapons because otherwise we are going to lose our rights if we don’t do so.

Mr. Chairman, our rights are at the ballot box and many other places, not just in our holster. I think if we continue to do this, first of all, this is the wrong place to do it, and, secondly, it is the wrong thing to do.

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Culberson), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. Within 2 months of my becoming chairman of the subcommittee, the ATF did, indeed, attempt to ban this commonly used ammunition. Mr. LATTA is exactly right.

I met, at the time, with the Director of the ATF. I am grateful that the ATF without the proposed ban. The Director of the ATF, Tom Brandon, is doing a good job of protecting America’s Second Amendment rights. I want to ensure Mr. LATTA that I will continue to do this, first of all, this is the wrong thing to do.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the gentleman’s amendment and I urge its adoption.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, just very briefly, I usually don’t get up a second time, but to my friend—and he is my friend—it is a confusion in this country. This is not about protecting the Second Amendment. We all do. Everybody does.

It is about common sense and asking: Where does it stop? How do we keep it from growing? How violent can we get? How many people can we shoot?

That is what this is about. It is not about the Second Amendment. The Second Amendment is well protected. Trust me.

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, again, the ATF received over 80,000 comments on their proposal. In their own words: “The vast majority of the comments received were critical of the framework and include issues that deserve further study.”

Again, this amendment is only codifying the ATF’s own stance. Again, I ask my colleagues to protect the rights of our sportsmen and sportswomen, and to support the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of several of my colleagues from the Sunshine State who still responding to the devastation from Hurricane Irma that made landfall earlier this week. The sponsor of this amendment, Congressman Deutch, and the cosponsors, Congresswoman Castor, Congresswoman Ros-Lehtinen, Congresswoman Wasserman Schultz, all represent districts that received significant damage from Hurricane Irma. Due to the damage in their districts, these Members—with strong interest in this amendment—were unable to return to D.C. in time to debate this issue on the House floor, so I am here pinch-hitting for them.

Recently there have been reports that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s Fisheries headquarters, located on Virginia Key in south Florida, may move to another location. This amendment would prohibit that move. Such a move would be devastating to the longstanding research relationships that the NOAA facility on Virginia Key has with local universities, the local business community, and the marine industries of south Florida.

The NOAA research facility on Virginia Key has maintained a partnership with the University of Miami and the south Florida community since 1943. Over the years, the NOAA facility and their research teams have worked to make sure that this rule is not put back into place.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of several of my colleagues from Florida (Mr. Deutch), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title) insert the following:

Ssc. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used for the operation of private, for-profit prisons.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title) insert the following:

Ssc. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used for the operation of a correctional facility by a private party or contractor.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.
The use of private prisons in our country is a crisis. More and more Americans are being locked up in facilities that don’t respect basic human rights. One in four people behind bars worldwide is in a United States jail. That country with less than 5 percent of the world’s population accounts for a quarter of all the world’s prisoners. In fact, our prison population has continued to increase over the past few decades, even as statistics have shown a decrease in crime. So long as we perpetuate the prison industrial complex, we will find it harder and harder to reduce our bloated prison population and make meaningful reforms to our justice system.

According to the FBI, violent and major property crimes are at historic lows. Nevertheless, more and more Americans are getting locked up. There are several reasons for this: from overly punitive mandatory minimum sentences to the cycle of poverty in the school-to-prison pipeline.

But one thing is for sure: so long as there is an incentive to build prison cells for profit, there will be more Americans unnecessarily behind bars. So long as we make the use of private prisons a priority, we will find it harder to reduce our bloated prison population. More and more Americans are being locked up and it is a waste of countless dollars and a waste of countless human lives that could be turned around and made into successful citizens.

I am proud that in my home city of New York we have decided to divest our pension system from the for-profit prison industry. But now it is time for the Federal Government to divest itself as well.

We must continue to work on comprehensive criminal justice reform that seeks to reform mandatory minimum sentences and curb the failed war on drugs and focus on reentry and reintegration so that those who serve time can become productive members of society, rather than lifelong inmates.

Tonight, we can start with this amendment and send a message to the Trump administration. Tonight, we can tell him not to reverse the progress made under President Obama and Attorney General Loretta Lynch. Tonight, we can say that making money off of incarcerating individuals is simply inconsistent with American values.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GRIFFITH). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I understand my colleague is offering this on behalf of another Member who could not be here today, but I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. Let me make it clear that we read it so the people understand what we are talking about. None of the funds made available by this act may be used for the operation of a correctional facility by a private party or contractor, period.

This would shut down every privately operated prison and halfway house in the United States. Where are those 34,000 criminals going to go? Well, you would have to just turn them loose on the streets or pack them in like sardines in existing prison cells or spend billions of dollars over the next few years to house them.

This amendment is dangerous, irresponsible, and risks the safety of the public. By cutting off immediately all funding to private prisons, these 34,000 inmates would have to be released onto the streets of America. I can’t imagine what kind of disaster that would result in.

Furthermore, I have always believed in the Yellow Pages test. If you can find a government service in the Yellow Pages, you ought to try to privatize it. As a general rule, the private sector is going to find a way to do it more efficiently, less expensively, and in a way that is going to save taxpayer money.

My experience with the private prisons that have operated in the State of Texas quite successfully throughout the Bureau of Prisons is that they are providing better security, better food, better healthcare, better transportation, better housing, better facilities for both the inmate and the staff. They have been very successful across the country. These 34,000 inmates will have nowhere else to go.

This amendment is extremely dangerous, destructive, and irresponsible. I urge Members to join me in opposing this amendment and funding to private prisons, the for-profit prison industry has not only been rejuvenated, but it is expanding.

Our criminal justice system’s only purpose should be to reeducate and rehabilitate the individuals who have made mistakes and are serving their sentence. No one should profit from our prison system.

That is what I plan to reintroduce the End For-Profit Prisons Act—legislation that will rescind the Bureau of Prisons and U.S. Marshals Service to end its contracts with for-profit confinement facilities and make critical changes to the reentry process for individuals who have been released from Federal prisons.

Mr. Chairman, I call for the immediate passage of this amendment.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to join me in opposing this amendment to protect the public safety of the people of the United States, to ensure that our tax dollars are efficiently used, but, above all, to make sure these 34,000 inmates are not released onto the streets of America.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO). The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 124 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 124 printed in House Report 115-20. Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title) insert the following:

None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce Executive Order No. 13547 (75 Fed. Reg. 43923, relating to the stewardship of oceans, coastal, and the Great Lakes), including the National Ocean Policy, developed under such Executive Order.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman...
from Texas (Mr. FLORES) and a Member from Texas.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment with my good friend from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), to address an ongoing bureaucratic overreach of our country's oceans and inland economies.

Our amendment bans the use of Federal funds for the implementation of the previous administration's National Ocean Policy. Executive Order 13547, signed by then-President Obama in 2010, requires that 60-plus bureaucracies essentially zone the oceans and the sources thereof.

The National Ocean Policy's requirements are an encroachment into the powers of Congress as set forth in Article I of our Constitution. These activities have not been authorized by Congress in the appropriations bills. Yet, the bureaucracies continue to act as if those are irrelevant prohibitions against their activities.

Mr. Chair, since 2010, this body has voted eight times in support of this amendment in a bipartisan manner. This language also was included in the base text to the fiscal year 2018 Energy and Water, Interior, and Agriculture Appropriations bills. We are looking to get it in the CJS bill now.

We are offering this amendment again because concerns remain that the National Ocean Policy extends far beyond restricting ocean activities and that it significantly impacts inland activity as well.

This amendment simply stops the funding of unauthorized bureaucratic overreach. It does not have any impact on coordination, planning, or congressional appropriations. It requires the agencies to take care of our Nation's important oceans.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, since New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I yield in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This executive order was signed by President Obama in July 2010. The National Ocean Policy is designed to improve stewardship of our oceans, coastlines, and Great Lakes by directing government agencies with differing mandates to coordinate and work together. The National Ocean Policy creates no new authorities.

The result of increased coordination is better stewardship of our national heritage through improved government efficiency, better development and use of data and information, and a process of open and transparent stakeholder engagement that informs decision-making. This increased coordination between agencies to take care of our Federal needs to take care on a Federal level to reduce efficiency, waste, and redundancy between agencies.

The National Ocean Council brings together State, local, and Tribal governments and all of the oceans uses, including recreational and commercial fishermen, boaters, industries, scientists, and the public, to better plan for, manage, harmonize, and sustain uses of oceans.

The bottom line is that the National Ocean Policy offers an avenue for thoughtful planning around issues affecting ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes areas. It is the best choice for stakeholders looking to be involved in the process.

For all of these reasons, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Before I reserve the balance of my time, on a personal note, it is amazing how much work we have done in the south Bronx with what little bodies of water and green space we have, how much we cherish it, and how much we feel that it has been a gift that we continue to work on. We no longer have the bureaucracy that this amendment would have, and I did it as part of my job in serving a lot of areas.

I see how, in other parts of the country and at the Federal level, we want to undo years and years of progress. I keep thinking of Republican leaders who took a different view. Teddy Roosevelt would be so upset at so much of what we are doing today because he saw the world in a different way. Thank God that he was our President for that period of time when we needed him for that particular issue.

Just on a personal note, I understand that a lot of people see the world differently than I do. Where I come from, the ocean, the Great Lakes, the rivers where they can fish, and where a beaver named Jose has returned.

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chair, in closing, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chair, I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment, and I support it. We have had it in previous bills. I hope the House will adopt it in this bill as well. Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chair, in closing, the issue is not whether or not we want to take care of our oceans. We all agree that we should take care of our oceans. We all believe in being good stewards of the environmental and economic interest in our oceans. But, Mr. Chair, we also believe in trying to make sure that we have a government that adheres to the Constitution.

Under Article I of the Constitution, all legislative powers are returned to Congress—not some, all. That is the issue at stake here. The Obama administration's National Ocean Policy has overstepped constitutional statutory bounds.

Congress did pass a bill in the 106th Congress to create an Ocean Commission to review and make recommendations. Since then, the 108th, 109th, 110th, and 111th Congresses each looked at those recommendations and decided to take no legislative action. This must have been what caused then-President Obama to move forward with his executive order to try to go around Congress. There have been no appropriations for these activities.

Additionally, 81 groups have signed a letter asking the Appropriations Committee to include this language to address this unconstitutional bureaucratic overreach in their annual appropriations bills.

Again, this is a simple amendment that stands up for the constitutional rights of this body to create the statute under which this activity can be conducted and to transparently appropriate the funds which authorize activities, should it so choose.

We are not against Ocean planning, as I said at the outset of this. What we are for, though, is the Constitution.

This amendment has been adopted with bipartisan support in this body eight times since 2010.

I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), for his work on this amendment, as well as to thank Chairman CULBERSON for his consideration. I urge my colleagues to support this straightforward amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

The question was taken; and the Acting CHAIR announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 125 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 125 printed in House Report 115–297.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 1615. None of the funds made available by this Act under the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program may be used in contravention of section 622 of the Illegal Immigration and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) and a Member from Texas opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.
Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak about my amendment to the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies division of H.R. 3354.

Mr. Chairman, the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, or SCAAP, is intended to help local law enforcement’s ability to adhere to Federal immigration law. SCAAP provides States and localities with Federal funds to help offset correctional costs related to incarcerating undocumented criminals at least one felony or two misdemeanor convictions.

However, in recent years, the number of jurisdictions receiving SCAAP funding that have adopted sanctuary policies, allowing violent criminal aliens to go free, has skyrocketed. My amendment would cut off SCAAP money for cities that violate the intent of these funds. These sanctuary cities must not continue using taxpayer money to flagrantly violate Federal, immigration law and put American citizens at risk. Look no further than my home State of Colorado in the case of Mr. Ever Valles. Back in October, Mr. Valles was picked up on charges, including possession of weapons upon, vehicle theft, and eluding. He also had a history of gang involvement.

ICE placed a detainer on Mr. Valles, but Denver officials failed to honor the Federal detainer, releasing him without providing the proper notice to ICE officials. Upon his release, Mr. Valles took part in robbing and shooting 32-year-old Tim Cruz at an RTD train station. He has been charged with first-degree murder.

Sanctuary policies just don’t break the law. They place people’s lives in danger. We cannot continue allowing these jurisdiction sanctuary cities to use taxpayer money to further these misguided policies. In fact, the Office of Justice Programs’ own website states that applicants for SCAAP funds are required to certify compliance with all applicable Federal laws at the time of application. It goes on to say that, if the Office of Justice Programs finds an applicant violates the statute related to sanctuary policies, that the applicant will be investigated by the inspector general and could be subject to criminal and civil penalties.

A recent U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency report identified the top 10 jurisdictions with the highest volume of detainers issued that restrict cooperation with ICE. Not surprisingly, every one of those sanctuary cities received SCAAP awards in fiscal year 2016.

Mr. Chairman, sanctuary cities stand against the rule of law. These jurisdictions support illegal immigration and allow individuals who violate the law to remain free. We cannot allow these jurisdictions to continue these harmful policies on the American people’s dime. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this unnecessary amendment. All this amendment does is prohibit use of funds for cities that violate Federal immigration law.

As we all know, Federal grant recipients of the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, or SCAAP, are not using Federal funds in contravention of Federal law.

The amendment is really about so-called sanctuary cities. This and other amendments like this seek to effectively overthrow community policing by diverting State and local police from their core mission of protecting public safety. Imposing this one-size-fits-all approach would degrade trust between immigrant communities and local police, thereby undermining public safety in all communities and for all residents.

We should not be attempting by word or deed to turn our local law enforcement into an arm of Federal immigration efforts. I live in a sanctuary city, and I can tell you with great certainty that the Federal policy like this one will make my hometown less safe. People will be less likely to report crimes and cooperate with investigations simply because of the concern that they will be deported for interacting with local law enforcement.

What we need is broad and humane immigration reform which would place undocumented immigrants on a workable and earned path to citizenship, thereby allowing them to contribute even more to their families, communities, and our country.

Our immigration system is broken, but this amendment does nothing to fix it. I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

And I must say, the sanctuary cities, as they are called, have a lot of support from law enforcement throughout the Nation because they know that they need to speak to people in the community and get information on who the bad guys are or who the bad gals are, number one.

Number two, this is going to be a boom for the legal profession because just about every city and every State is going to sue if this ever became law.

And we actually started holding monies back because they know how much help is brought to their community and how much they want to keep it in place.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have left.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield ½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBerson).

Mr. CULBerson. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman from Colorado’s amendment.

When Kate Steinle was murdered, I was the new chairman of this subcommittee, and I swore that I would find a way to cut off Federal funding to these sanctuary cities. That young lady’s murder could have been prevented had the city of San Francisco simply cooperated with Federal immigration authorities and handed that criminal over to be deported immediately. That is all we are talking about here.

With the previous administration, Attorney General Lynch, I met with her as the CFO, so to speak, of the DOJ. I used the power of the purse that the Congress was entrusted with by the Founders of our constituencies to persuade the previous Attorney General to adopt precisely the policy that Mr. Buck is attempting to make sure that we continue to follow.

I know, under Attorney General Sessions’ leadership, sanctuary cities are not going to receive Federal money. That policy was first put in place last summer. At my insistence, current guidelines in the Department of Justice grant policies are that a local law enforcement agency has to certify that they are cooperating 100 percent of the time with Federal authorities you are about to release this person so they can be immediately deported. That is common sense. It protects public safety, and it is a wise use of our tax dollars.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 20 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBerson. Mr. Chairman, the days of sanctuary cities accepting Federal money and ignoring Federal law are over. The policy under this administration, the policy I insisted be overturned had the city of San Francisco acted, was the new chairman of this subcommittee for his support.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I would just ask my colleagues to support my amendment, and I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his support.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by
the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 126 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 126 printed in House Report 115–297.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. 3. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for activities prohibited by the orders issued by the Attorney General entitled “Prohibition on Certain Federal Adoptions of Seizures by State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies” (Order No. 3485-2015, dated January 16, 2015) or the order entitled “Prohibition on Certain Federal Adoptions of Seizures by State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies” (Order No. 3485-2015, dated January 12, 2015).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, each year the Federal Government uses civil asset forfeiture to take billions of dollars’ worth of property from people who have not been charged with any crime. It is an unconstitutional practice that is used to violate the due process rights of innocent people.

Fortunately, some States have passed laws to limit asset forfeiture; but the Federal Government helps State law enforcement evade these requirements by doing adoptive forfeitures where the Federal Government accepts property seized by the State law enforcement, forfeits it under Federal law, and gives the State agency a cut of the proceeds.

Mr. Chairman, this practice is outrageous. It supplants the authority of States to regulate their own law enforcement, and it further mires the Federal Government in unconstitutional asset forfeitures. In 2015, the Department of Justice placed limits on adoptive forfeiture, prohibiting the Federal Government from accepting property seized by local police when there is no involvement by Federal law enforcement and the property does not relate to public safety. These are commonsense restrictions that prevent the most egregious seizures.

Unfortunately, these restrictions were revoked in June of this year. My amendment would restore them by prohibiting the use of funds to do adoptive forfeitures that were banned under the 2015 rules.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, I stand in support of the amendment.

The amendment does a great deal to restore our constitutional right to due process and protects the institution of federalism. The equitable sharing program incentivizes local law enforcement agencies to ignore State laws regarding civil asset forfeiture in favor of Federal law.

After Obama reformed civil asset forfeiture laws, local agencies have been able to bypass, just as the gentleman from Michigan described. DOJ allows this even when Federal officials play no role in the investigation or the arrest. Congressman AMASH’s amendment would end this policy.

This program violates the independence of State’s police powers and promotes an asset forfeiture scheme that undermines due process. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

\[1630\]

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues strongly to adopt this amendment.

Attorney General Sessions’ recent announcement to expand civil action forfeiture really allows local law enforcement to steal and seize property from people with the lowest possible burden of evidence and without concern whether the person is eventually charged or convicted.

While some will tell you this is necessary to go after the cartels, the reality is the median value of the adoptive forfeiture seizures has been around $9,000—not exactly the sign of any major drug trafficking operation.

These adoptive forfeiture efforts tend to target poor neighborhoods. Between 2012 and 2017, the median value of assets seized by Cook County police was just over $1,000. In Philadelphia, in 2015, the median value was $192.

This policy does not discriminate between the innocent and the guilty.

With the responsibility on private citizens to prove their innocence, rather than law enforcement to prove guilt, innocent people without legal representation often never see their money or property again, and even those who are proven innocent have no promise that their property will be returned.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Chairman, the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution exists to protect the citizens of this country from being deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. As a core principle, adoptive forfeiture is a violation of that Fourth Amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROHRABACHER).

Ms. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Asset forfeiture is a crime against the American people, committed by their own government. This is absolutely opposite of what our people who wrote the Constitution of the United States had in mind.

For the government to take away someone’s property and then say, “You have to prove you are innocent to get it back,” that is totally in contrast to the limited government, individual responsibility, individual freedom, and property rights concepts that our Founding Fathers had in mind.

If we believe in freedom and if we believe in liberty, let’s not open up the government to be able to steal our property and then we have to go to court. We have lost all of our due process. We have now or situation to prove that we are innocent until proven guilty. That is ridiculous. Vote for this amendment and protect the freedom of our people.

Mr. Chairman, I rise as a proud co-sponsor in strong support of the Amash-Sanford-Labrador-Rohrabacher Amendment.

Civil asset forfeiture is a widely abused law enforcement tactic in which federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies seize property, often with little or no evidence that a crime has been committed. The person whose property has been seized then has to hire an attorney and prove their innocence in order to try to get their property back.

Police departments have a strong incentive to abuse civil asset forfeiture because they get to keep these ill-gotten gains for their own use. Even when state legislatures have enacted important safeguards against abuse, the Justice Department has helped local police departments to circumvent such restrictions by “adopting” seizures that would be illegal under state law, and then sharing the proceeds with local law enforcement.

In January 2015, under the Obama Administration, the Justice Department issued two crucial orders to stop this circumvention of state, raw. Unfortunately, the current Justice Department has reversed those orders, and Congress must now take action.

This amendment will prohibit the Justice Department from using any money in this bill to engage in activities not allowed by the 2015 orders. I ask my colleagues to stop the assaults against law-abiding citizens by the people who are supposed to protect them. Vote for the Amash-Sanford-Labrador-Rohrabacher Amendment.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I stand here also to express my strong support for the Amash amendment.

Civil asset forfeiture without limits presents one of the strongest threats to our civil liberties, our constitutional rights. It creates a reverse incentive for law enforcement to seek profit over justice.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this great amendment.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 10 seconds remaining.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, I encourage everyone to support this amendment. We must defend the Fifth
Amendment and we must protect property rights.
Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 127 OFFERED BY MR. ROSKAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 127 printed in House Report 115–297.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. 9. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5050 of title 5, United States Code, prior to the date on which the Department of Justice rules on all petitions for resolution in judicial forfeiture cases pursuant to section 9.4 of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, for which the Internal Revenue Service has submitted a report of its investigation and its recommendation to the Department of Justice on or before June 26, 2017.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you a quick story. Andrew Clyde served three combat tours in Iraq, after which he returned home and opened a store in Georgia. Mr. Clyde had an insurance policy that only covered up to $10,000 in personal losses. So like any reasonable person, he never brought more than $10,000 in cash with him when he was making his nightly deposits.

Do you know what happened next?

The Internal Revenue Service noticed that he was depositing just under $10,000 in cash regularly, so they took all of his cash. That is $950,000.

If you are like most people, you are confused when you first hear about this. As it turns out, Mr. Clyde was in violation of the law known as structuring, which is the intentional avoidance of Federal reporting requirements by staying below $10,000 in cash deposits. This law was intended to catch large-scale criminal enterprises, mobsters, terrorists, and human traffickers, not veterans like Mr. Clyde.

When structuring is believed to have occurred, the IRS can use its civil asset forfeiture authority to seize funds in question and force the owner to prove that the money was earned legally. Well, in this instance, Andrew Clyde earned the money legally and had a legitimate reason for depositing less than $10,000. So you would assume that Mr. Clyde would have ended this with the IRS talking to him and then saying: Oh, we made a mistake. Clearly you are not a mobster or a terrorist. Thank you for your service. Here is your life savings back.

But, no, that is not what happened, Mr. Chairman. That is not how the story ended.

Instead, the IRS threatened him with criminal structuring charges until he agreed to settle with the agency and give them $50,000, even though he had already spent $100,000 in legal fees. He lost $150,000 simply because he wanted to make sure that his cash deposits were low enough to be insured. If that sounds messed up to you, Mr. Chairman, that is because it is.

Now, here is the good news. The House recently passed, unanimously, H.R. 1843, the RESPECT Act. This bill prohibits the IRS from seizing funds from individuals, unless there is a probable cause that the money was earned illegally or connected to an illegal activity. But there is still the problem of those people who are already victims of this abuse by our government in civil asset forfeiture.

Now, since the beginning of a bipartisan investigation of the IRS’s civil asset forfeiture practices a couple of years ago, the IRS has apologized for past behavior; which is good; they worked quickly to reach out to possible victims; which is good; and they subsequently responded to the 454 petitions that they received. As of March 1, the IRS returned over $6 million in seized funds. Good news. So far so good.

But the plot continues, and here is where we are right now. It turns out that a majority of the petitions were actually referred to the Department of Justice. The IRS referred the DOJ 255 cases, and has recommended that the DOJ return $16 million to taxpayers whom they do not suspect of being connected to an illegal activity. Unfortunately, the Department of Justice has not been nearly as interested in correcting these past wrongdoings.

As of July, the Department of Justice responded only to 73 of the outstanding 255 cases. This is completely unacceptable. The Federal Government took legally earned money from taxpayers, and the Department of Justice hasn’t given the majority of these people a response, including Andrew Clyde.

The Roskam-Neal amendment, offered by myself and Mr. Neal, the ranking member from Massachusetts on the Ways and Means Committee, is very simple. It simply says this: No one in the relevant section of the Department of Justice can get a performance bonus until they finish reviewing the backlog of cases that the IRS has sent them. We are not asking the Department of Justice to do anything extraordinary, Mr. Chairman. We are simply asking them to do their job, and until they do their job, the bare minimum that taxpayers can expect is that we at least don’t reward these people with bonuses.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the amendment. I will work with Mr. Roskam as theRepo of the DOJ and do whatever is necessary to help make sure they review these cases rapidly and return people’s money to their rightful owners.

Once again, Mr. Roskam has brought a growing abuse to the floor. I look forward to working with him to ensure that his intent is implemented as quickly as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his support.

I thank the chairman for his assurance and his hard work on this. I am confident that this will be resolved.

Mr. Chairman, I have got to tell you that the discussions that this House has made on a bipartisan basis with the Department of Justice have been obtuse and they have been ridiculous. I have been embarrassed by the interactions that I have had with senior staff members at the Department of Justice on this issue.

The Ways and Means Subcommittee has been scandalized by this, and we are going to do something about it. So here, today, we are rising on both sides of the aisle to bring remedy, rescue, and restoration to our citizens.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 129 printed in House Report 115–297.

AMENDMENT NO. 129 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 129 printed in House Report 115–297.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. 9. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay a performance award to any officer or employee of the Money Laundering and Asset Recovery Section of the Department of Justice under section 5384 or 450a of title 5, United States Code, prior to the date on which the Department of Justice rules on all petitions for resolution in judicial forfeiture cases pursuant to section 9.4 of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, for which the Internal Revenue Service has submitted a report of its investigation and its recommendation to the Department of Justice on or before June 26, 2017.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you a quick story. Andrew Clyde served three combat tours in Iraq, after which he returned home and opened a store in Georgia. Mr. Clyde had an insurance policy that only covered up to $10,000 in personal losses. So like any reasonable person, he never brought more than $10,000 in cash with him when he was making his nightly deposits.

Do you know what happened next?

The Internal Revenue Service noticed that he was depositing just under $10,000 in cash regularly, so they took all of his cash. That is $950,000.

If you are like most people, you are confused when you first hear about this. As it turns out, Mr. Clyde was in violation of the law known as structuring, which is the intentional avoidance of Federal reporting requirements by staying below $10,000 in cash deposits. This law was intended to catch large-scale criminal enterprises, mobsters, terrorists, and human traffickers, not veterans like Mr. Clyde.

When structuring is believed to have occurred, the IRS can use its civil asset forfeiture authority to seize funds in question and force the owner to prove that the money was earned legally. Well, in this instance, Andrew Clyde earned the money legally and had a legitimate reason for depositing less than $10,000. So you would assume that...
number of instances where the government has confiscated private property from citizens and small businesses without any criminal conviction, or even criminal charges. Under current civil forfeiture law, the state has a captive audience—prime real estate for abuse, and has undermined the constitutional rights of far too many Americans.

In response, 24 States and the District of Columbia have adopted reforms to their forfeiture laws. However, through a practice known as adoptive seizures, Federal agencies, like the Department of Justice, can circumvent State and local laws to continue this practice.

In July, the Department of Justice announced a continuation and expansion of civil forfeiture, reversing a previous ban on adoptive seizures.

My bipartisan amendment, introduced with Representatives COHEN, MCCLINTOCK, and ELLISON, would prohibit funds for the DOJ to implement this expansion.

Our amendment is also supported by a broad and diverse coalition of organizations, including the American Conservative Union, the Institute for Justice, the NAACP, and the ACLU.

Today’s vote takes an important step in halting the practice of adoptive seizures, protecting the rights of States and localities, and limiting some future abuses.

Ultimately, this amendment is a starting point, and we can’t stop here. Congress must submit more comprehensive changes into law, changes like those included in the Fifth Amendment Integrity Restoration Act, my bipartisan bill, that calls for sweeping reforms to curb civil asset forfeiture abuse.

America was founded on the principles of due process and property rights, and these principles must be vigorously defended.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. WALBERG for bringing this amendment and for the bills he has proposed, and I thank Senator PAUL as well.

I think criminal asset forfeiture is one of the worst, most heinous, most despicable, and most vile laws that we have ever put on the books. It is an assault on human beings and State governments on State sovereignty and on individuals having a right to their property and having a right to a hearing and being found guilty of something before their property is taken.

This amendment would make the government come in, and they don’t even have to charge you with a crime, and they can take your car or your money or whatever else they find. It is an unconstitutional thing as has ever existed.

Mr. WALBERG laid out some of the supporters: the ACLU, NAACP, and then it goes around to some conservative organizations. There are many times I have found that you get 360 degrees where the conservative come together and agree on libertarian principles that something needs to happen.

Mr. WALBERG and also from Mr. AMASH.

When you have got RAND PAUL, KEITH ELLISON, Mr. WALBERG, and myself all on the same thing, this needs to happen. So we need to pass it now.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. COHEN for yielding. I think that what he said is absolutely true. When you do a complete circle, you have come to a point of understanding that something is amiss, in good will we work together in a bipartisan fashion to fix it.

There can be useful issues relative to civil assets, but it needs to follow due process. Our civil liberties must be protected. We want to support law enforcement; it is a tough job. But, nonetheless, in our great country, liberty is still the most important ideal that we have, and the freedom that makes us different from other nations.

Mr. Chair, I thank my good friend for his support, and I would ask my colleagues to support it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 130 OFFERED BY MR. RASKIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 130 printed in House Report 115–297.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement Order Number 3946-2017 of the Attorney General allowing Department of Justice components and agencies of the Federal Government's civil Asset Forfeiture Program.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, the recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank my colleagues, Mr. SENNENBRENNER, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. MOONEY, for co-sponsoring and supporting this amendment.

It is a bipartisan amendment and, I think, a natural complement to the excellent amendments just added from Mr. WALBERG and also from Mr. AMASH. It would prohibit funding made available by this act from being used to implement the recent DOJ policy change, which dramatically expands the Federal Government’s civil Asset Forfeiture Program.

The new policy revives a controversy and, I think, unconstitutional practice that has been decried by Americans and Members of Congress across the political spectrum who hold dear the idea of due process and the protection of innocent people not just to us as people but also to our private property as well.

The new policy allows State and local law enforcement to circumvent State laws limiting civil asset forfeiture by having Federal agencies adopt State and local cases. Under this dubious practice, law enforcement may seize a citizen’s cash and property simply because someone suspects it of being connected to a criminal activity without convicting the innocent, or even charging the property owner with having committed a crime and without proving or even alleging in court that the property is somehow connected to a criminal activity.

Hundreds of millions of dollars worth of property have been seized in this way by law enforcement on an officer’s mere suspicion. In order to get your property back, you have to go out and hire a lawyer, you have to go to court, and you have to prove that your property was obtained through innocent means, completely reversing the constitutional presumption of innocence that is at the heart of due process.

This practice is an outrageous violation of property rights, of civil liberties, and of the due process principle that we are all presumed to be innocent as American citizens, and it raises profound questions also under the Takings Clause, which forbids the taking of private property without just compensation by the government.

Although the resurrected policy contains a few new safeguards, they will not remotely prevent abusive seizures or eliminate the profit incentives that encourage rampant civil asset forfeiture. The policy will lead to the same abuses uncovered in 2014.

A Washington Post investigation found that, since 2001, State and local law enforcement had made more than 55,000 seizures of cash and property worth nearly $2.5 billion under the civil Asset Forfeiture Program.

One striking case discussed by The New York Times was of Carole Hinders, owner of a restaurant in Arnolds Park, Iowa, who deposited her cash earnings in the bank on a weekly basis, and it was always under $10,000. She was suspected of illegally structuring her deposits, although they were perfectly innocent, and the IRS simply seized $33,000 from her, causing huge problems for her business.

Another case that caught my eye was of a Chinese-American restaurateur who was traveling with a large sum of...
money because he was about to buy a building for his new restaurant. He had been saving for decades to buy his own restaurant. He was stopped by the police and became understandably very anxious during the encounter. The police say they found the large sum of cash money he had with him suspicious, and his nervous demeanor also telling, and they simply seized his money. They detained him for 2 hours. They let him go. They didn’t charge him with anything but they seized his money, his life savings that he had planned to use to purchase the building for his restaurant. He was a lucky one in that he was able, eventually years later, to get his money back, but he lost the business deal and his deposit in the process.

In 2014, the value of money and property seized under civil asset forfeitures by Federal law enforcement exceeded the total of losses in money and property from burglaries in our country. That means our people lost more money at the hands of the government through civil asset forfeiture than from being burglarized.

Because of the abuses revealed in 2015, the DOJ imposed restrictions to limit when the Federal Government could adopt forfeiture cases, and banned State and local police from using Federal law to seize cash and property without criminal charges or warrants, but the new policy lifts these restrictions and places the Federal Government back on the side of the trampling of people’s constitutional rights.

Civil asset forfeiture, people cannot only lose their property without being charged with a crime, they can also lose their property when someone else allegedly uses their property in commission of a crime.

A Michigan woman lost a car she owned with her husband because he was caught soliciting prostitution while driving her car.

This policy runs roughshod over the property rights of the innocent and burdensome with one more layer to get their property back that they never should have lost in the first place.

Mr. Chair, Democrats, Republicans, and Independents all agree that civil asset forfeiture is a serious threat to constitutional values.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of us to vote for this important amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. COLE OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 504, as the designee of Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, I offer amendments en bloc No. 4.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 4 consisting of amendment Nos. 132, 140, 143, 144, 146, 147, 148, 151, 153, 157, 159, 162, 163, 166, 177, 181, and 185, printed in House Report 115-297, offered by Mr. COLE of Oklahoma:

AMENDMENT NO. 132 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

Page 697, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by $16,000,000)”.

Page 698, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by $16,000,000)”.

Page 718, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: “(decreased by $16,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 140 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI OF OREGON

Page 718, line 15, after the first dollar amount insert “(increased by $966,000) (decreased by $966,000)”.

Page 719, line 14, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by $966,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 143 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI OF OREGON

Page 734, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $15,270,000) (increased by $18,270,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 144 OFFERED BY MR. KIDDER OF MICHIGAN

Page 735, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $1,000,000)”.

Page 740, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $1,000,000)”.

Page 740, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $1,000,000)”.

Page 770, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $3,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 146 OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN OF MINNESOTA

Page 738, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $1,000,000)”.

Page 770, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert “(decreased by $300,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 147 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 738, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $1,000,000)”.

Page 770, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 148 OFFERED BY MR. MAST OF FLORIDA

Page 740, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $400,000)”.

Page 741, line 16, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $400,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 151 OFFERED BY MR. DESALVADORI OF CALIFORNIA

Page 744, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $1,000,000)”.

Page 770, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert “(decreased by $1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 152 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO OF NEW YORK

Page 751, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $12,500,000) (increased by $12,500,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 157 OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM OF CALIFORNIA

Page 763, line 3, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 154 OFFERED BY MS. MCASKEY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 767, line 24, insert “(increased by $13,232,847)” after the dollar amount.

Page 805, line 25, insert “(reduced by $13,232,847)” after the dollar amount.

AMENDMENT NO. 155 OFFERED BY MR. BONAMICI OF OREGON

Page 794, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by $8,900,000)”.

Page 794, line 15, after the second dollar amount, insert “(increased by $8,900,000)”.

Page 794, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $8,900,000)”.

Page 805, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by $8,900,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 163 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI OF OREGON

Page 795, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $1,150,000,000) (reduced by $1,150,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 166 OFFERED BY MR. DRAHMLER OF VIRGINIA

Page 796, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by $10,000,000)”.

Page 805, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(decreased by $10,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 177 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of division F (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ For ‘Health Resources and Services Administration—Health Workforce’ for establishing and carrying out the training demonstration grant program, as authorized by section 760 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 294k), there is hereby appropriated $30,000,000, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for ‘Health Resources and Services Administration—Program Management’ is hereby reduced by $11,750,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 180 OFFERED BY MS. SEWELL OF ALABAMA

At the end of division F (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act to carry out the Child Care Development Block Grant Act of 1990 may be distributed to any child care provider if a local list of providers as mentioned in part 98 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, applicable to the Department of Health and Human Services, Administration of Children and Families, and in the final rule published in the Federal Register, Vol. 81, No. 190, on Sept. 30, 2016 indicates that a serious injury or death occurred at the provider due to a substantiated health or safety violation.

AMENDMENT NO. 185 OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH OF VIRGINIA

At the end of division F (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ For ‘Health Resources and Services Administration-Rural Health’ to carry out section 427(a) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, that is here- by appropriated, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for ‘Health Resources and Services Administration-Program Management’ is hereby reduced by $2,791,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DeLAURO), who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education approved this list of amendments last week, along with myself, and was looking forward to discussing them and others with all of us here today.

Unfortunately, the gentlewoman is not able to be here this week due to the death of her beloved mother, Luisa DeLauro, who passed away over the weekend at the age of 103.
The gentlewoman from Connecticut and I have something in common on this point: neither of us would likely be a Member of this body today were it not for the inspiration and role model of our mothers, both of whom were actively involved in local politics.

Like my own late mother, Helen Cole, who served in the Oklahoma House and Senate and as mayor of our home town of Moore, Oklahoma, Luisa DeLauro served 35 years as a member of the New Haven, Connecticut, Board of Aldermen, the longest tenure in the city’s history. She served with six different mayors and dedicated her time to improving the lives of seniors and the working poor.

Her daughter has most certainly followed in her footsteps, bringing her passion, dedication, and tirelessness for these same causes to the Halls of Congress.

We are sorry the gentlewoman cannot be with us today. We know she is honored by her mother’s legacy, and making her mother proud of her work here.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to join my colleague in sending our thoughts and condolences to the DeLauro family.

Ranking Member DELAURO’s mother, Luisa, passed away this weekend at the age of 103. The family is together this week in New Haven, Connecticut.

Luisa DeLauro was an inspiration to her daughter, ROSA, to the city of New Haven, and to us all. Luisa was the longest serving member of the New Haven Board of Aldermen in the city’s history, serving 35 years.

She set an example for women everywhere as she fought to ensure that women’s voices were heard in the male-dominated arena of politics.

As ROSA has said, her mother understood that politics was an avenue for change, a way to help people who were struggling, and she dedicated her service to issues involving seniors, the working poor, and her beloved neighborhood of Wooster Square, which she helped to designate as New Haven’s first historic district.

Luisa was a beloved local leader with an open-door policy, who developed friendships that lasted a lifetime, but she was also well known as a strong-willed fighter for issues she believed in, and it is clear that her dedication and fierce passion will live on in her daughter, our friend, ROSA.

Even though Luisa DeLauro passed away at 103, for ROSA and her family, it still feels like she was taken too soon. My thoughts are with her good friend, ROSA DELAURO, and the entire DeLauro family.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the en bloc amendment, which includes my bipartisan amendment to highlight the need to fully fund Student Support and Academic Enrichment grants.

These grants are critical to the successful implementation of title IV of the Every Student Succeeds Act. A declining portion of the overall Student Support grants give all students access to a well-rounded education.

The grant program is also important because it was created to allocate funding by formula, which levels the playing field so small school districts can get their fair share of funding.

I am disappointed that this bill funds Student Support grants significantly lower than the original $1.65 billion authorized in the Every Student Succeeds Act, and I hope there will be an opportunity in the Senate to increase funding for these critical Student Support grants.

I thank the chairman and ranking member for including my amendments in an en bloc package and for their hard work on this bill.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), my good friend.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bloc, which includes my amendment to prevent homeless youth and young mothers from seeing a lapse in service from their runaway youth programs and maternity group homes.

Specifically, this amendment allows HHS to offer transitional living programs and maternity group home grants for centers that would otherwise see a lapse in funding in fiscal year 2018.

This amendment does not increase funding for the program. This amendment simply prevents centers from facing a gap in grant eligibility due to a fiscal year which commenced off cycle. Failure to act will cause runaway and homeless youth and maternity group home centers across the county to downgrade, discontinue, or eventually close.

These important centers provide a temporary shelter to youth in crisis who are experiencing homelessness. These centers teach life skills and provide counseling and transitional services to homeless, pregnant, and parenting young people access to life-changing services.

Unfortunately, the Modesto center and more than 100 other centers and shelters across the country are in jeopardy of losing eligibility for funding due to circumstances outside of their control. These grants account for a significant portion of their total budgets, and a gap of this length will drastically reduce the services or force programs to shut down completely.

My amendment implores the administration to authorize bridge funding to close this gap in grant eligibility, allowing services to continue until the grant is realigned with the appropriations process. For the area I represent, losing these grants would have much more ramifications for the overall homeless population and collaborative efforts to improve homeless care and services.

TLP and MGH grants help break the crippling cycle of homelessness. I call on my colleagues to support this amendment and allow homeless youth and parenting young people access to life-changing services.

Mr. Chair, I support and appreciate my amendment being included in this en bloc amendment. My amendment increases funding for three very important and very successful programs that provide lead prevention resources in support for those already exposed to high levels of lead.

Lead is a dangerous neurotoxin. Its effects can be permanent, especially on very young people and those most vulnerable citizens among us. In fact, according to the medical community, there is no safe level for lead.

As you know, I come from Flint, Michigan, where we have experienced the most significant lead crisis. It is one that we are still working to overcome. Even though that crisis in Flint is no longer in the headlines, Flint and many other communities are still dealing with issues caused by exposure to lead.

There is no cure to lead exposure. We have to work on prevention and do everything we can to support those like the people in Flint across the country who have been exposed so they can grow into healthy and successful adults. This amendment will do just that.

I appreciate the ranking member, Ms. DELAURO, and I share in my colleagues’ expression of grief for her loss. I thank Ranking Member LOWEY and I thank Chairman COLE for working to include this in the en bloc amendment, and I urge its passage.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO), my friend.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of this en bloc amendment, specifically the amendment I offered with Congresswoman BONAMICI.
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Our amendment would help ensure adequate funding for a grant program available to States, including my home State of Pennsylvania, to tailor assessment systems to work for teachers, parents, and students. The amendment would prevent a $1 million in funding for State assessment grants the amount authorized for these grants in the Every Student Succeeds Act but, notably, $8.9 million more than that which was included in the legislation we are amending.

Including full funding for State assessment grants is a critical way for Congress to fulfill our promise under ESSA that we would streamline testing so the high-stakes testing culture that has burdened schools and students for too long is rolled back.

I thank the chairman and ranking member for the opportunity to offer this amendment, and I urge the adoption of the en bloc amendment.

Mr. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this bipartisan amendment that would increase funding for the Black Lung Clinics Programs in the Health Resources Services Administration (HRSA) by $2.7 million. This increase, when added to the $7.2 million provided in appropriations bills being considered, will provide $10 million in total funding for Fiscal Year 2018. I want to commend Representative GRIFFITH for his leadership on this issue.

The additional funding proposed by the amendment is fully offset by a reduction in program management, and the total amount of $10 million is equal to the permanently authorized amount. That level, I would note, has remained the same since the Black Lung Clinics Program was first authorized in the 92nd Congress as part of the Black Lung Benefits Act of 1972.

Today, there are 28 black lung clinics located in 15 coal mining states, which, with small grants provided by HRSA’s Federal Office of Rural Health Policy, serve as a lifeline for disabled miners.

In many cases, these coal miners spent a lifetime working in our nation’s mines, but now face black lung disease—a debilitating and frequently fatal lung disease that continues to erode lung function even after a miner leaves work in the mines. Since 1968, 76,000 miners have lost their lives to black lung disease.

The black lung clinics program is expected to serve 13,800 miners this year. The need for these clinics is rising due to an increase in the number of cases, coupled with an increased number of miners who are now seeking assistance following the closure of mines.

The rate of black lung disease in coal miners fell steadily in the 30 years following the enactment of the 1969 Coal Mine Safety and Health Act. However, that favorable downward trend started to reverse beginning in 2000, according to the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH). NIOSH is also finding that miners are becoming totally disabled from black lung at much younger ages.

The increase in black lung disease has been due in part to longer mining shifts, more powerful mining machinery, and mine operators cutting into more rock because the easiest reach coal has been mined out. Much of that rock is quartz bearing sandstone which, when mined, releases large amounts of silica containing mine dust that is far more toxic than coal dust.

The most severe form of black lung disease, known as progressive massive fibrosis or PMF, has spiked dramatically. Earlier this year, NIOSH reported that the Stone Mountain Resources clinic in southwest Virginia had identified the largest cluster of PMF ever found—over 400 cases. National Public Radio has reported on large clusters in Kentucky and other states.

PMF produces large masses of scar tissue in the lung, and often the only means for survival is undergoing a high-risk lung transplant. While funding for the black lung clinics has been frozen at virtually the same level for the past 5 years, a number of clinics, including many of those in Appalachia, have faced substantial increase in demand from coal miners for screening, diagnosis and pulmonary rehabilitation.

Clinics provide benefits counseling, including assisting miners with federal black lung benefits and state compensation claims.

Some clinics are so underfunded that they are operating with obsolete and inefficient diagnostic equipment, which needs to be upgraded.

Mr. Chair, we owe it to coal miners to get them the care and benefits they need and deserve. I urge a yes vote.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLI).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills and agreed to a joint resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 102. An act to direct the Federal Communications Commission to commence proceedings related to the resiliency of critical communications networks during times of emergency, and for other purposes.

S. 327. An act to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to provide a safe harbor related to certain investment fund research reports, and for other purposes.

S. 416. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Company Act of 1958 to require an annual review by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the annual government-business forum on capital formation.

S. 444. An act to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to expand the investor limitation for qualifying venture capital funds under an exemption from the definition of a ‘‘business development company’’.

S. 462. An act to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to refund or credit certain excess payments made to the Commission.

S. 488. An act to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to terminate an exemption for companies located in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and any other possession of the United States.

S. 498. An act to increase the threshold for disclosures required by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to compensatory benefit plans, and for other purposes.

S. 1312. An act to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States.

S.J. Res 49. Joint Resolution condemning the violence and domestic terrorist attack that took place during events between August 11 and August 12, 2017, in Charlottesville, Virginia, recognizing the first respond­ers who lost their lives while attending the events, offering deepest condolences to the families and friends of those individuals who were killed and deepest sympathies and support to those individuals who were injured by the violence, expressing support for the Charlottesville community, rejecting White nationalism, White supremacists, the Ku Klux Klan, neo-Nazis, and other hate groups, and urging the President and the President’s Cabinet to use all available resources to address the threats posed by those groups.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GRIFFITH). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 131 printed in House Report 115-297. Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will now present the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 693, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ‘‘(decreased by $10,000,000)’’.

Page 693, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ‘‘(increased by $10,000,000)’’.

Page 694, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ‘‘(increased by $10,000,000)’’.

Page 718, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ‘‘(decreased by $10,000,000)’’.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment that would increase funding for youth employment initiatives by $10 million.

Michigan’s unemployment rate is 4.7 percent, but for youth aged 16 to 24, it is more than double that, over 10 percent. Young people face high unemployment, and the lack of opportunity to find meaning in the world of work has implications that go far beyond just those years that they might find meaningful employment.

Investing in those young Americans ensures that they all do better. Providing those important employment...
opportunities builds a strong foundation around the concept of hard work, and I know many Members support this effort. We just need to make sure that we find every opportunity that we can to make sure that every young person looking for an opportunity to earn a living and, especially, understands the connection between their focus on work and the benefits that they will realize from that not only in terms of their own well-being, but the contributions they can make to our communities.

Just last month, I had an opportunity to visit a really great example about how youth employment can make a positive impact in my home community. I visited a community garden run by Greg Gaines, who employs Flint area youth in summer jobs. They learn to grow crops. They learn that hard work pays off. Over time, they see these crops come in that they sell at the local farmers market. Very few of them will work in agriculture, but they come to understand that some patience and some effort and the focus on showing up on time and doing a day’s good work literally and figuratively will produce fruits that they can benefit from.

So for 14- to 20-year-old kids in this program, obviously, it will make a difference in terms of the way their lives and their life trajectory goes forward, but it also sets a great example for their peers.

This is just one of those things that we do in the Federal Government that is an investment in our future. It is an investment in the lives of these kids. It pays us back tenfold. We should support it with every dollar we can find, and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by saying how much I, frankly, appreciate the gentleman’s amendment.

Many programs in this bill, frankly, were eliminated or substantially reduced to stay within the allocation, which, as I know my good friend knows, is $5 billion below the FY 2017 enacted level. Some other programs, including job training programs for youth, were reduced by relatively modest amounts, again, to stay within the allocation. The total amount in the bill for youth job training grants is $852 million, a reduction over last year of just 4.5 percent.

While I support the job training grants and programs in question, I oppose the amendment out of concern that these cuts to the Department of Labor’s administration account will be too hard to absorb, including the administrative reductions already included in the bill.

I will commit to my friend that we will try to work with him through the process and see if there is some way that we can get these funds restored going forward.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my friend’s comments. I understand the position he holds, and I do hope that we can work together, eventually, to make sure that this program is more fully funded.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, appreciate the chairman’s comments, and I do hope, during this process, we will respond to this important request. I rise in support of this amendment.

The underlying bill cuts the Department of Labor’s Youth Employment Program, which provides funding to all 50 States, by $42 million, a shortsighted proposal that ignores the needs of millions of young people.

In the United States, there are roughly 5.5 million teenagers and young adults ages 16 and 24 who are neither working nor in school. This translates to one in seven teens and young adults. The youth program helps prepare out-of-school and low-income youth in your communities for employment and postsecondary education. These youth represent extraordinary potential for our Nation’s economy. Investing in them has a ripple effect on future generations of low-income children and families, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, a champion for this issue and many others.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which would increase funding for youth employment activities under the Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act.

As has been stated, about 5 million of our Nation’s youth are both out of school and out of work, so we have a responsibility to the Committee on Education and the Workforce to help our youth get on a good path towards a good job, or do we pay considerably more later?

We have to choose to invest now. This includes increased funding for youth employment activities that help out-of-school and out-of-work youth, and it helps fund summer jobs, on-the-job training, apprenticeship training, and others. The alternative is to pay much more later in incarceration, teen pregnancy, and public assistance. When we make these Federal investments now, we make investments in our communities, our Nation, and our shared future, and we save money in the future.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment and urge its adoption.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I would simply urge my colleagues to join me in support. I think we all know of these individual cases where the life of a young person is changed permanently because of an experience that they had finding meaning in work.

Again, as I said at the outset, my view is we should try to find every way we can to support, including as many young people in that experience as possible. This amendment would do that.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.
The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.  

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, our Nation faces a dire fiscal situation. We have now reached our debt ceiling and are determining how to control spending while funding necessary programs. The path forward is not sustainable. It jeopardizes our future, our children’s future, and our national security. We must get our fiscal house in order and take this problem seriously.

Page to page the problem will not solve it. We must be responsible now before it is too late. The reality is that we can make cuts to the size and cost of our Federal Government without impacting essential programs. In fact, the right cuts will allow our economy to grow by stopping overzealous bureaucrats who seem to believe everything should be regulated until it no longer functions.

We in Congress need to be focused on growing and protecting Main Street, not pursuing an already bloated Federal Government and bureaucracy. The amendment I propose today is simple. It makes a cut to the bureaucracy of several offices of division F relating to Labor, Health and Human Services. My amendment cuts funds from the same Department of Labor that gave us the overtime rule and the persuader rule. This is an agency of bureaucrats that wishes to legislate through regulation. My amendment puts forth a modest 10 percent reduction of administrative expenses, which would save taxpayers $351 million annually on Labor and HHS alone. Let me restate that: We can actually save $351 million annually by just cutting administrative costs.

We, in fact, may well find the money to put the additional $10 million into youth employment services if we cut our bureaucracy.

I come from a world of privacy business, so I understand that fiscal responsibility in a small business requires commitment to changing the trend. My amendment, when combined with similar measures across all appropriations, will yield big savings to taxpayers, and will do so without cutting projects or essential programs that we hold dear.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to seriously consider my amendment as we work to secure our fiscal future, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the efforts of the chairman, and, in fact, all of the appropriations efforts. In fact, this week we will pass a full set of appropriations bills out of the House to send to the Senate—something that has not happened before in a very long time, although I am new.

The reality is that many of the cuts we have talked about thus far are cuts to the increases many agencies requested. I worked in the private sector where a cut meant you really spent less real dollars.

Now, I believe there are a number of programs we need to be very careful of. Item by item would be the best way, but at some point in time, we need to let Mr. Speaker know we can't continue spending what we are spending, and I hope that we are going to be fiscally responsible down the road. So I appreciate the chairman’s comments. I worked very carefully with him, and, yes, I agree that entitlement reform is a huge issue and we have got to take it on. We need to amend the Budget Control Act. There are so many things we need to accomplish.

I am going to support our appropriations package and continue to try and work to tweak those so we actually save money, and we are efficient, and we save programs that we hold dear that are productive.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Scotty), my good friend.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. Delauro), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 706, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ``(increased by $5,400,000)``.

Page 708, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ``(increased by $10,000,000)``.

Page 708, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ``(increased by $9,976,000)``.

Page 708, line 28, after the dollar amount, insert ``(increased by $10,000,000)``.

Page 708, line 33, after the dollar amount, insert ``(increased by $1,051,000)``.

Page 713, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ``(increased by $21,317,000)``.

Page 715, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ``(increased by $25,224,000)``.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman was appropriately $5 billion below the nondefense level allowed under the Budget Control Act.

We have the resources available, yet the majority refuses to allocate them to the essential programs funded through this bill.

This amendment would not encourage the agencies to do more with less. Simply put, it would force the agencies and our constituencies to do less with less.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Mitchell), my good friend.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the efforts of the chairman, and, in fact, all of the appropriations efforts. In fact, this week we will pass a full set of appropriations bills out of the House to send to the Senate—something that has not happened before in a very long time, although I am new.

The reality is that many of the cuts we have talked about thus far are cuts to the increases many agencies requested. I worked in the private sector where a cut meant you really spent less real dollars.

Now, I believe there are a number of programs we need to be very careful of. Item by item would be the best way, but at some point in time, we need to let Mr. Speaker know we can't continue spending what we are spending, and I hope that we are going to be fiscally responsible down the road. So I appreciate the chairman’s comments. I worked very carefully with him, and, yes, I agree that entitlement reform is a huge issue and we have got to take it on. We need to amend the Budget Control Act. There are so many things we need to accomplish.

I am going to support our appropriations package and continue to try and work to tweak those so we actually save money, and we are efficient, and we save programs that we hold dear that are productive.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. Lowey), my good friend, the distinguished ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman was appropriately $5 billion below the nondefense level allowed under the Budget Control Act.

We have the resources available, yet the majority refuses to allocate them to the essential programs funded through this bill.

This amendment would not encourage the agencies to do more with less. Simply put, it would force the agencies and our constituencies to do less with less.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Scotty), my good friend.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. Delauro), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 706, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ``(increased by $5,400,000)``.

Page 708, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ``(increased by $10,000,000)``.

Page 708, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ``(increased by $9,976,000)``.

Page 708, line 28, after the dollar amount, insert ``(increased by $10,000,000)``.

Page 708, line 33, after the dollar amount, insert ``(increased by $1,051,000)``.

Page 713, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ``(increased by $21,317,000)``.

Page 715, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ``(increased by $25,224,000)``.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman...
from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I am doing this on behalf of Ms. DELAUBRO. As we know, her mother passed this weekend, and she is in our thoughts.

Mr. Chairman, this also incorporates two other amendments that we would have otherwise taken up separately under my name, but they are all-inclusive in here. So let me talk about what the amendment does.

This amendment would restore funding to worker protection programs to keep the fiscal year 2017 levels. The bill, as it stands, has a cut of $59 million to worker protection agencies, including a cut of $21 million to OSHA, the elimination of the Susan Harwood training grants, and a cut of $14 million to the Mine Safety and Health Administration.

This is the lowest budget OSHA has seen since 2009. We need OSHA. It saves lives. Since 1970, occupational deaths have been cut in half, saving over $80 million lives. But there is plenty of work left to do.

Last year alone, 4,800 workers were killed on the job, and over 3 million were seriously injured. An average of 15 workers die every day from job injuries, costing U.S. businesses over $170 billion.

The proposed budget would further reduce enforcement personnel by 140 inspectors to 2,318 fewer workplace investigations. In addition, in the bill under consideration, safety training grants to reach workers in the highest risk jobs are eliminated, despite being a core OSHA program through every administration, Republican and Democrat, since 1978.

OSHA has only enough funding to inspect every workplace under its jurisdiction every 159 years. Why would this bill eliminate funding for Susan Harwood training grants, and cut OSHA enforcement personnel by 140 inspectors for compliance assistance, and reducing enforcement activities. That is exactly what this bill actually does.

I appreciate that the subcommittee had to reduce funding for many programs in the bill to work within its allocation. My concern with this amendment is the substantial offset of the department management funds at the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

Mr. Chairman, for that reason, I oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I will close by saying that I have been an employer for nearly 30 years; and on behalf of the vast majority of employers who have very responsible workplaces and care for their workers and take care of their workers, it is the irresponsible businesses that hurt all of the other businesses.

When we do inspect companies that could have workplace violations, when we can find every 159 years to every workplace that is under the jurisdiction, when we don’t enforce wage laws, we hurt the responsible businesses in this country, and that is why it is important to do this.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment. The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by saying how much I regret—I know my friend regrets that our good friend wasn’t here to offer her amendment here this evening, and I appreciate my good friend from Wisconsin stepping up here doing that. He is a very valued member of this subcommittee, and one who contributes mightily to its deliberations.

I certainly understand the concern of some with the relatively modest reductions in this bill at labor enforcement agencies at the Department of Labor. It has been the subcommittee’s policy for many years to protect workers’ health and safety by increasing funding for compliance assistance, and reducing enforcement activities. That is exactly what this bill actually does.

I appreciate that the subcommittee has had to reduce funding for many programs in the bill to work within its allocation. My concern with this amendment is the substantial offset of the department management funds at the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

Mr. Chairman, for that reason, I oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I will close by saying that I have been an employer for nearly 30 years; and on behalf of the vast majority of employers who have very responsible workplaces and care for their workers and take care of their workers, it is the irresponsible businesses that hurt all of the other businesses.

When we do inspect companies that could have workplace violations, when we can find every 159 years to every workplace that is under the jurisdiction, when we don’t enforce wage laws, we hurt the responsible businesses in this country, and that is why it is important to do this.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question was taken; and the Act is agreed to.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment. The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman’s amendment, and I agree that worker safety is one of the

Some of you may know that the Northern Mariana Islands are in a transition from overreliance on foreign workers to an economy that is predominantly U.S. workers. As part of this transition effort, last month, the House passed and the President signed into law an increase in the fee that is used to train U.S. workers to replace foreign workers. At the end of this month, minimum wage goes up bringing us within 20 cents of the U.S. minimum wage, $7.25 an hour. These changes are all part of the strategy to make the workplace more accessible and attractive to U.S. workers who are still on the sidelines unemployed.

There is one more small but important move we can make: assure these potential U.S. workers that job sites are safe. We are fortunate to have lots of investment in the resort industry in the Northern Mariana Islands right now. Hotels are going up, and headlines are being laid. I imagine some Members have had a first job working construction, so they know there are inherent dangers on a construction site. Frankly, we have already had accidents. Now every State has an OSHA office. There is an OSHA office in Honolulu, but that is 4,000 miles away from my district, and we have no Federal safety officer on duty in the Northern Mariana Islands. We need a real Federal presence—boots on the ground—that will assure U.S. workers that if they get a job working construction, the workplace is safe. As I say, this is one more element in the strategy to put U.S. workers into jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman’s amendment, and I agree that worker safety is one of the
The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, this amendment seeks to increase funding for the Women’s Bureau within the Department of Labor by slightly more than $1 million and would decrease funding for the Bureau’s Division to be funded almost $3.5 million above the current enacted funding level and more than half a million dollars over the President’s request for the coming fiscal year.

For those who might be unaware, the Women’s Bureau within the Department of Labor conducts research to help departmental agencies develop policies that advance the interests of working women. It plans and executes research and advises other agencies on the structure and implementation of a wide range of worker programs.

Unfortunately, the President’s budget request for next fiscal year sought to cut more than three-quarters of the existing Women’s Bureau while still allowing the BLS Prices and Cost of Living Division to be funded at almost $9 million. Thankfully, this bill does better than the request. My simple hope is that we can go one small step further and fund this program next year at the level it is currently funded at. That is all my amendment seeks to do.

I urge my colleagues to support funding for the Women’s Bureau within the Department of Labor at existing funding levels while offsetting this change with funds in a manner that still permits the BLS Prices and Cost of Living Division to be funded almost $3.5 million above the current enacted level and almost half a million above the President’s request.

Mr. Chair, I urge support for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MITCHELL). The Acting Chair offers the gentleman from the Northerm Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 137 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 138 OFFERED BY MS. MENG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 138 printed in House Report 115–297.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, I have no further speakers. I ask my friends and colleagues to please support this lifesaving amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Acting Chair offers the amendment introduced by the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Acting Chair offers the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG) were dispensed with and the amendment rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 139 OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 139 printed in House Report 115–297.
Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 717, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $1) (decreased by $1)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment highlights the need to think about our future workforce and how it will change because of technology and to encourage the Bureau of Labor Statistics to accept a wider and more forward-looking range of inputs into its range of projections for its workforce of the future.

I chair the New Democrat Coalition Future of Work Task Force with my colleagues, Congressman SETH MOULTON and Congressman JARED POLIS. Congressman JIM Himes, the chair of the New Dem Coalition, has been active in the task force work and joins me in cosponsoring this amendment today.

Over the course of several months, the task force has held a series of forums to hear from experts on various areas that will require this body’s attention in the coming years and decades. We have heard from historians, economists, and policy experts about how technological revolutions of the past have impacted social and political institutions and how lessons from those experiences and from current conditions can help us prepare for the future.

We have also heard from labor and business leaders who are pioneering the way they attract talent, retain their skilled employees, and develop skills for the increasingly rapidly change economy. It is nearly unanimous among our experts that the economy will change significantly and change faster, but it is less clear just how quickly the workforce will need to adapt.

For decades, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has been doing excellent and invaluable work to track our labor market trends, and its projections have been proven very reliable and useful—to businesses and to our educators—in times of slower and relatively predictable technological development.

However, they are based on historical data and historical trends, and some of the anticipated changes in technology—such as robotics, self-driving vehicles, and artificial intelligence—could fundamentally change our economy in ways that haven’t been seen before. So, in its current form, the way the Bureau calculates and estimates future development of the workforce may not be able to capture the dramatic changes that our future holds.

One panel convened by the task force suggested that it would be impossible to do projections in any single way to predict the workforce, but that, with additional resources, the Bureau of Labor Statistics could model for a variety of scenarios of different rates of technological change in different areas. My amendment increases the BLS account by a dollar and decreases it by a dollar, and I intend it to mean that the BLS should submit to Congress an estimate of the resources it would need to make a range of forward-looking estimates amenable with those industries that are driving this rapid technological change and those that will be affected by that change to account for the increasing rate of technological job displacement.

It is hard to estimate by backward-looking extrapolations how the changes from self-driving cars and vehicles or artificial intelligence will affect the real jobs of the future. Technological changes in the workforce are not new. The industrial revolution and the automation of agriculture transformed the way work was performed in our country and significantly improved, on the whole, our standard of living over time.

The results have not been uniform for all communities and all populations. Those transformations typically played out over generations, so our social and political institutions had ample time to respond. But today, development and deployment of technology is far more rapid, and Congress, business, and our educational system need the best possible data to evaluate policy proposals and to produce the workforce training needed for future employees and to develop educational curricula to ensure that our economy works for everyone.

Like in the industrial revolution, technological development presents the opportunity for a greatly improved standard of living, but it will also bring challenges and opportunities. Businesses, communities, and the government must work together.

Additional considerations in the projections made by the BLS will help Congress to anticipate these changes and to weigh proposed solutions. Objective projections based on empirical evidence are crucial to a debate that will be based on our different views of the role of government and its relationship with market forces. Those are the differences that should shape our ideas for helping Americans enjoy prosperous and full lives in the future.

I urge my colleagues to join me and vote “yes” on my amendment to begin to establish a range of scenarios for the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the future world that we will inhabit.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not object to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection. The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman’s amendment has no net impact on the amendment, so I do not oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. FOSTER. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 141 OFFERED BY MS. MENG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 141 printed in House Report 115–297.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE Lujan Grisham), and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 734, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $5,000,000)”.

Page 770, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $5,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to encourage my colleagues to support my amendment, which simply increases funding for the Behavioral Health Workforce and Training program by $5 million. This is a reasonable show of support for this important program, which saw its funding cut in half in this bill.

The Behavioral Health Workforce and Training program supports education and training for careers in behavioral health at institutions of higher education and through professional and paraprofessional training programs, with a focus on rural and medically underserved communities. This program was created as part of the 21st Century Cures Act in response to the significant nationwide shortage of behavioral health providers.

According to SAMHSA, 55 percent of U.S. counties do not have a practicing behavioral health provider, and 77 percent of counties reported unmet behavioral health needs. These statistics would be alarming at any time, but they are particularly concerning in the midst of a national opioid epidemic. A 2010 Surgeon General’s Report found that only 10 percent of people with a substance abuse disorder receive any type of specialty treatment. Additionally, 60 percent of adults with a mental illness didn’t receive mental health services in the previous year.

This lack of access to services has severe consequences for the individuals seeking treatment, their families, and
our communities. When they don’t have access to treatment, individuals with behavioral health needs receive a whole different set of services. Jails and sometimes emergency rooms become the de facto behavioral health systems.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to make this important investment in the behavioral health workforce, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from New York, representing the gentlewoman from New Mexico, raises a very important point.

The amendment offered is for an increase to a workforce training program. Our committee understands the value of this program, which is why we did not accept the administration’s budget request which actually terminated the program. We were able to fund it, though, below last year’s level.

Our committee received an allocation of $11,124,000 for this program, which was lower than fiscal year 2017, and as I have explained several times before and doubtless will again, we had to make some very tough decisions. I do pledge to work with the gentlewoman as we work toward the fiscal year 2018 final bill. At this time, though, I must oppose the amendment and urge its rejection.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is now in order to consider amendment No. 142 printed in House Reports 297.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 734, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $24,800,000)”.

Page 770, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by $4,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment that I have offered to increase funding for the very successful Healthy Start program, adding $21.8 million to match the President’s funding request.

The Healthy Start program helps infants start out life with the support they need to grow into successful adults. It provides prenatal care, basic health needs, and promotes positive parenting practices for thousands of children.

It is especially important to the people of my hometown, as I mentioned before, and many other communities trying to work through exposure to high levels of lead, which is a national issue. Of course, we now know there is no cure, but the way we treat and the support we provide these youngsters often gives them a chance to overcome these sorts of developmental challenges.

Healthy Start is a critical way to do that by helping infants and their families mitigate the effects of that lead exposure.

Flint’s ongoing process brought to light the nationwide issues that we face in drinking water. People are more aware of these issues and the impacts they can have on families. So it is incumbent upon us to do everything we can not just to repair the damage, but to actually help those who are struggling to get through these sorts of developmental challenges.

Healthy Start is a proven program. It does that. It is one of the reasons that I essentially take the same position that President Trump is taking: we should have a greater investment in Healthy Start. I don’t often find myself in that position, but in this case, I am willing to assert that on this floor.

Early childhood education gives kids, regardless of their socioeconomic background, a chance. I think it is our duty to give every child a fair chance to succeed. That is what this amendment is intended to do.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend for his amendment. I wish I could support it, quite frankly, because I very much support Healthy Start and very much appreciate his support for that program.
The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment that redirects $120 million from CMS overhead spending, which is a 3/2 percent reduction, towards increasing funding in three specific areas: $40 million for pediatric research, $40 million for Alzheimer's research, and $40 million to address our country's opioid crisis.

The approval of this amendment will motivate CMS to curtail punitive bureaucratic culture. Today, hardworking American families are demanding that their government find competent solutions for a struggling healthcare system, and CMS' failure to properly implement the Taking Essential Steps for Testing Act of 2012—or the TEST Act, as it is more commonly known—is a notable example of bureaucratic incompetence.

American families expect the Federal Government to work with healthcare providers, not against them, to ensure the efficient delivery of healthcare. In 2012, the TEST Act was passed and signed into law due to the mandatory and harsh sanctions that CMS was then imposing on hospitals and labs that violated the Clinical Laboratory Improvements Amendments Act—or CLIA, for short.

While CLIA regulations are necessary, in some instances, the sanctions that CMS imposed against hospitals and labs the time that inadvertently violated the statute were found to be draconian and at odds with the efficient delivery of healthcare. At the time the TEST Act was considered in 2012, Congress determined that there were instances where a hospital or laboratory's violations were accidental, unintentional, and resulted in no patient harm.

At the time, CMS lacked the flexibility to align the severity of the sanctions for minor and inadvertent actions at the lab, resulting in needless punitive penalties, such as revoking lab certificates and banning principals from owning or operating certified laboratories.

The TEST Act was passed in 2012 to provide CMS with needed discretion to substitute reasonable alternative sanctions in the event of minor or inadvertent violations. In lieu of the previously mandatory sanctions, the TEST Act allowed the appropriate remedies like directed plans of action, onsite monitoring, and/or modest monetary penalties.

Yet, despite being given this mandate and this flexibility, CMS has written its regulations and interpreted the underlying statute in a way that are clearly at odds with Congress' intent in the TEST Act. There are serious impacts when CMS fails to use their congressionally mandated discretionary authority to issue appropriate sanctions.

Healthcare providers are forced to divert scarce resources to severe penalties, to oppressive settlements, and/or to a costly appeals process. These would not be needed if CMS had properly implemented the TEST Act. This diverts scarce resources from patient care to dealing with an out-of-control CMS, and negatively impacts healthcare in our communities.

I would like to explain to my district where a nonprofit faith-based community hospital committed an unintentional CLIA violation that resulted in no patient harm. The hospital then self-reported that violation, as we would expect any healthcare provider to do.

This hospital is my community's only level II trauma center and provides a significant amount of uncompensated care to the lower income population, including minority families. Yet, rather than working collaboratively with the hospital, CMS ignored the TEST Act and, instead, imposed crippling sanctions and forced the hospital to engage in a burdensome appeals process.

This action will cost this important community resource over $100 million per year. This arbitrary unwarranted action by CMS forces the hospital to divert finite resources toward an unnecessary bureaucratic process instead of taking care of patients.

CMS needs to change its implementation of the TEST Act to follow the law. In the meantime, my amendment sends a message that this is not how we expect our Federal Government to act in a time when we are articulating a new vision for building a better American healthcare system.

The approval of the amendment will motivate CMS to curtail its punitive bureaucratic culture. Today, hardworking American families are demanding that their government find competent solutions for a struggling healthcare system, and CMS' failure to properly implement the Taking Essential Steps for Testing Act of 2012—or the TEST Act, as it is more commonly known—is a notable example of bureaucratic incompetence.

American families expect the Federal Government to work with healthcare providers, not against them, to ensure the efficient delivery of healthcare. In 2012, the TEST Act was passed and signed into law due to the mandatory and harsh sanctions that CMS was then imposing on hospitals and labs that violated the Clinical Laboratory Improvements Amendments Act—or CLIA, for short.

While CLIA regulations are necessary, in some instances, the sanctions that CMS imposed against hospitals and labs the time that inadvertently violated the statute were found to be draconian and at odds with the efficient delivery of healthcare. At the time the TEST Act was considered in 2012, Congress determined that there were instances where a hospital or laboratory's violations were accidental, unintentional, and resulted in no patient harm.

At the time, CMS lacked the flexibility to align the severity of the sanctions for minor and inadvertent actions at the lab, resulting in needless punitive penalties, such as revoking lab certificates and banning principals from owning or operating certified laboratories.

The TEST Act was passed in 2012 to provide CMS with needed discretion to substitute reasonable alternative sanctions in the event of minor or inadvertent violations. In lieu of the previously mandatory sanctions, the TEST Act allowed the appropriate remedies like directed plans of action, onsite monitoring, and/or modest monetary penalties.

Yet, despite being given this mandate and this flexibility, CMS has written its regulations and interpreted the underlying statute in a way that are clearly at odds with Congress' intent in the TEST Act. There are serious impacts when CMS fails to use their congressionally mandated discretionary authority to issue appropriate sanctions.

Healthcare providers are forced to divert scarce resources to severe penalties, to oppressive settlements, and/or to a costly appeals process. These would not be needed if CMS had properly implemented the TEST Act. This diverts scarce resources from patient care to dealing with an out-of-control CMS, and negatively impacts healthcare in our communities.

I would like to explain to my district where a nonprofit faith-based community hospital committed an unintentional CLIA violation that resulted in no patient harm. The hospital then self-reported that violation, as we would expect any healthcare provider to do.

This hospital is my community's only level II trauma center and provides a significant amount of uncompensated care to the lower income population, including minority families. Yet, rather than working collaboratively with the hospital, CMS ignored the TEST Act and, instead, imposed crippling sanctions and forced the hospital to engage in a burdensome appeals process.

This action will cost this important community resource over $100 million per year. This arbitrary unwarranted action by CMS forces the hospital to divert finite resources toward an unnecessary bureaucratic process instead of taking care of patients.

CMS needs to change its implementation of the TEST Act to follow the law. In the meantime, my amendment sends a message that this is not how we expect our Federal Government to act in a time when we are articulating a new vision for building a better American healthcare system.

This amendment does this by reducing CMS spending on bureaucracy by $120 million and directing those funds toward true solutions for better healthcare by finding cures for pediatric cancer, Alzheimer's, and opioid abuse.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I have considerable sympathy with my friend's concerns. Frankly, I think he has certainly every right to be concerned about a hospital in his district. I certainly agree with an effort to put additional funding for the opioid epidemic, for pediatric cancer, and for Alzheimer's disease. These are all critical issues facing our country.

Nevertheless, I must oppose the amendment. The bill actually includes $126 million within the CDC for surveillance and prevention of opioid misuse, which continues the large increase provided in fiscal year 2017. The bill also provides a $1.1 billion increase for the National Institutes of Health, which would provide a target increase of $400 million for research on Alzheimer's disease, as well as increases for each institute center, including the National Institute of General Medical Sciences.
Cancer Institute, to support vital research on diseases such as pediatric cancer.

Furthermore, the bill also continues to provide funds authorized in the 21st Century Cures Act, including $300 million for the Cancer Moonshot, and $500 million for opioid abuse.

Finally, the reduction of funding at CMS proposed by my friend would weaken the agency’s ability to properly and administer Medicare and Medicaid. So for that reason, I must oppose my friend’s amendment.

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chair, the bottom line is that hardworking American families are tired of having unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats ignore congressional intent when implementing legislation such as the important TRUST Act.

We must send a message to CMS today. Now is the time to right this wrong. In the meantime, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment to cut CMS by 3 percent, $120 million, and to block funding for pediatric cancer, for Alzheimer’s, and for opioid treatment. This amendment is a win-win amendment for American healthcare.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I strongly support additional funding for the CDC, the National Cancer Institute, and the National Institute on Aging. I have spent my time in Congress fighting for those agencies. In fact, over the past 2 years, Democrats on the Labor-HHS Subcommittee have worked closely with Chairman Tom Cole to increase the NIH budget by $2 billion annually, and I hope we are able to do it again this year.

But this amendment is fundamentally flawed because it slashes $120 million from the CMS Program Management. Keep in mind that the CMS Program Management account is already cut by a $524 million in the underlying bill. That is a 13 percent cut. This amendment would increase that cut to more than 16 percent.

According to HHS, over 143 million Americans will rely on programs administered by CMS, including Medicare, Medicaid, CHIP, and the Federal health insurance exchanges.

Why would my colleagues in the majority support more than $600 million in cuts to the Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP programs?

Slashing their administrative budgets by 16 percent is certain to harm services that impact Americans on a daily basis. These cuts will directly harm America’s seniors, the blind, low- and middle-income families, children with special needs, and Americans with chronic conditions like end-stage renal disease, as well as pregnant mothers and newborns.

CMS programs face historic growth in the years to come. A cut of $644 million to its administrative budget would open up the program to mismanagement, fraud, and abuse.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 150 OFFERED BY MS. TENNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 150 printed in House Report 115–297.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 741, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $10,000,000)”.

Page 763, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $10,000,000)”.

Page 764, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $10,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to increase funding to the Community Services Block Grant program. As my good friend from New York knows, that program was actually zeroed out in the administration’s budget. We replaced $600 million of $755 million, but it clearly is an important program to many Members on both sides of the aisle, has a superb reputation, and we are going to do everything that we possibly can to build upon that and get back to at least the fiscal year 2017 level.

The gentlewoman’s leadership in this is greatly appreciated, and we look forward to working with her as we go forward.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chairman, because of Chairman Cole’s great willingness to work with us on this, and I want to assure that we will work with her. I appreciate her concern for the Community Services Block Grant program. As my good friend from New York knows, that program was actually zeroed out in the administration’s budget. We replaced $600 million of $755 million, but it clearly is an important program to many Members on both sides of the aisle, has a superb reputation, and we are going to do everything that we possibly can to build upon that and get back to at least the fiscal year 2017 level.

The gentlewoman’s leadership in this is greatly appreciated, and we look forward to working with her as we go forward.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chairman, because of Chairman Cole’s great willingness to work with and help the truly needy people in our communities, I am going to be withdrawing my amendment this evening. I look forward to working with Chairman Cole as we move forward in this process, and I just want to say thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 152 OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 152 printed in House Report 115–297.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 741, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $3,819,000)”.

In my district, the Mohawk Valley Community Action Agency in Utica has received more than $640,000 from the CSBG program, which they have used to support Head Start programming that promotes early childhood development, and the Energy Assistance Program, which helps seniors meet ever-rising energy costs in the very cold Northeast.

All told, the CSBG program accounts for more than $55 million in financial assistance to New York, which touches the lives of more than 705,000 New Yorkers. This number includes more than 46,000 individuals with disabilities and more than 317,000 children in my district. Cuts to this program will have a disproportionate impact on some of the most at-risk and forgotten constituents in our district.
Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I re-
demand the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentle-
t賴woman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK). Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield my thanks and gratitude, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question was taken; and the Acting CHAIR announced that the noes polled 219,620,000, and the ayes polled 11,710,000.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to unanimous consent, thegentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's concern. She is a very valuable member of the sub-
committee. This is an area in which she not only has considerable passion, but considerable expertise. However, as the gentlewoman also knows, we have an allocation well below last year's level, and we had to make, again, a difficult decision.

Reduction of this magnitude of the Health and Human Services' admin-
istrative functions would eliminate the core funding for the Secretary's office completely, and for that reason I would oppose the amendment.

However, I want the gentlewoman and, certainly, our good mutual friend from Connecticut whom she is rep-
dresenting tonight to know that, as we work with our colleagues in the Senate on a bill to reach the President's desk, I intend to work on these issues with her and with my friends on both sides of the aisle to address the concerns that she raised in her remarks.

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentle-
t赖woman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

The question was taken; and the Acting CHAIR announced that the noes appeared to have 219,620,000, and the ayes polled 11,710,000.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-
cedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.
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Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OLSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.
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The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 0, not voting 43, as follows: (Roll No. 485)

YEAS—399

Abraham
Adams
Adherolt
Aguilur
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Bakin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Berman
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MO)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bos
Boyle, Brendan P.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braxton
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Browne
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burr
Burell
Bush
Bustos
Byers
Calvert
Capuano
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Handel
Harrer
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Isa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (NV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katz
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kristol (TN)
Kuster (NH)
Lahood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipton
LeBoutillier
Lebo
Leach
Leggo
Lengend
Lentz
Love
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luhan, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Mackoul
Marchant
Marshall
Marsh
Mateu
McAuliffe
McClintock
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McMorris
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meehan
Meeks
Mitchell
Moolemen
Moroney (WY)
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Musgrave
Napolitano
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norris
O’Halleran
O’Rourke
Olver
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarella
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Peters
Pettersen
Pittenger
Pocan
Poliquin
Pols
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (NC)
Ridley
Richmond
Robb
Roar
Rooney
Romney
Roos
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Raskin
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ranzier
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schaak
Schiff
Schoenker
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shinkins
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Soto
Tibbetts
Walorski
Walker
Walden
Walberg
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walters, Mimi
Waltz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Webster (FL)
Wenzler
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The vote was four to two, in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Authorizing use of Emancipation Hall for ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to Filipino Veterans of World War II

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Administration be discharged from further consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 23, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROSTEY) asked for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Concurrent Resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall for ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to Filipino Veterans of World War II

(a) Authorization.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on October 25, 2017, for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the Filipino Veterans of World War II in recognition of their dedicated military service.

(b) Preparations.—Physical preparations for the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall for ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to Filipino Veterans of World War II

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker’s table the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 49) condemning the violence and domestic terrorist attack that took place during events between August 11 and August 12, 2017, in Charlottesville, Virginia, recognizing the
first responders who lost their lives while monitoring the events, offering deepest condolences to the families and friends of those individuals who were killed and deepest sympathies and support to those individuals who were injured by the violence, expressing support for the Charlottesville community, rejecting White nationalists, White supremacists, the Ku Klux Klan, neo-Nazis, and other hate groups, and urging the President and the President's Cabinet to use all available resources to counter the threats posed by those groups, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S. J. RES. 49

Whereas, on the afternoon of Sunday, August 11, 2017, a day before a White nationalist demonstration was scheduled to occur in Charlottesville, Virginia, hundreds of torch-bearing White nationalists, White supremacists, Klanists, neo-Nazis, and other hate groups chanted racist, anti-Semitic, and anti-immigrant slogans and violently engaged with counter-demonstrators on and around the grounds of the University of Virginia in Charlottesville;

Whereas, on Saturday, August 12, 2017, ahead of the scheduled start time of the planned march, protestors and counter-demonstrators gathered at Emancipation Park in Charlottesville;

Whereas the extremist demonstration turned violent, culminating in the death of peaceful counter-demonstrator Heather Heyer and injuries to 19 other individuals after a neo-Nazi sympathizer allegedly drove a vehicle into a crowd, an act that resulted in a charge of second degree murder, 3 counts of malicious wounding, and 1 count of hit and run;

Whereas 2 Virginia State Police officers, Lieutenant H. Jay Cullen and Trooper Pilot Berke M.M. Bates, died in a helicopter crash as they patrolled the events occurring below them;

Whereas the Charlottesville community is engaging in a healing process following this horrific and violent display of bigotry; and

Whereas White nationalists, White supremacists, the Ku Klux Klan, neo-Nazis, and other hate groups reportedly are organizing similar events in other cities in the United States and communities everywhere are concerned about the growing and open display of hate and violence being perpetrated by those groups; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress—

(1) condemns the racist violence and domestic terrorist attack that took place between August 11 and August 12, 2017, in Charlottesville, Virginia;

(2) recognizes—

(A) Heather Heyer, who was killed, and 19 other individuals who were injured in the reported domestic terrorist attack; and

(B) several other individuals who were injured in separate attacks while standing up to hate and intolerance;

(3) recognizes the public service and heroism of Virginia State Police officers Lieutenant H. Jay Cullen and Trooper Pilot Berke M.M. Bates, who lost their lives while responding to the events from the air;

(4) offers—

(A) condolences to the families and friends of Heather Heyer, Lieutenant H. Jay Cullen, and Trooper Pilot Berke M.M. Bates; and

(B) sympathy and support to those individuals who are recovering from injuries sustained during the attacks;

(5) expresses support for the Charlottesville community and the city of Charlottesville for following this demonstration of violent bigotry;

(6) rejects White nationalism, White supremacy, and neo-Nazism as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contradictory to the values that define the people of the United States; and

(7) urges—

(A) the President and his administration to—

(i) speak out against hate groups that espouse racism, extremism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, and White supremacy; and

(ii) the heads of other Federal agencies to improve the reporting of hate crimes and to emphasize the importance of the collection, and the reporting to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of hate crime data by State and local agencies.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.


The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3364.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) kindly rise to the chair.

☐ 1856

In the Committee of the Whole

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, with Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 154 printed in House Report 115-297 offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) had been postponed.
them treatment, the idea of assisted outpatient treatment is, when a pa-
tient can be stabilized by remaining on their medication, by having their coun-
seling, perhaps supportive housing, supportive education, supportive em-
ployment, their life can turn around.

So what is it a court, judge, protecting this person’s own rights, civil rights on every level, will say to this person: I am not going to involun-
tarily commit you to a hospital. Your crime doesn’t rise to the level—it is not a-thinking that it doesn’t rise to the level of prison, but what they say is: We are going to re-
quire, however, that you stay in treat-
ment, require that you take your medi-
cation, that you stay in counseling, and you do other things as prescribed by the
court.

Now, most States allow this, but here is the problem: in many counties in America, they don’t have the ability to pay the administrative costs to handle this. So a amendment provides a mechanism whereby people can do this.

So understand, the assisted out-
patient treatment is a civil-legal pro-
cedure whereby a judge can order an individual with a serious mental illness to follow an ordered treatment plan in the community.

Here is another thing about this: Does it work? And the answer is yes. In a Duke University study of the New York AOT program, it said 90 percent of those AOT patients more likely to keep appointments or to take medication; 88 percent said they and their case manager agreed on what is important for them to work on; 87 percent of them said they were com-
petent in their case manager’s ability to help them; 87 percent had fewer in-
carcerations; 83 percent had fewer ex-
eriences arrests—and the point is, they had an increased number of ar-
rests prior to being in AOT, and then afterwards it declined precipitously.

Eighty-one percent said AOT helped them get and to stay well; 97 percent fewer experienced homelessness; 55 percent fewer experi-
enced suicide attempts or physical harm to themselves; 49 percent fewer abused alcohol; 48 percent fewer abused drugs; 47 percent fewer physically harmed others; 46 percent fewer damaged property; and costs were cut in half.

This small amount of money—and be-
lieve me, it would cost perhaps 10 or 20 times more to really do this thor-
oughly—is there to help people in men-
tal health care. We could either them-
tinue to throw people in jail, continue to see crimes happen—and by the way,
when a mentally ill person is in prison, 80 percent of them get no treatment. We put them back on the streets and the problem remains.

The House passed this. It came out of committee unanimously. We need to do this for America. We don’t want to read more statistics on a mentally ill person who harmed someone, primarily because they were not in treatment.

This is our opportunity to save lives. This is our opportunity to do some-
thing about this. And I do ask that the House pass this small amendment out of an existing budget, ready to be pending, to provide an additional $5 million for assisted outpatient treatment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman and want to begin by ac-
knowledging that my very good friend is the recognized expert in this House on all matters related to mental health and has probably done more on behalf of this cause than anybody in this Chamber in very many years. So it was with considerable surprise that I opposed this particular amendment, earlier, when we actually accepted.

But the amendment increases fund-
ning for programs currently funded at $15 million, the same as last year. As a amendment actually received an allocation that was lower than last year, and we had lim-
ited resources to provide increases.

But in recognition of the importance of the Assisted Outpatient Treatment Program, my committee maintained funding for the program at its current levels.

I want to assure my friend, I intend to work with him during the process as we negotiate with the Senate. I would expect we probably will have a dif-
erent allocation. We may be able to revisit this issue, and I would hope that we can, and certainly will, work with my friend.

But at this time, I simply must op-
pose this amendment so we can stay within our current allocation.

Madam Chair, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Madam Chair, before I dis-
cuss this amendment, I would just like to take a minute to offer my and all of our condolences to honor the memory of Congresswoman DELAURo’s dear mother, Luisa DeLauro, who passed away at the age of 103 this weekend. As Congresswoman DELAURo always said, her mother was a fearless champion for women’s equality, and I hope that ton-
ight we can really think about Con-
grresswoman DeLauro, her family, and her mother, and offer our sincere con-

dolences to her.

Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment which would shift an additional $5 million away from SAMHSA’s existing mental health pro-
gress. In the bill under consideration today, SAMHSA’s mental health pro-
gress are already cut by $231 million. That is a 20 percent cut.

Unfortunately, this amendment would further reduce funding for crit-
ical SAMHSA programs such as Mental Health First Aid, Suicide Prevention, and the National Child Traumatic Stress Network. We need to be increas-
ing support for mental health services, not robbing Peter to pay Paul by shift-
ing money from one program to another.

Now, by profession, I am a psychi-
atriac social worker, and I founded a community mental health center. Be-
lieve me, I personally know the impact and the need, the unmet need, for addi-
tional funding for mental health ser-

dices.

As my colleagues and I have noted, the allocations approved by the com-
mittee are approximately $5 billion below the nondefense level allowed under the Budget Control Act. That is $5 billion down.

We have the resources available, yet the majority refuses to allocate them to support critical programs such as mental health and substance abuse services. This bill is $5 billion below the fiscal 2017 funding level.

That is why Members are being forced to rob critical programs to transfer funding to other programs. We need to negotiate a budget deal that lifts the sequestration caps and provides significant funding for mental health and substance abuse pro-
gress for individuals who need them.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chair, as the designee of Ranking Member LOWEY, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of amendment 155, the assisted outpatient treatment, $5 million in-
crease; $20 million total.

As the original cosponsor of H.R. 2646, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2016, I recognize the importance of funding for out-
patient treatment.

As a former chief psychiatric nurse at the VA hospital in Dallas, Texas, I have witnessed the unintended con-
sequences of the deinstitutionalization process. Many of my own patients, di-
agnosed with severe mental illnesses, were discharged with 30 days of pre-
scription medicines and did not have stable housing.

Once they ran out of their prescrip-
tions, their condition worsened, they suffered psychotic breaks, and they be-
came homeless or incarcerated. Indi-

viduals with untreated psychiatric ill-
ness make up one-third of the Na-
tion’s estimated homeless population. That totals 600,000.

In Texas, there are 35,000 incarcer-
ated individuals with a severe mental illness, but only 4,500 psychiatric beds are available in all of the Texas hos-
pitals combined.

This amendment increases court-or-
dered assisted outpatient treatment by
$5 million to meet the fully authorized amount of $20 million in support of the severely mentally ill, thereby allowing them to get treatment in the community without incarceration or hospitalization.

This outpatient treatment reduces incarceration, homelessness, and emergency room visits by upwards of 70 percent.

I urge support of this amendment. This country has neglected the mentally ill, and this country is suffering because of it. We have got to recognize the need, and I urge everyone to support this amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I just want to say, investing in the AOT program, Congress says it is worth it to ensure the most vulnerable among us have the treatment they need, instead of being in Eols, or jails.

This pilot is extremely important. It saves money. It saves lives. And for Members to reflect back on this, I hope they would rather say: I helped fund a program known to save lives. SAMHSA has been reported many times by the GAO to waste a lot of money. This saves lives, and I urge people to vote for this amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 156 OFFERED BY MR. KELLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 156 printed in House Report 115–297.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 763, line 3, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $5,000,000) (increased by $5,000,000)"

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment No. 156.

Over the past 25 years, infant adoptions have decreased, and only about 1 percent of pregnant women choose adoption. While there are approximately 2 million couples waiting to adopt in the United States, there were only 18,329 domestic infant adoptions in 2014.

Unfortunately, too many women who have encountered unplanned pregnancies report not receiving adequate information about adoption. Everyone facing an unplanned pregnancy should be able to receive, and noncoercive information about adoption that helps them make their own fully informed decision.

In 2000, Congress authorized the Infant Adoption Awareness Training Program. This program awards grants to adoption organizations to train healthcare workers who offer health services to expectant mothers and are trained to provide adoption information and referral.

In the year 2000, the program annually delivered training to an estimated 10,000 healthcare workers nationwide. This program was phased out in 2010.

This bill funds adoption awareness programs at $39.1 million. My amendment designates $5 million of that funding to restart the Infant Adoption Awareness Training Program with the goal of ensuring that expectant mothers have access to timely, accurate information about adoptions.

I also support the administration’s effort to fund activities to improve hospital-based adoption support services for our expectant mothers. I urge them to continue this hospital-based program to ensure that mothers who wish to make an adoption have access to comprehensive support throughout the entire adoption process.

Adoption is a bipartisan issue, and it is vital that individuals who are providing health services to expectant mothers are trained to properly provide adoption information and referral.

Madam Chair, I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. KELLY. Madam Chair, I don’t rise to oppose. I just want to commend my friend for bringing this issue and highlighting it. We think it is very important.

We wanted to note that we support what he is trying to do. We certainly accept the amendment, and we look forward to working with him through the process to help achieve the objectives that he stated.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Madam Chair, this amendment cuts $5 million from the account that funds, mind you, Head Start, Runaway and Homeless Youth grants, and the Community Services Block Grant, among other critical programs, and uses it to provide $5 million in new funding for the Infant Adoption Awareness Training Program. Now, this program does not receive funding in fiscal year ’17.

Women should have access to all options when considering the impacts of an unintended pregnancy, of which one is adoption. But we should not ignore the irreplaceable role of preventing unintended pregnancy by providing education and health services.

The underlying bill limits women’s access to care by prohibiting funding to the Title X Family Planning program, a program specifically created to ensure women have access to high-quality family planning services to prevent unintended pregnancies and access reproductive care services. By denying women access to comprehensive family planning and reproductive health services, the bill would have a devastating impact on women and families, especially low-income women and women in rural communities.

In 2014, Title X Family Planning centers helped women report 961,000—that is, 904,000—unintended pregnancies. Without the services provided by these Title X clinics, the rates of unintended pregnancy in the United States, unplanned birth and abortion, each would have been 33 percent higher, and the teen pregnancy rate would have been 30 percent higher.

In addition, Title X providers are required to offer pregnant women the opportunity to provide information and counseling regarding all of their options—all of their options—in a neutral, nondirective, and factual manner, including adoption. For some women, adoption services and counseling may be the best option. But we must ensure that every woman has all options and is allowed to make the choice that is best for her and her family.

Unfortunately, this bill represents yet another missed opportunity to get serious about reproductive health and preventing unintended pregnancy in this country. This amendment uses funding from other programs in the Children and Families Services account that are critical to the well-being of children, women, and families as an offset for this new program. Funding for Head Start, the Domestic Violence Hotline, programs that help serve and protect runaway and homeless youth, among others, are at risk.

Madam Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman. I do share her concern. That is why we are asking for $5 million of the $39.1 million be used to expand expectant mothers the opportunity to learn fully and make a decision based on what they want to do. It is about education. It is about making them fully aware.
The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MITCHELL). The question is on the amendment of—

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chair, as I close, while this amendment focuses on adoption services, we cannot ignore what is missed in the bill and from this process, and that is an opportunity to vote on the amendment to fund Title X Family Planning. We must restore funding for family planning services; invest in a comprehensive approach that prioritizes health promotion, education, services, and care; and an approach that includes sex education programs, better access to birth control, and reproductive health services.

I am extremely concerned about the cut that this amendment imposes on the Children and Families account at HHS. I oppose this amendment. This is cutting funds from Head Start, Runaway and Homeless Youth grants, and the Community Services Block Grant, among other critical programs.

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman’s comments. What this is really about is 2 million couples willing to adopt. It is hard for me to stand here today and say that it would be a much different world if people were really given the opportunity to understand what their options are and be able to fulfill the wishes of over 2 million couples in the United States who are looking to adopt a child. I think that is incredibly important, and I don’t understand why we couldn’t look at something like that and say this is about adoption. That is all it is about.

Now, this is fully endorsed, by the way, by the National Council for Adoption.

At this time, I would also offer my condolences to Ms. DELATO for the loss of her mother. She is a fine lady, and I am sure that, no matter what, she will look back on the years she spent with her mother and cherish every one of those.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MITCHELL). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee of the Whole continue its sitting.

The Acting CHAIR. As the Committee of the Whole arose earlier in its sitting, the amendment No. 156 printed in House Report 155–297, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 156 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 156 printed in House Report 155–297, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) had been disposed of.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will now present the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 767, line 24, insert “(increased by $51,000,000)” after the dollar amount.

Page 767, line 46, delete “(increased by $64,000,000)” after the 1st dollar amount.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to increase funding for senior nutrition programs under title III of the Older Americans Act. My amendment funds these programs at levels authorized by the House just last year.

We are in the middle of an unprecedented demographic shift as this country ages. The population of older adults is growing faster than at any point in history. As we grow older, we all want people across the country to be able to age with dignity, health, and independence in their own homes and communities for as long as possible.

For more than 50 years, the Older Americans Act has supported community-based providers that reach more than 11 million seniors and caregivers annually in each and every one of our districts providing person-centered assistance to help people age in place. These critical OAA services include home-delivered and congregate meals to make sure that older adults are getting the nutrition they need to stay healthy and engaged, which reduces the risk of falls, depression, and other negative outcomes.

Just a few weeks ago, I had the pleasure of joining dedicated volunteers to deliver Meals on Wheels to seniors in northwest Oregon. I highly recommend this to my colleagues. You can see firsthand the value of these programs and how important these meals and visits are to our constituents who rely on them.

The Older Americans Act also covers transportation to get older adults to the doctor, the grocery store, or even to a local senior center to engage with friends and avoid isolation. The OAA funds critical disaster assistance response efforts for seniors and communities like those just devastated by Hurricanes Harvey and Irma.

Unfortunately, funding for the Older Americans Act has drastically lagged behind the growth in the older adult population, the increasing need for services, and the rising cost of delivering these supports. This stagnant and, in some areas, eroding Federal investment in OAA programs costs us more in the long term. When seniors can’t stay healthy at home, they end up in hospitals paid for by Medicare or in institutional long-term care, often funded by Medicaid. Both are far more expensive than adequate investments in the Older Americans Act to keep our seniors healthy at home for as long as possible.

Support for the Older Americans Act is strongly bipartisan. Last year, Congress voted without opposition to authorize the Older Americans Act, a bill that included modest increases in authorized funding levels.

Unfortunately, annual appropriations still fall woefully short of these
amounts we clearly and firmly approved. This amendment will increase funding for core OAA programs delivered through title III—which include critical nutrition, home- and community-based support, and caregiver services—to the amounts that were just so broadly supported last year.

These investments in OAA are necessary if we are to provide the person-centered, cost-effective in-home services and supports needed to keep our expanding older population healthy and independent in their homes and communities. This amendment is an essential first step toward rectifying the recent depletion of these important funds for these vital programs.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman’s concern for programs that support vulnerable seniors. In fact, my committee has provided increases for these programs in prior years because, like her, we understand how valuable and important they are to keeping seniors independent in their homes.

As the gentlewoman knows, our subcommittee received an allocation below last year’s level, and we were not in a position to provide another year of increases to these programs. The amendment reduces the administration funds available to the Secretary of Health and Human Services. A reduction of this magnitude would significantly hinder the Secretary’s ability to administer the agency.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who is the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, and is someone who understands the importance of these investments.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Ms. BONAMICI, the vice ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, and is someone who understands the importance of these investments.

The BHWET program helps close the gap in access to behavioral healthcare by establishing partnerships with a broad range of organizations and community partners to ensure a wide recruitment of students, opportunities for field placements, career development, and to provide job placement services.

These efforts will increase the number of able behavioral health providers serving vulnerable populations especially in rural and medically underserved areas.

Peer support has improved health outcomes while lowering healthcare costs. In fact, there is growing evidence that peer support-related strategies can be used as more engaging and successful solutions than current hospital and emergency room care-related options. Peer support programs provide individualized, managed care to those who need it the most.

Many studies have shown the vast benefits to patients who utilize peer support. For example, a 3-year pilot project called the Peer Health Navigation Intervention, or “The Bridge,” showed that peer support, in addition to a variety of other positive outcomes, shifted the focus of healthcare from urgent care and emergency room visits to outpatient primary care.

Furthermore, numerous studies have shown the potential cost savings that the increased implementation of peer support can deliver. A 2006 study demonstrated that, for patients using day treatment, the use of certified peer specialists led to a $5,497 cost reduction per person per year.

Another successful program based out of Denver, Colorado, showed a return on investment of $2.28 for every dollar spent. As evidenced by these and other studies, a small investment in peer support services will greatly reduce healthcare costs in the long run.

The current system for treating behavioral health issues is not sufficient to serve those who need help. It is unacceptable that more than 50 percent of primary care patients with depression go undiagnosed and two-thirds of primary care providers have no ability to prescribe outpatient behavioral health for their patients.

Additionally, dedicated funding for peer support paraprofessionals will be essential in helping address the current lack of access to behavioral health services in our healthcare system.
Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 161 OFFERED BY MRS. LOWEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 161 printed in House Report 115–297.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. LEE), and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 794, line 25, after the dollar amount insert "(decreased by $100,000,000)".

Page 794, line 19, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by $100,000,000)".

Page 794, line 15, after the first dollar amount insert "(increased by $100,000,000)".

Page 794, line 15, after the second dollar amount insert "(increased by $100,000,000)".

Page 794, line 19, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by $100,000,000)".

Page 805, line 25, after the dollar amount insert "(decreased by $100,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, nearly 1.7 million youth from more than 87,000 in my home State of New York, rely on afterschool programs supported through the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program to provide a safe, enriching environment to learn. Yet this bill would cut funding for afterschool programs, leaving tens of thousands of students without educational programs as well as drug and violence prevention counseling, arts, music, recreation, and more.

We should invest more, not less, in our children. This amendment would restore funding to the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program so our students can have access to the safe afterschool enrichment they deserve.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for the amendment and for working with our good friend who couldn’t be here tonight to make sure that this issue that I know she cares deeply about and I know my friend cares deeply about is raised.

I tell the gentlewoman that I will continue work with her as we move forward in the appropriations process this year. I hope we can reach an agreement, particularly in this area.

I understand the gentlelady’s frustration with finding a large enough offset to accommodate the increase she proposes. However, her amendment would actually reduce resources for the Department of Education by nearly a quarter. I think this would jeopardize the Department’s ability to administer the very program she seeks to increase.

So I will reluctantly oppose the amendment at this time. I believe the offset within the Department of Education administrative account is just simply too much.

Again, I want to reiterate to my friend that I look forward to working with her as we go forward and perhaps receiving a different allocation under a House-Senate agreement in the future.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman’s kind and thoughtful words about afterschool programs.

There are over 18 million children whose parents want to take advantage of afterschool programs, but they lack access in the area where they live. That is why we work to fund our national network of afterschool programs through the 21st Century Community Learning Centers initiative.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I just want to say to the distinguished chair that I appreciate his positive comments about this program. I look forward to a better allocation as the process moves forward, and I look forward to having him and colleagues on both sides of the aisle join me in supporting this very important program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to point something out. I am glad I have a chance to speak on this amendment.

When I was growing up, I spent a lot of time before school, a lot of time after school, and a lot of time in summer school being supervised by my parents. They did a great job.

I think before we fall all over ourselves to make sure the government is the one supervising people all the time, we ought to remember it is good to educate the public that parents are responsible for a little of this as well, and nobody loves their kids like their parents.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?
The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding to me. Again, I look forward to working with him and the other members of our committee as we expand the budget.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the distinguished gentleman who spoke before, who grew up in the Bronx, New York, I was fortunate to have my mother not working at the time. She was able to supervise me. I had many wonderful play dates.

I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman, in my community where this program is so essential, many of these people are working two, three jobs. The mother is working two or three jobs; the father is working two or three jobs. For some of these families, there is only one parent.

Perhaps you can come visit my district. I would like you to come to Port Chester, New York. This was one of the first afterschool programs I was fortunate to be able to support with this account. I would love you to come and visit and see what these programs do, which is so important for their parents who want to help and want to be supportive of their children, but sometimes these jobs do stand in the way.

These programs are so very important, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in providing more funding.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, having yielded to people on both sides of the debate, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York will be postponed.

Amendment No. 96 Offered by Mr. COURTNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 164 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 796, line 5, insert after the dollar amount "(reduced by $1,184,000)" (increased by $1,184,000)."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, this, I think, is a very modest amendment, which would restore a cut to the existing 2017 level of support for the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, which is a program which has been around for quite a while. It actually was reauthorized in the Every Student Succeeds Act in 2015, which was a great bipartisan success for K-12 education.

And again, this program provides support for magnet schools all across the country. There are 4,340 magnet schools in the U.S. 3.5 million students benefit from magnet programs, which again, are administered by local school districts and utilize a variety of academic themes such as STEM, Language Immersion, Career and Technical Education, Visual and Performing Arts, just to name a few.

Again, it is a strategy which also provides a regional structure to the student population and promotes diversity. It has done great things in terms of Connecticut in terms of ending racial isolation. In many places, the magnet schools have sort of seen a steady sort of decline from 10 years ago in terms of Federal support for it, and this amendment really is just basically saying enough. I mean, we should, again, restore an amount, which I indicated is very modest, of $1.1 million to this account, and offset and paid for.

And again, I think it just will allow a lot of school districts and communities to continue the great work that they are doing with magnet programs.

I want to conclude my initial remarks by, again, thanking the chairman and also Congresswoman LEE for their kind remarks about my colleague and neighbor from Connecticut, Rosa DeLauro, who lost her mother, Luisa DeLauro, a 103-year-old amazing woman.

We all marvel at ROSA’s energy and passion, but if you have ever met Luisa, you would understand where it came from because she was an amazing woman, just a great inspiration for her daughter who, I think, made her so proud in terms of the great work that she has done in the Congress.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman, quite sincerely, for his amendment. And again, as I will oft repeat tonight, as the gentleman knows, we had to cut $5 billion from this bill, and we had to make some genuinely tough choices.

In this case, we accepted the President’s recommended funding level for magnet schools, and we were also able to increase charter schools, though not by as much as the President requested. Charter schools have demonstrated effectiveness in providing a real choice in quality education for millions of students around the country.

If we have a chance in our allocation in the conference, I will gladly take another look at the Magnet Schools Assistance Program to evaluate additional funding there. I think my friend makes a very good case on their behalf; however, at this time, simply because of reasons of allocation, I will oppose the amendment because it reduces charter school grants, which I strongly support.

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentleman for offering this amendment, and I rise in strong support of it. It restores funding to the Magnet Schools Assistance Program—which the amendment helps assist school districts in promoting desegregation long overdue.

I am glad that we increased this program in fiscal 2017 omnibus by $1 million. That additional funding was intended to allow the program to increase the total number of grantees. I was disappointed to see that the majority took a step back from the progress that we had made and imposed a cut to this program in the underlying bill.

Why in the world would the majority not want to see school segregation ended? This amendment certainly leads us in that direction, and I strongly support it, and I hope you would reconsider your opposition because many of us remember those days.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I consume.

Mr. Chairman, I disagree with my friend about charter schools. Actually, charter schools have provided enormous opportunity for children of every race, every ethnic background. They have been particularly effective. I think, in minority areas, I reject any suggestion that the decisions we made had anything to do with race or racism or that the charter school movement is involved in that. I just don’t think that is the case.

But I do agree on the importance of magnet schools, and if we get a different allocation, we are going to sit down and work with our friends to see
Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 165 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 167 OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF MINNESOTA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 167 printed in House Report 115-207.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

Mr. LEWIS. This amendment increases funding for TRIO and GEAR UP programs with proposed funding $230 million above their 2007 level.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by thanking my friend from Minnesota for the amendment. I am a big fan of career and technical education, and frankly, along with the State of Ohio, Oklahoma probably has the most robust and strongest career technical education program of any State in the country. It is actually something we fund ourselves, for the most part. I would recommend other people do the same.

I am also, you know, frankly, as my friend knows, dealing with a cut of $5 billion from the bill. In this case, the gentleman seeks to cut TRIO funding to pay for his amendment. In my opinion, it is totally misguided.

Since the TRIO program began, it has produced over 5 million college graduates, and those college graduates were almost exclusively from families where no one had ever had the opportunity to go.

This is a proven successful program. It has helped literally millions of first generations of college students, so I strongly support TRIO and will not support cuts in this program; so I, therefore, oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to increase funding for current technical education programs. For some people, pursuing their desired career means securing a college degree.

In my 30-year career in workforce education, I have seen firsthand this
Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would take money from important college access programs, Gear Up and TRIO, to help ensure our investment in this critical career and technical education. Because of the way the amendment is drafted, it would also jeopardize funding for minority-serving institutions to be used to increase that funding. This amendment reduces funding for programs that improve college access for low-income students.

First of all, whether it is CTE or TRIO, all of these programs don’t have enough money. One should not be stripped for the sake of another. By lifting one program that leads to one opportunity over neglecting another that leads to another opportunity, you limit the choice of future life outcomes at a time when members of the next generation should be able to choose the best option for each individual.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this harmful amendment and try to fund both more robustly.

Ms. MOORE, Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Ranking Member Lowey, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MITCHELL). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE, Mr. Chairman, as the co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional TRIO Caucus, I find this amendment, which would cut $60 million in funding from TRIO educational services that assist veterans and low-income and first-generation college students, deeply disturbing and misaligned with our national economic interests. It sends the misguided message that only university education is unnecessary for low-income students. You know, just get a little job training and go straight to work.

I might make the observation that I don’t see anybody over there who has less than a bachelor’s degree, and I know my good friend has a law degree.

While career and technical education is very, very important, low-income students and our country’s economic viability deserve the option of educating some of our students at a 4-year-degree level.

For us to maintain hegemony in the world, we need people like Steve Jobs, who was not a trust fund baby, who was not a legacy kid, but someone who had the talent and ability. We need to provide opportunity to the larger pool of talent in our country in order to be able to create the next iPhone.

I will give you a really good example, Mr. Chairman. There is a student who was not a trust fund baby, who did not come from a 2- or 3-year degree. TRIO has given him the chance to get not only out of homelessness, but the ability to really create economic prosperity in our country.

In Minnesota’s Second Congressional District, there are 1,521 TRIO students being served at four institutions, including two community colleges.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this harmful amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from the Education and the Workforce Committee, Mr. Lewis, for offering this amendment.

At a time when U.S. job openings are at a record 6.2 million, America faces a skills shortage. Employers all over the country tell us they need more employees who are skilled.

I have said this before, and I will say it again for so long as I am here: All education is career education.

I am a former TRIO director. I am not opposed to TRIO.

This is not an effort to diminish access to baccalaureate degrees, but to give priority to programs that are helping Americans learn the skills they need for good, high-paying jobs.

Research has shown that graduates with a technical or applied sciences associate’s degree outearn baccalaureate degree holders by between $2,000 and $11,000.

Earlier this year, the House passed the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act. That bill and this amendment are important steps to make sure all Americans have access to an education that helps them develop the skills they need to have a successful life.

I am proud to support this amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate to see some of my colleagues claim that career and technical education is somehow the separate or lesser pathway to a 4-year college degree. These claims are neither factual nor are they very genuine. CTE promotes college access, with 91 percent of high school graduates who earn a 2- or 3-year CTE credit going on to enroll in college.

When partisan politics gets injected into workforce development policy, it is students across the Nation who lose. I can tell you that, throughout the Second District, I have employers and students dying for these opportunities from all backgrounds.

The current bill leaves CTE State grants with funding $60 million below
what they received 10 years ago, while trio receives funding $110 million above both its authorized level and what the program received just 2 years ago.

My amendment supports all of our students and their diverse ambitions and affirm our investment in technical education as a viable pathway to success.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Our students are waiting for it, our employers are waiting for it, and our country is waiting for it.

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

Mr. Cole. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It has been a good and robust debate, but I don’t think it has been a particularly partisan debate. As a matter of fact, I see people on both sides of the aisle that actually have both solutions. My friend, Mr. Lewis, may have the best solution of all: let’s plus-up both of these programs because they both do a lot of good.

But, in this case, I don’t think you make one the enemy of the other. I have seen TRIO programs work, and I have seen how many jobs they produce. We are anywhere close to the population eligible for TRIO. Somewhere less than 10 percent of the eligible students actually take advantage of the program.

Again, my State invests very heavily, probably more heavily than most other States that I would suggest do the same thing Ohio and Oklahoma have done. And these programs which my friend rightly champions, I have seen people actually raise their own taxes so they could have a career or technical institute.

So I think there is merit to both of these approaches. But I do also think 5 million college graduates from people who did not have the chance to go is something this country ought to think about. The statistics tell us each of those graduates in a lifetime earn $1 million more than they would have. I promise you, the Federal Government will get its share of that million dollars.

This is a program that has paid for itself over and over again. Perhaps as we go forward, we can find other ways to help both of these programs capitalize on their potential.

So while I agree with the objective my friend is trying to achieve, I don’t agree in achieving it at the expense of TRIO or GEAR UP.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Lewis).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appear to have it.

Mr. Lewis of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 195 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 195 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 802, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by $38,964,220)”.

Page 805, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by $8,620,000)”.

Page 806, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by $1,185,120)”.

Page 856, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $38,759,340)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Grothman) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of an amendment to reduce funding by 2 percent for the Department of Education’s Office of Program Administration, Inspector General, and Student Aid Administration.

I say this because, even a month ago, it was apparent that when we wind up doing the appropriations bill or an omnibus bill or wherever we are, we are probably going to be borrowing about 14 percent of that budget. Then in the last month, we have had two hurricanes hit America, and we have already set aside another $15 billion.

I want to remind people here that we are approaching $20 trillion in debt—$60,000 for every man, woman, and child in this country. If you have a family of four, they are $240,000 in debt.

I think given those numbers, every Congressman, when they look at this appropriation document, ought to make as their primary goal spending less money. And again, we are borrowing like 14 percent.

When I was a State legislator, I dealt several times with people from the Department of Education; and, honestly, the few times I dealt with them, I never felt that their positions or what they were doing helped anybody at all. It looked like they almost had too much money.

So I think a small reduction of 2 percent is something that we should all be supportive of, make a little bit of a dent on that deficit and a little bit of a dent on that huge sea of money we voted for—including myself—working its way towards Florida and Texas.

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

Mr. Cole. Mr. Chairman, I think we have had enough debate, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I think we have had enough debate, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair–

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Scott).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, one of the agencies affected by this amendment is the Department of Education’s Office of Inspector General that is responsible for conducting independent and objective audits and investigations. It is through this agency that we can review offices like the Federal Student Aid office, and Congress can learn about policies that should be improved.

It was just last March that the OIG investigated that department and found that Congress needs to do more to...
monitor colleges with unstable finances in order to protect students and taxpayers from abrupt school closures.

Any cuts to this agency will reduce the chances that such findings will be made, and reduce consumer protections. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would decimate the ability of the Department of Education to meet the needs of Americans by indiscriminately transferring $44 million to the spending reduction account. This does nothing to improve the bill, which is already underfunded. The majority has imposed a $5 billion cut to the Labor-HHS bill below the 2017 omnibus level. Further cuts are completely unnecessary.

That is not all. This $5 billion is also below the nondefense levels allowed under the Budget Control Act. We have the resources available, but the majority refuses to allocate them to essential programs passed through this bill. The Department will simply have to do less with less. That is not good for the American people, and it is not good for our constituents.

A Department with fewer resources to oversee the Student Aid portfolio, and as Mr. SCOTT pointed out, the Office of Inspector General’s ability to promote efficiencies within the Department and investigate fraud, will be hampered.

Mr. Chair, for these reasons, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 169 printed in House Report 115-297.

AMENDMENT NO. 169 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 170 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 817, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $99,000,000)”.

Page 817, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $99,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment, which will reduce funding for the National Labor Relations Board by $99 million in fiscal year 2018. Since its inception, the NLRB has served as a partisan board that flips in ideology from one administration to the next, often cutting businesses off at the knees and stifling economic growth.

In just the last 8 years of the Obama administration, the NLRB managed to overturn a total of 4,105 collective years of precedent in 90 cases. In cases such as the ambush election rule and the joint employer rule, the board significantly overstepped their bounds and dipped their hands into the day-to-day business operations of hardworking Americans.

Now, let me be clear: I am not here to attack the unions. I wish more people would join unions under the amendment that we just dealt with. I believe that employees should have the right to join a union if they think that joining a union is best for them and their family. But the fact remains, since 1990, the NLRB has received 65 percent fewer election petitions and 40 percent fewer unfair labor practice charges. Meanwhile, while private sector labor representation has decreased in the last 25 years, the NLRB’s budget has increased in inflation-adjusted dollars by close to $50 million.

My amendment would implement a necessary reduction to the NLRB, which will bring their funding in line with their expected workload for the upcoming fiscal year. Specifically, my amendment saves taxpayers close to $100 million in the upcoming fiscal year and provides private industry with the relief the NLRB will have to focus on the most pressing cases that arise rather than engaging in partisan witch hunts.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the distinguished ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, as my colleagues have made clear, this amendment would impose a 45 percent cut on the NLRB budget. The NLRB would expect that these cuts could lead to the closure of regional offices in 17 States, but it is really the American workforce and our economy that would suffer.

We benefit from a worker’s right to exercise freedom of association. These cuts will delay NLRB-conducted representation or decertification elections and delay democracy for workers who deserve a timely vote.

In the past 3 years, the NLRB has re-instated 7,000 workers who were unlawfully fired by their employers, and the NLRB has awarded over $191 million to workers in backpay or fees.

Mr. Chairman, justice delayed is justice denied. Delayed justice is what this amendment would inflict.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, my only other comment is assuming that figure of employees is right, and this is not the total number of employees, just the employees that she envisions being cut, 1,500. I always kind of look at my State, which is about typical in size. That would be 30 employees on a board that I wouldn’t think our forefathers thought the people have to consider for themselves, I guess, whether the average State would even need 30 employees. Here we are just
cutting 30. We are still leaving the bulk of the agency in existence.

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an insult to the millions of American workers who work in coal mines and a group of 964 employees, with annual salaries aggregating $78,970,000, is hereby reduced by 10 percent (comprising 96 employees, with annual salaries aggregating $5,999,570).

It is necessary for the amendment to be considered.

The Acting CHAIR. The question was taken; and the Acting CHAIR announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to amendment No. 171 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. BEAN, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division F (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ___. The Coal Mine Safety and Health program area of the Mine Safety and Health Administration, comprising 964 employees, with annual salaries aggregating $78,970,000, is hereby reduced by 10 percent (comprising 96 employees, with annual salaries aggregating $5,999,570).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 50, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to amendment No. 172 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is to consider amendment No. 171 printed in House Report 115-297.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), insert the following:

AMENDMENT NO. 172 OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS

Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. Chairman, I include in the Record a letter from Cecil E. Roberts, the International President of the United Mine Workers of America, in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the distinguished ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. Chairman, this amendment irresponsibly cuts funding for coal mine safety and health by 10 percent, cuts 96 positions in the Mine Safety and Health Administration, or MSHA. The Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 established MSHA and requires MSHA to conduct four wall-to-wall inspections every year on underground mines and two wall-to-wall inspections for every surface mine. These are mandatory and required for safety in the mines. MSHA is required to conduct spot inspections every 5 days at those coal mines that release large amounts of combustible methane since those mines have the highest risk of fires and explosions. In addition to the mandatory and spot inspections, MSHA responds to hazard complaints from miners, investigates discrimination complaints, and provides compliance assistance with standards such as the new rule to prevent the scourge of black lung disease.

If this amendment is enacted, 96 positions will be cut and MSHA will have to choose between the mandatory inspections or meeting its obligation to conduct these functions. It can’t do both, yet all of these functions are necessary to protect the health and safety of miners.

Mr. Chairman, the preamble of the Mine Act of 1977 states: “The first . . . duty of all those who work in the mining industry must be the health and safety of its most precious resource—the miner.” This amendment cuts funding for coal mine safety and health by 10 percent, cuts 96 positions in the Mine Safety and Health Administration, or MSHA, and would cut the personnel whose responsibility it is to ensure the safety and health of our Nation’s coal miners.

Mr. Chairman, I urge you to reject the Amendment offered by Representative Mark Meadows of North Carolina that would reduce the Coal Mine Safety and Health program and workforce at the Mine Safety and Health Administration. When more workers are on the rise, we should be looking for ways to increase enforcement and oversight of mining companies.
Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, which I introduced earlier this year, would amend Federal law to ensure union elections are fair and prevent similar NLRB overreach in the future.

This commonsense bill was approved by the Education and the Workforce Committee, and it is my hope that it will come up for a vote in this House, but today we have an opportunity to take a first step toward putting an end to this radical scheme once and for all.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members to support this amendment, as well as the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan, Mr. WALBERG, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment which would block the NLRB’s election rule, an attempt to undermine collective bargaining rights. The NLRB enacted this rule to modernize and streamline the process for voting on union representation.

To be clear, the NLRB undertook a very deliberative rulemaking process. It was transparent, and it included input from stakeholders and the public.

The majority’s claim that this rule enables ambush elections is false. These are commonsense adjustments that eliminate unnecessary delays that have hindered the union election process for decades.

The election rule provides for the timely exchange of information so that issues can be resolved quickly. It improves workers' ability to hear from all sides prior to making a decision, and it reduces frivolous litigation.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the distinguished ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. WALBERG that
would block the National Labor Relations Board election slim-line rule because this amendment would result in reverting to a previous rule that would result in needless delays in the process for conducting union representation elections.

The election slim-line rule was adopted in 2015, and it has increased transparency, reduced frivolous litigation, and decreased the opportunity for bad actors to improperly delay union elections.

The pre-election process previously had been open to manipulation, delay, and drawn-out pre-election maneuvering. I point out that the so-called 11-day election that has been referred to can only occur if both sides agree to a consent election.

Another part of the rule requires the employer to provide more modern forms of employee contact information to the union prior to the elections, such as email addresses and phone numbers, in lieu of the previous requirement that the employer only provide home addresses. Under the new rule, employers must provide this electronically within 2 days of ordering an election.

By ensuring that there is a timely transfer of more complete voter contact information, the rule removed another obstacle that had denied workers the opportunity to be more fully informed prior to voting on whether or not to form a union. The employer, of course, already has unfettered and unlimited access to communicate with employees, even on work time.

I also want to point out that the NLRB’s election procedures are now settled law. Every court where this rule has been challenged has upheld the rule. The fifth circuit, for example, said that the Board “acted rationally and in furtherance of its congressional mandate in adopting the rule.”

The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia held that “the Board engaged in comprehensive analysis of a multitude of issues relating to the need for and the propriety of the final rule.”

Mr. Chairman, history has shown when workers’ rights are respected, the economy benefits. Protecting workers’ rights to make their voices heard helped build a strong middle class. Research shows that the erasure of union density has weakened the middle class and exacerbated wage stagnation by breaking the traditional link between increasing worker productivity and rising wages.

This amendment undermines workers in the ability to exercise their right to collectively bargain. Plain and simple, the workers have a right to join a union, and if they ask for an election, they should get an election—not a delay, not interference, and not retaliation.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of my colleagues from the Education and the Workforce Committee. We have debated that very clearly. We have discussed the fact that individuals ought to be able to make a decision and have a full understanding of what is available for them.

But when we talk about a slim-line rule, it only works for the union organizer. It doesn’t work for the employee, and certainly not for the small-business person who isn’t blessed with having a large lawyer team, attorney team, who can go into all of the background information to find out how, indeed, they even represent themselves and communicate with their employees in relationship to a union that is well-versed in what they will do with their challenge in the lawyered-up situation that they have.

It discourages any comprehensive study by the employee—let me state that again—by the employee of what they are looking at with union representation or without.

Severely limited access to information to get their act together is not a slim-line that works for them. It works for the union organizer alone, not the employee or the employer.

Mr. Chairman, I continue to state that, if we empowers the employees to make informed decisions with all of the information that can be available to them and the assistance needed so that both sides are served when they look for a final decision, we must do away with this rule.

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Polis), a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman.

This is about giving both sides—the workers seeking to organize and the employer opportunity to make their case to workers fairly and expeditiously.

Prior to this case, in every case, employers would have access with ways to pester and bug employees at home, through their personal email, through their phone numbers. There was simply no way that there was any equality given to the case for union organizers to make. In fact, union organizers often had to try to find ways that they could reach to simply make the case to workers so that they can make a fair choice.

In addition, I find it ridiculous that this is called, by those on the other side, an ambush when, in fact, the only ambush is when they ambush the right of workers to organize by drawing out the election process to months and years, often beyond when many of the employees involved are even at the same employer because of the adverse working conditions that could have led them to organize in the first place.

This rule was done through a multi-stakeholder process. There was a lot input from all sides, and it was a very thoughtful rule that gave a level playing field to ensure that workers, should they desire to organize, had a reasonable calendar for doing so and a reasonable way of reaching other workers to tell them the benefits of organizing, just as the company was telling them the downside.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to reject this amendment which throws out a very thoughtful rule that levels the playing field in labor relations.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ARRINGTON). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Walberg).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 174 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to offer amendment No. 174 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division F (before the short title), insert the following:

SNC. (Each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 1 percent.)

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. Blackburn) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the recognition, and I want to begin by commending Chairman Cole, his staff, and the Appropriations Committee for the fine work that they have done.

As we are looking at the Labor, HHS, and Education appropriations bill, we are looking at $356 billion for fiscal year 2019. My amendment would cut an additional 1 percent out of that number.

I think it is important to commend the work that they have done over the past couple of years. If you go back and look at the appropriations numbers in 2016, they were at $163.65 billion; 2017, down to $162.985 billion; and this year, at $156 billion.

I think that that work is to be commended. The leadership in this House, the chairman, Chairman Cole, and the work that they are doing is getting us on the right path. It is important that as we as Members of Congress do our job, it is important that we engage the
But the important thing to realize is that drivers of our debt, frankly, are our grandchildren, to future generations, because we realize, as Admiral Mullen said on July 6, 2010, the greatest threat to our Nation’s security is our Nation’s debt, we need to do a little bit more. And, of course, there are always good programs that we can stand here and talk about, and talk about what will not be funded if we do a penny on a dollar.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I want to begin by thanking my friend. We are classmates, we are friends, and we have served on the Budget Committee together. So I know the commitment to fiscal responsibility is serious and continuing and real. I particularly want to thank her for her kind words about the work of the committee in recent years because we genuinely have tried to continuously lower the amounts of money.

My friend makes a very good point about the dangerous face in terms of a skyrocketing national debt, but as my friend suggests, we have already cut this more than 1 percent. I am not suggesting there aren’t areas that can be cut additionally. There probably are. But as an appropriator, we prefer to look at things individually, one at a time, because there are always areas that could be plussed-up as well.

I don’t think anybody here really wants to cut money, even 1 percent, from Social Security or Medicare’s research or Pell grants or programs that we think actually help folks have an educational choice, like charter schools, and yet that is always the impact of an across-the-board cut. You cut things that need to be cut, for sure, but you also cut some things that probably shouldn’t be.

So we would prefer to continue the approach that my friend has singled out and said that seems to work well, and we will do that, and I know she will be helpful in that.

I also know my friend knows that the real drivers of our debt, frankly, are Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, all entitlement programs, our mandatory spending programs. And that is where folks on both sides of the aisle, I think, need to get very, very serious, and the administration. Because we are never going to get to a balanced budget that I know my friend wants to achieve and achieve until we put 70 percent of all spending, which is the entitlement spending, on the table for serious examination to be dealt with.

I don’t oppose the goals of my friend. I just have a different method of trying to achieve them. So over the last 3 years, we have been able to do that. We are going to continue to try and do that going forward.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, we always do hear, well, you would take this from or that if you were doing across-the-board cuts. But just to my colleagues who are in the Chamber tonight and those who are watching, across-the-board cuts work at the local level and the State level because you look at that number that you need to hit and you get inside some programs more than others, and you find that penny on the dollar, and you find a way to you find a savings, and you examine what the priorities of a budget ought to be.

That is the heavy lift. And while we are doing it with the work we do here in this Chamber and that the appropriators do, it is important that, just as Governors in our States—both Democratic and Republican Governors, by the way—just as mayors in towns and cities across this country do on a regular basis, many and are doing right now because fiscal years are beginning October 1, just as they do that work, we need to do it.

Do we need to look at entitlements? Yes, absolutely. I am for putting those issues on the table. I encourage our colleagues and our administration to do that. It is imperative because we are staring a deficit in debt. We are staring that in the face.

How do you look at your children and grandchildren and say, “That is okay. That is okay. Paying for $20 trillion worth of debt is easy”? The answer is you don’t, because it is not.

What it takes to address it is will. It takes resolve. It takes cutting back more than you have cut back before and eliminating programs that are essential. It is time to get serious about this. I encourage support of my amendment.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), who is my good friend.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. The underlying bill is already underfunded. The majority has imposed a $5 billion cut to the Labor-HHS bill below the 2017 omnibus level.

This cut is as unnecessary as it is indiscriminate because it indiscriminately cuts programs in this bill without thought to its relative merit. For instance, this amendment would result in fewer infants and toddlers receiving Head Start’s services, fewer students receiving financial aid to help afford college, fewer research grants, and cuts to public health emergency response. The list goes on and on.

Investment is what we need to help build and strengthen our middle class, and this amendment threatens that.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge Members to oppose this amendment.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 175 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 175 printed in House Report 115-197.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division F (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. 116. For “Health Resources and Services Administration—Maternal and Child Health” for establishing and carrying out grants, and cuts to public health emergency response. The list goes on and on.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), who is my good friend.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. The underlying bill is already underfunded. The majority has imposed a $5 billion cut to the Labor-HHS bill below the 2017 omnibus level.

This cut is as unnecessary as it is indiscriminate because it indiscriminately cuts programs in this bill without thought to its relative merit. For instance, this amendment would result in fewer infants and toddlers receiving Head Start’s services, fewer students receiving financial aid to help afford college, fewer research grants, and cuts to public health emergency response. The list goes on and on.

Investment is what we need to help build and strengthen our middle class, and this amendment threatens that.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge Members to oppose this amendment.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 175 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 175 printed in House Report 115-197.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division F (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. 116. For “Health Resources and Services Administration—Maternal and Child Health” for establishing and carrying out grants, and cuts to public health emergency response. The list goes on and on.
programs, including programs for infants and children at significant risk of developing or showing early signs of or having been diagnosed with mental illness, including serious emotional disturbance. This was passed and authorized under the Mental Health and Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act last year in Congress in which it was passed 422-2—nearly unanimous.

The importance of this is that, across the United States, up to one in five children has a mental disorder in a given year, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. This equates to more than 17 million young people who meet criteria for disorders that affect their ability to learn, behave, and express emotions. This small $5 million amount is about 29 cents per child, hardly enough to do much when distributed over that many, but it can do a great deal when directed and focused.

If you follow the course of children with mental illness, untreated mental illness, of course, leads to very troubled adults and other problems. I might add that this is National Suicide Prevention Week, and an alarming number of children are attempting suicide. In fact, over the last 20 years, suicide rates have climbed overall in this country. But, tragically and alarmingly, they have grown a great deal among children.

How do we tell families of children who have completed a suicide or attempted a suicide that we couldn’t come up with the money for this, and, instead, we thought other programs were more important?

This money comes from the existing programming budget. It does not take away from vital programs. But I want you to know that there has been a 54 percent increase of suicides among children under age 12. Thirty-seven percent of those child suicides are Black children. The rate among African-American children ages 5 to 11 has doubled over the last decade.

This provides critically important services where they are needed the most. It appears that schools are the most important place where treatment can take place. Only 23 percent of prekindergarten programs have onsite or scheduled visits from psychiatrists and psychologists, according to the Child Mind Institute.

The current workforce consists of approximately 7,500 child and adolescent psychiatrists. We need 32,000. Eighty-five percent of all psychotropic medications for children are written by primary care practitioners, not psychiatrists, so we end up with serious problems here as suicides grow and as mental health problems grow. This small amount of money is taken from existing funds, not from any other programs to make sure we are providing services for these children.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to, again, thank my good friend for, as he always does, raising important issues, and I appreciate his bringing attention to the mental health of children.

The amendment offered—and this is an important amendment. Many Members in this body don’t think about—is actually for a newly authorized program that has not received funding in the past, and our committee actually has a smaller allocation than it had last year. If the public still doesn’t realize it, and it is sort of helpful, frankly, for my friend to advance this amendment. Just because something moves through an authorizing committee doesn’t mean any money could come with it.

Now, in some cases—my friend worked on the Cures bill—they sent money with portions of that on the opioid initiatives, some additional money at NIH, and, of course, every program has more need than ever. They found a way to fund it. But we can end up in a situation where you just simply pile on authorizations and send us less money and think we will somehow work it out. That is why we have been able to steadily increase funding at NIH, steadily increase funding for programs like TRIO and GEAR UP, and steadily increase money for charter schools. There are some areas where we have been able to do that, but we can’t do it everywhere.

I want to tell my friend that, while I oppose the amendment, I am certainly going to work with him. Actually, I asked him not too long ago to give me the one thing that is the most important thing, and he mentioned the lack of trained and qualified personnel, that we could have a lot of programs, but until we had a bigger pool of people capable of rendering the services, then we wouldn’t simply be moving from program to program. I think that was a very good point, and it is why I accepted my friend’s amendment for $10 million to begin to do that. That is another area. I think we have to pick a few areas where we can do more, and it doesn’t eradicate any problem. With this amendment, we could have a lot of programs, but we can’t do it everywhere.

I agree with what my friend is offering here in terms of the need for emphasis. We just simply have to work harder either getting the funds or finding other places to take the funds from.

So while I oppose the amendment, I want to be very clear that I intend to work with my friend going forward.

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 11/2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, let me add to this. Yes, there was money in the Cures bill for opioid abuse for 59,000 people who had died from drug overdoses, but 350,000 people will die this year related to mental health problems.

I want to make sure that Congress is not, once again, in a situation where we are having another moment of silence for some suicide, for some child or young adult that got violent and shot someone or ran their car into a crowd, or something else. We have got to start putting money into these programs. The child said, "It will make a difference for this one."

This will make a difference to a few children.

How do we explain this to a parent whose child is suffering, who can’t get services, that what we have is we couldn’t transfer money within an existing account, it doesn’t add any more, and it doesn’t eradicate any programs, but it is something there especially at a time when this is so life threatening?

You can’t explain that to a mom or a dad.

During all the time in the course of working this bill, we heard countless stories of people telling their horrific and sad stories. I spent the last 42 years of my life working as a psychologist. I have seen the faces of those who have gone to the funerals and seen those wasting away in prisons. I do ask that this amendment be adopted.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), who is my good friend.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I do not oppose this amendment. In fact, I support my colleague’s effort to improve access to early childhood mental health promotion, intervention, and treatment. But I think it is important that we come back to why we put $5 billion into this effort and why this $5 million for mental health programs is not included in this Labor-HHS bill under consideration.

The reason is because this bill is being cut by $5 billion from FY17 levels. This is the end result that we get when the majority’s efforts to slash nondefense spending come to fruition. We are forced to choose between life-saving programs, such as mental health and substance abuse programs, and programs that invest in our future, like early childhood education or job training.

We ought to be negotiating a bipartisan budget deal to lift the sequestration caps on both defense and non-defense programs. Then we could begin working on a bipartisan base that will allow us to adequately fund mental health and substance abuse prevention.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).
The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 176 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 176 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division F (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 2115. For “Health Resources and Services Administration—Maternal and Child Health” for carrying out the Pediatric Mental Health Care Access grant program, as authorized by section 330M of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-19), there is hereby appropriated, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for “Health Resources and Services Administration—Program Management” is hereby reduced by, $9,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this amendment increases access to pediatric mental healthcare by providing $9 million in grants to improve access to behavioral integration and pediatric primary care.

I thank the chairman of the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee for his agreement to our other two to boost this workforce. We have a massive workforce shortage in the field of mental health. What good is it to have good wishes among Members of Congress for treatment, yet people can’t get it?

There is a shortage of child and adolescent psychiatrists for the 17 million children with a mental health condition. We have 9,000. We need over 30,000. There is a shortage of psychologists, and 36 States have a shortage of psychiatric nurses. As a matter of fact, half of the counties in America have no psychiatrists, no psychologists, and no clinical social worker. So for children with primary mental health problems, it is a desert for treatment.

They sit on long waiting lists. Their symptoms worsen.

A study called the RAISE Program—Recovery After an Initial Schizophrenic Episode—found that if we provided treatment initially for those who show their initial psychotic episode, it improves their prognosis over their lifetime. But delaying treatment actually causes them harm.

When you have no care, you have that harm. For those few psychiatrists and psychologists out there, what are they told to do in rural areas? They tell them to go to another to try and give them access, with valuable hours of time taken up. They can’t provide that care.

This $9 million helps provide mechanisms by which pediatricians and family practices can have telemental health. We know that when a warm handoff occurs in the office—and that is when the family or the child at that point meets a psychiatrist or that psychologist—the actual follow-up rate is over 99 percent. A large number—over 80 percent—continue follow-up right through treatment.

However, when they are given a referral, that actual follow-up is around 50 percent, and only 11 percent of people complete treatment. That is why you need to have some level of face to fail.

This issue of at least providing telemental health gives people that face-to-face approach.

Since 50 percent of serious mental illness cases emerge by age 14, and 75 percent by age 24, this is the critical period in the life of someone who is developing serious mental illness to have care. We can no longer just say that we are going to let pediatricians be the primary providers for mental illness treatment when that is something that they do not have the specialty and training.

The number of psychiatrists there to treat children is declining relative to the needs. The problems among children, as I mentioned previously, continue to go up. I might also add here that this does not reduce any spending among the critical funded and authorized programs within this Act.

But let me say where some of the money goes in these SAMHSA programs. The GAO did a study and found that 80 percent of the grants are not being used. It is an administrative cost. SAMHSA, instead, spends their money on ridiculous, embarrassing programs: making fruit smoothies if you are on a diet; making masks, making collages, a website and crisis hotline for people in the Boston area who had snow anxiety during a snowstorm; teaching people interpretative dancing, $25,000 for a painting of people sitting on a rock at SAMHSA headquarters, an alternative conference funded by SAMHSA at the luxurious Boston Park Plaza Hotel. And we can’t fund something that will save children’s lives?

It makes no sense to me.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, once again, I agree with my friend on the basic point, but this, too, is a program that was authorized with no funding.

The things we are funding for in the 21st Century Cures Act, we funded to the tune of $1 billion. Frankly, if we didn’t get funding for it, we still authorized it.

This is one of those cases where, again, the cause is worthy, and we are willing to work with the gentleman—and we will certainly continue to do that—but a lot of these things that my friend just mentioned are from programs that were authorized by non-appropriations committees. We don’t create the programs.

That is where my friends, frankly, on the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Ways and Means Committee need to spend some time. They need to spend some time deauthorizing certain programs that continue.

Again, I will work with my friend if our allocation changes or we can find financial savings. But I can’t willy-nilly, particularly when we have already cut these administrative programs, partly in the en bloc amendment, to fund some of the things, including my friend’s amendment, that personally felt were very worthy. We will look at this.

The other thing that I would hope we could do is work with our friends on the other side of the aisle. I will just tell you, from a conference standpoint, when you go to a conference with a program that has been authorized but not funded, it is extremely difficult to get the other body to join in with you. That is just the reality.

Every decision involves taking something away. It is always easy to call something administration or nonvital. That is what it looks like in the phrase. That may or may not be what it is in the program. So it is just a more difficult exercise than I think most folks understand.

Mr. MURPHY’s point is still the right one. One of the reasons I look very carefully at this one is because I see it as a multiplier, in terms of the professional shortage of people that we have that my friend has pointed to.

Mr. Chairman, again, I reluctantly oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. CLARK, once again, I rise not in opposition to this amendment, but I support this effort by my colleague as well.

Let’s close behavioral health integration into pediatric primary care, for I, too, have seen the shortages of mental health providers in my home State.
and the very real and devastating im-
 pact that that has on families.

This is a false crisis. There is $5 bil-
 lion that we have cut from the FY17
 levels, but this false crisis has very
 real impacts on the lives of children
 and their families.

Let's get to the work of negotiating
 a bipartisan budget to lift sequestra-
tion caps on both defense and non-
defense, and draft a reasonable Labor-
 HHS bill that adequately funds health
 and substance abuse prevention pro-
 grams. We have the opportunity and
 we need to seize it.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr.
 Chairman, let me say this: I have got
 to tell you that this is distressing to
 me. I know what my colleague meant
 by false crisis, but this is a crisis for
 children.

The children in America with mental
 health problems cannot get care. Mem-
 bers of Congress have an opportunity
to put a small amount of money to
make a big difference for children who
cannot get that care.

What we can do and what my col-
 league from Oklahoma said is we need
to cut some things. One of them is stop
the ridiculous wasteful spending at
SAMHSA. They can fund $400,000
 sites and going to luxurious hotels,
they can certainly do something that
actually puts providers there so chil-
dren can change the trajectory of their
lives.

I have just known too many families
who suffer through this. I hope that as
Members vote on this, they remember
those families in their districts and de-
cide this is a way to send a signal that
we can make a big difference in the
lives of many.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the bal-
ance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield
back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is
on the amendment offered by the gent-
leman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Mur-
phy).

The question was taken; and the Act-
ing Chair announced that the ayes ap-
ppeared to have it.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I demand
a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to
clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-
ceedings on the amendment offered by
the gentleman from Pennsylvania will
be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 178 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY
OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order
to consider amendment No. 178 printed

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr.
 Chairman, I have an amendment at the
desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will
designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as fol-
 lows:

At the end of division F (before the short
title), insert the following:

Sec. 510. For ‘‘Substance Abuse and Men-
 tal Health Services Administration—Mental
Health’’ for establishing and operating the
National Mental Health and Substance Use
Policy Laboratory, as authorized by section
501A of the Public Health Service Act (42
U.S.C. 290aa–9), there is hereby appropriated,
and the amount otherwise provided by this
Act for ‘‘Substance Abuse and Mental Health
Services Administration—Health Surveil-
 lance and Prevention Support’’ is hereby re-
duced by $5,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to
House Resolution 504, the gentleman
from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) and a
Member opposed each will control 5
 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman
from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr.
 Chairman, I want to restate the prob-
lems that exist at SAMHSA.

The General Accounting Office, dur-
ing the multiyear investigation of the
subcommittee which I chair, the Over-
sight and Investigations of the Com-
mittee on Energy and Commerce, came
back and said that 80 percent of the
grants for SAMHSA are not evidence-
based. There is a serious problem in
that agency.

Instead, they funded absurd pro-
grams, such as making fruit smoothies;
and a $100,000 website for toddlers
to sing-along songs, which they told us
about prevention.

We asked: What are you preventing?
They said: We will get back to you on
that.

They also had workshops on how to
tell people to get off their medications.
They had a $25,000 oil painting for their
office, which graces their hall, of peo-
ple sitting on a rock, which gives them
mental health awareness. I might add,
the only thing I learned from SAMHSA is
a total waste of money. And, of course,
an alternative conference, which continues
this year as well, spending, I think,
$150,000 or so to hold their conference
at the luxurious Boston Park Plaza
Hotel.

I don’t want to hear from that agen-
cy that they don’t have money. This
particular program redirects them so
they get reset in terms of evidence-
based care. It forms a panel of people
with expertise in medical psychiatric
areas, including consumers.

It is there to provide direction and
guidance for an agency that has been
without direction and guidance. It is
there to make sure that we redirect the
way SAMHSA is going so that it gets
in the area of really treating mental
illness.

Let me say this—if I let me use the
words of Dr. Elinore McCance-Katz,
the current Assistant Secretary of Mental
Health and, therefore, the de facto
head of SAMHSA.

She said: ‘‘. . . SAMHSA does not ad-
dress the treatment needs of the most
vulnerable in our society. Rather, the
unit within SAMHSA charged with ad-
dressing these disorders, the Center for
Mental Health Services, chooses to
focus on its own definition of ‘reco-
very,’ which generally ignores the treat-
ment of mental disorders, and, as a
result, for Initiative under authorizing
services, focuses on the development of
a ‘peer workforce.’’

‘‘There is a perceptible hostility to-
ward psychiatric medicine; a resistance
to addressing the treatment needs of
those with serious mental illness and a
questioning by some at SAMHSA as to
whether mental disorders even exist.’’

For example, they state that psy-
chosis is just a different way of think-
ing for some experiencing stress. They
also focus on activities that don’t di-
rectly assist those who have serious
mental illness.

She adds that: ‘‘Significant dollars
are spent on hotlines for callers who
may be experiencing suicidal thinking.
. . .

But I might add that during this
whole time, while death rates decline
for heart disease, lung disease, AIDS,
and accidental deaths, etcetera, they
went way up for suicide. They in-
creased steadily for substance abuse.
It is a failed agency, along those lines.

She says that there are pressing
needs, but nowhere in SAMHSA’s stra-
ategic initiatives do they even address
psychiatric treatment of mental illness
as a priority.

I know we have to change this. I
would like to ask of my dear friend, the
chairman of the subcommittee, is there
a way we can talk more about this and
address this in the future to see that
this is addressed adequately?

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I
tyield to the Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my
friend for yielding and for his excellent
work in this area.

Yes, we would look forward to that.
Frankly, we have pretty regular ex-
changes with a lot of the committees
under our jurisdiction where they have
done the hard work of authorizing an
investigation. That can be used to
guide appropriations.

So I look forward to working with
my friend to make sure we can elimi-
nate the type of abuses that he is talk-
ing about, and redirect funds where
they need to go for the care of patients.

I thank my friend for his work and
his kind words, and I certainly pledge
that I will work with him going for-
ward, as I have in the past.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Re-
claiming my time, knowing that when
my friend says something, I consider
that a bond.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the bal-
ance of my time, and I withdraw my
amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment
is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 179 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY
OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order
to consider amendment No. 179 printed
Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division F (before the short title), insert the following:

Sect. 1. For "Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration—Mental Health for carrying out the Strengthening Community Crisis Response Systems grant program, as authorized by section 520F of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 296b–37), the amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration—Health Surveillance and Program Support" is hereby reduced by $10,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is the last of my amendments on this. Although this House overwhelmingly passed the authorization for these, as did the Senate, money was not allocated towards it.

While I understand there is a priority to treat substance abuse, but even with that, many times there is nowhere for someone to go.

Back in the 1950s, we had over half a million psychiatric hospital beds in this country. I think at the time the population of the United States was 150 million. Now, with a population close to 317 million to 318 million, we have about 40,000 hospital beds and a shortage of 100,000. The only State that actually has an adequate number of beds is Mississippi. All the rest are at a critical shortage.

So what happens when a person has a drug overdose and needs to get into treatment? What happens when a person has a psychiatric breakdown?

Well, generally what happens is the police arrive, not the paramedics. They arrest the person. Many States actually say: Let’s put these people in a jail cell, because there is no bed.

Or, if they take them to the hospital, the hospital says: Let’s just give them some medication to stabilize them and let them back out because we can’t hold them. We have no place for them to go.

What happens, many times these people are boarded, that is, they remain in an emergency room bed, which is no place for someone with a psychiatric crisis. Sometimes they will be tied to their gurney; sometimes they are in the hallways; sometimes they are, for days or weeks or several weeks, waiting in a psychiatric ward, and nothing opens up.

I thought when Dorothea Dix said let’s close down the jail concept, that was prevalent in our country back then, let’s have nice hospitals for them. Historically, they said that was a good move, but what happened is these psych beds closed down starting widely in the 1960s and continuing until now. There simply is no place for them to go.

Let’s remember that President Kennedy’s last bill he signed before his assassination was to begin this process of closing the beds but having community-based treatment, but America and Congress hasn’t promised.

There is a story of a Senator from Virginia by the name of Creigh Deeds. Some may remember in the news when his son Gus had a crisis and Senator Deeds took his son to a hospital. There they waited hour after hour after hour while the hospital tried to find a hospital bed available for him. Finally, he said they couldn’t find any beds: Take young Gus home, and let’s see what happens in the future.

When Senator Deeds took his son home, his son stabbed Senator Deeds, trying to kill him; and when Senator Deeds ran to get help, he survived, but his son did not because he shot himself with a bullet—because there were no beds.

Now, this particular amendment doesn’t create beds, but what happens is sometimes there are beds available in other communities; but short of a hospital calling hospital after hospital after hospital to find a bed for someone, which may be an hour or two drive away, there is no place for them.

Surely, we understand the idea: Do we continue to put these folks in hospitals and jail cells? Do we dump them back in the street and let them be the forgotten homeless whom we walk over? Do we send them back home and risk further harm to them? Do we have them tied to a gurney and given a chemical sedation, a chemical straight-jacket to wait until something opens up?

What this amendment does is it is $10 million in grants to develop and maintain or enhance the database of inpatient psychiatric facilities and crisis stabilization units so we can begin to address this bed shortage. Rather than lead people away from care, this is a way of helping hospitals get that care and instill States to put together programs to speed this up.

We still have work with CMS to create more beds and stop some of the ridiculous rules that they have in there, but what do we continue to tell the mentally ill? “We will get around to it?” “We couldn’t do it this time”? “Good luck”? “I am sorry your son died”?

When does this end? Will we hear more excuses that we can’t do anything about it because we had a $5 billion cut? What do we do with Americans who are dying from this over and over again?

Thomas Jefferson once said: “I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, that His justice cannot sleep forever.” We have a chance to make a difference in the justice for the mentally ill, or will we once again turn a blind eye and say we can do nothing? Mr. Chairman, I ask that Members vote for this amendment to try and save some lives.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in the order to consider amendment No. 182 printed in House Report 115–197.

AMENDMENT NO. 182 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 182 printed in House Report 115–197.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division F (before the short title), insert the following:

Sect. 1. For "Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration—Substance Abuse Treatment for the Controlled Substance Monitoring Program, as authorized by section 399O of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 288g–3), there is hereby appropriated, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for “Office of the Secretary—General Departmental Management” is hereby reduced by $10,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chair, tonight I am proud to introduce an amendment that will fully fund the National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reporting program, colloquially known as NASPER. NASPER has long provided an opportunity to help prevent the spread of opioids across the country; however, until now, we have not funded it.

NASPER funding supports the development and maintenance of a State-run prescription drug monitoring program. These prescription drug monitoring programs allow for doctors and pharmacists to electronically interconnect with one when prescribing opioids, allowing for the providers to confer and ensure that the patient is not receiving a duplicate opioid prescription that the patient may then divert or sell.

Prescription drug monitoring programs work because they engage providers and they successfully prevent individuals from exploiting weaknesses in the healthcare system.

During any epidemic, it is important to first help those in need and provide support to individuals and first responders who were affected by the epidemic. Last year, the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Subcommittee on Health did exactly this.
We worked to put forth the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act to provide support for those impacted by the opioid epidemic by increasing access to those in need.

No epidemic response, however, is complete without preventative measures, and that is why NASPER is so important to this fight. We must prioritize programs like NASPER that are preventative and can ensure that errant prescribers and bad actors do not fall through the cracks. If we want to end the opioid epidemic, we must commit resources to programs that will promote prevention and encourage safer prescribing of prescription drugs.

As the subcommittee chairman for the authorizing committee that has been tasked with the public health response to a crisis that claimed more than 60,000 American lives last year, I am committed to further working to oversee the implementation of our initial response efforts and to develop any supplemental responses that may be needed to prevent future unnecessary deaths.

I encourage my colleagues to take this opportunity to support the work of the Subcommittee on Health on the Energy and Commerce Committee in authorizing this and allow Congress to approve funding for NASPER.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Burgess). The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 184 printed in House report 115–297.

AMENDMENT NO. 184 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 184 printed in House report 115–297.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT). The amendment is very simple. If you have a contract doing business with the Federal Government, you can steal wages, especially if the employer is paid by a government contractor who repeatedly and intentionally violates the law.

Contract Compliance is the Federal Government's competition to ensure that Federal contractors and subcontractors take affirmative action to ensure that all individuals have equal opportunity for employment. EEOC is complaint driven, unlike the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, the focus is on contract compliance, and the ultimate sanction is disbarment of a Federal contractor. It gets its authority through an executive order and accomplishes much of its enforcement through the administrative process. By contrast, EEOC's authority to make a statute and makes and enforces Federal statutes through lawsuits in Federal courts. Other distinctions:

The ultimate client for Contract Compliance is the Federal Government, while EEOC's clients are private employees; EEOC is complaint driven, unlike the Office of Federal Contract Compliance; Contract Compliance can audit contractors, EEOC cannot; EEOC has subpoena power, Contract Compliance does not; Contract Compliance does not have the authority to file lawsuits and get punitive damages, EEOC can seek punitive damages and lawsuits; Contract Compliance enforces the Vietnam Era Veterans' Readjustment Act, the EEOC does not; EEOC protects employees from genetic discrimination, Contract Compliance does not.

The proposal to transfer the Office of Federal Contract Compliance into the EEOC came about by some ideological groups that want to shrink the Federal Government, but it is unwise because it is opposed by civil rights groups and the U.S. Chamber.

To underscore the collective voice and opposition to this transfer, the Senate Committee on Appropriations adopted language last Thursday that says that the committee rejects the budget. Further, this amendment would merge the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs with the EEOC.

Mr. Chairman, the realignment of responsibilities would ask the EEOC to do considerably more with a lot less in terms of expertise, personnel, and funding. Further, this amendment would realign the EEOC's efforts to reduce its backlog of charges while simultaneously trying to collect vital data relevant to the enforcement of civil rights laws.

The enforcement of civil rights laws would be best served if we in Congress would fully fund both the EEOC and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, and that they both can do the vital work of securing the right to work in a place free of harassment, retaliation, and other forms of discrimination.

For these reasons, I ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 186 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 186 printed in House Report 115–297.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division F (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. 2145. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition listed in section 2210c(1) of title 41, United States Code, in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term "Fair Labor Standards Act" and the disposition is listed as "willful" or "repeated".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. If you have a contract doing business with the Federal Government, if in your disclosures you have been found designated to have violations of the Federal Labor Relations Act, and those violations are considered to be willful, intentional, and repeated, then you will not be able to take advantage of this particular appropriation.

This kind of amendment is designed to say that the Federal Government believes that a penny earned and a penny worked should be received by the worker. It is as simple as that.

People who do not support this amendment are saying that Federal contractors can engage in wage theft and it is okay with us. And we are simply saying that the hardworking people in the United States expect that the Federal penny that workers earn will be given to them, and that is not too much to ask.

Hardworking people living in America should never worry that an employer will steal their wages, especially if the employer is paid by a government contractor. Right now, Federal contractors who repeatedly and intentionally pay subminimum wage, force
their workers to work off the clock, refuse to pay overtime, or make illegal deductions on their employees’ pay are still allowed to apply for Federal contracts. They should not be. We should reward workers who treat their workers fairly and not allow firms who willfully and repeatedly violate the Fair Labor Standards Act cannot apply for a Federal Government contract until they clean up their act. To be clear, my amendment would not punish a single accidental violation.

If my colleagues across the aisle won’t make corporations pay their fair share of their taxes, I hope that they will at least join me in going after employers who refuse to pay taxpayer money to line their pockets by cheating employees repeatedly, and on purpose. This is not a small thing. This is real money out of real people’s pockets.

The Economic Policy Institute found that low-wage workers in just the ten most popular states—California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, and others—lose $8 billion in wages due to wage theft each year.

For example, the corporation General Dynamics Information Technology owns a number of call centers that serve Federal contracts. In the last 10 years, they have agreed to pay $412,000 in back wages to 921 employees for Fair Labor Standards Act violations. Immigrants and residents of low-income communities are often at the greatest risk for abuse at the hands of employers who do wage theft.

The government should be doing everything it can to protect workers from intimidation and stolen wages. If this amendment passes, companies like General Dynamics Information Technology won’t be able to continue to do what they have been doing. They will have to be fair to people, at least after they clean up their act.

We have to demand higher standards, Mr. Chairman. Respecting a fair day’s pay for a fair day’s work is an American value.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman’s amendment, and I know the sincerity of his view on the issue.

This amendment, in my view, mirrors, to some degree, the last administration’s regulation on so-called Fair Play and Safe Workplaces, also known as a blacklisting rule, which has recently been adopted.

There are existing requirements for reporting and addressing violations of labor laws by Federal contractors.

As the Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chair, in Virginia, Mr. Chairman, we know that there are a lot of contractors who have significant wage violations. It should be a privilege to contract with the Federal Government. Taxpayers should not be asked to subsidize companies that engage in willful and repeated wage theft.

This amendment only applies to contractors with repeated willful violations, not technical violations that could result from good faith difference in interpretation of rules and regulations—willful and repeated.

Awarding contracts to those kind of contractors is not only unfair to workers, it is unfair to law-abiding contractors who play by the rules but are forced to compete on an uneven playing field with those who cut corners.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter from the American Civil Liberties Union.


Vote yes on Amendment No. 113, No. 184, and No. 186 to Make American Workers Secure and Prosperous Appropriations Act, 2018.

Dear Representative: On behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union and our more than two million members and supporters, we urge you to support the following amendments that may be offered during floor consideration of H.R. 3994, the Make America Secure and Prosperous Appropriations Act, 2018:

1. Amendment No. 113 (Preserving funding for the EEOC/EO-1 equal pay data collection).

In July, the House Appropriations Committee adopted the Harris Amendment to defund implementation of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission’s (EEOC) re-quirements under the EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION (EO-1). Amendment No. 113, offered by Representatives DeLauro, Frankel, and Scott to the FY18 CJS appropriations bill, would preserve funding for that critical equal pay initiative.

The data collection at issue, through the EEO-1 that employers already must use to document the demographics of their workforce, is a critical tool to lift the cloak of secrecy that shrouds pay decisions in this country. Without such transparency, the pernicious gender and race wage gaps, and the discrimination that causes them, will continue to flourish. The new EEO-1 revision was adopted after extensive public comment and would have dried up disparities, facilitated employers’ good faith efforts to comply with equal pay laws, and identified appropriate targets for federal enforcement of non-discrimination.

Instead of supporting this measured approach to eliminate the pay gap, the EEO-1 has been undermined by members of Congress and the Trump administration’s Office of Management and Budget, which recently halted implementation of the EEO-1 equal pay data collection. Because OMB has delayed review and release of the EEOC’s proposal, the Harris amendment would ensure that a new effort, the Harris amendment, could unnecessarily tie the agency’s hands. Members should vote in favor of the DeLauro-Frankel-Scott amendment in order to preserve the ability of the EEOC to continue to make meaningful progress on equal pay. A vote against this amendment is a vote against equal pay.

2. Amendment No. 184 (No funding to eliminate OFCCP and transfer duties to EEOC)

The Trump administration’s FY2018 budget submission to Congress recommended the elimination of the Department of Labor’s Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) and the transfer of its functions to the EEOC. This amendment, offered by Representative DeLauro and included in the FY18 Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill, would withhold federal funding in order to prevent implementation of this ill-advised proposal.

These vital and distinct agencies have different missions and different areas of expertise. The OFCCP seeks to remedy complaints of discrimination in employment. The EEOC more broadly oversees the employment practices of federal contractors who are required to proactively monitor workplace diversity and pay equity, make meaningful efforts to recruit qualified applicants from under-represented groups, and eliminate barriers to equal opportunity for various disadvantaged groups, including veterans and individuals with disabilities. The administration’s proposal would jeopardize the uniquely important missions of each agency and weaken our government’s ability to effectively enforce our nation’s civil rights laws. It would also place an extraordi-narily heavy burden on contractors who already have an excessive workload and a well-known backlog. Finally, numerous organizations that work with these agencies—from civil rights, women’s rights, and workers’ rights groups along with business groups such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—oppose the administration’s proposal.

For these reasons, we urge members of the House to support Amendment No. 184 that would prevent the elimination of OFCCP.

3. Amendment No. 186 (No funding to federal contractors who habitually and willfully violate FLSA)

This amendment, offered by Representatives Ellison, Grijalva and Pocan to the FY18 Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill, would ensure that no funds are entered into with entities that willfully and repeatedly violate the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Employers that have the privilege of doing business with the federal government also have a responsibility to comply with our laws. This amendment would provide a strong protection against our government doing business with employers that commit labor violations.

If you have any questions, please contact Vanis Leveille. Sincerely,
FAIR SHAKIR,
Director, Washington Legislative Office.
VANIA LEVYELLE,
Senior Legislative Counsel.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Ellison).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 187 OFFERED BY MR. GIBBS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 187 printed in House Report 115–297.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division F (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. 4. Nondisclosure of funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the final regulations on “Improving Tracking of Workplace Injuries and Illnesses” published by the Department of Labor in the Federal Register on May 12, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 26243 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Gibbs) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman my amendment prohibits the Department of Labor and OSHA from implementing a burdensome rule dealing with reporting workplace injuries and illness.

The OSHA rule requires all businesses with more than 250 employees to file all illness and injury reports in a publicly available database. It would also be a requirement for any business with more than 20 employees in certain industries such as manufacturing or agriculture.

This online filing requirement raises serious privacy concerns. While employers were previously required to collect this information, it was never open and available to the public.

The rule risks the confidentiality of personal and identifiable information for those injured on the job.

Additionally, a provision in the final rule declaring automatic postaccident drug testing is now considered an unreasonable procedure, a provision that conflict with States’ workers’ compensation laws.

While the Trump administration has wisely delayed the implementation of the regulation, it is important to prevent any future development of this rule.

I encourage my colleagues to adopt this amendment, which rolls back another one-size-fits-all regulation from Washington, D.C., that potentially interferes with the privacy of employers and employees for the entirety of fiscal year 2018.

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, which would remove protections for workers who report workplace injuries and prevent OSHA from collecting data necessary to identify and target the most hazardous workplaces and serious safety and health problems.

Let’s look at 2015. There were nearly 5,000 workers killed on the job by traumatic injuries and an estimated 50,000 deaths from occupational diseases. Each day, 150 workers in this country died because of exposure to workplace hazards.

In 2015, there were 3.7 million workplace injuries reported, with more than half of them serious, but these numbers don’t show the whole problem. Studies have shown that up to half of all workplace injuries are not reported on the OSHA injury log. One of the reasons is that some workers fear that they will be retaliated against or fired if they report an injury.

The new OSHA rule strengthens protections for workers who report injuries, which will allow workers to report their more freely and result in more complete reporting.

OSHA’s injury tracking rule is an important worker protection measure that does three things. First, it prohibits employers from retaliating against workers who report workplace injuries. Second, it continues longstanding requirements that certain employers in high-risk industries submit summary injury and illness data to OSHA, which now must be done electronically. And, third, it requires large employers in high-risk industries to submit more detailed injury and illness data to OSHA.

These are critical protections for workers. They should not be overturned.

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, employers will still be required to keep this information on record. Any OSHA inspector can come in and inspect those records. So the idea that there is no documentation of any workplace injuries or illnesses is still there.

The problem here is that it is put on a website, that could have issues with FOIA requests, also publicly available. Businesses will be forced to sensitive information and confidential information that will be public information that risks the identity of many employees out there.

OSHA has historically recognized the sensitive nature of this data and sought to protect employees’ information being released on. As I said, the Freedom of Information Act request.

Furthermore, OSHA has failed to demonstrate any evidence that this rule is effective in reducing workplace injuries and illnesses. I think the point to remember here is that employers are required to keep the records of that, and OSHA inspectors can see that. So when OSHA comes in and inspects a business entity, they can look at those records and see what the workplace injuries are and red flag them, and they have that ability. But personal information should not be at risk to the public and risk people’s identities and their personal health issues for illness at work injuries.

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Scott), my friend, the distinguished ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, which blocks OSHA’s ability to improve tracking of injuries and illnesses in workplaces across the country.

One of the problems we have is that Federal OSHA and State OSHA plans have less than 2,000 inspectors to cover 8 million workplaces nationally. If you do the arithmetic, each Federal OSHA inspector can inspect a workplace about once every 159 years. State OSHA might be able to do it once a century. So the fact that you have something on site that is there for them to see if they ever get there, the problem is they never get there.

We need to make sure they have the information to know which ones to go to, which ones are the dangerous sites. The scarce resources that OSHA needs to precisely target those resources is a result of these reports. For large employers, and each illness with summary information from smaller employers, that is how they figure out where to visit.

This rule also protects workers against discrimination if they report injuries. GAO has found that workers fear reporting injuries, especially where employers impose sanctions or reduce bonuses for work-related injuries.

This amendment would upend this important rule which allows OSHA to target their resources to inspect those that really need inspecting. This amendment would upend the rule and compromise its transparency and worker protections.

The information is not individually identifiable. People are protected. But
the courts have said that this information is not confidential.

This amendment would rig the system against worker safety by depriving OSHA of the information they need to target the workplaces, so I request a ‘no’ vote on this amendment.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask support of my amendment to make sure that we protect the private health records of our employees at the work site and any illnesses that they might have. I don’t think we should risk that.

As I said earlier, I think OSHA inspectors have the ability to come in and inspect those records on the workplace site. Putting it out on the internet doesn’t make a lot of sense.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, Congress should support OSHA’s efforts to protect workers and use their data to target safety and health efforts to the most dangerous workplaces.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this rider and to move forward with the underlying bill.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 188 printed in House Report 115-297.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 189 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this rider and to move forward with the underlying bill.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 188 printed in House Report 115-297.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 189 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Gibbes) having assumed the chair, Mr. ARRINGTON, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill to make appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS PROGRAM

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to highlight the importance of the Secure Rural Schools program. It was created to fill a void in the economics left by restrictive forest management practices and regulations that have basically cut off our Federal forests and left many rural communities without the forests that once drove their economy: timber harvest.

The program was established in 2000 as only a temporary program to help rural America until we could restore active forest management, which would allow communities to then be self-sufficient to create jobs, work the land, and keep their schools running.

Indeed, the temporary program has not seen the practices towards forest management, towards timber harvest that is needed, as we see the West up in smoke once again.

We need, in Congress, to put policies in place that allow for timber harvest, for better air quality, for the safety of the habitat, for the economy, and for secure rural schools so they will see funding they need, and for counties as well the revenues to get money on the road.

In Modoc County, they are afraid they may have to close one of their high schools, which means another 50-mile drive through bad weather over a ridge for some of the students there.

Congress must implement commonsense forest management for a myriad of reasons: again, forest health, school funding, jobs, all the things that make sense for the West. We need to pass Secure Rural Schools funding.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CURRIBO of Florida (at the request of Mr. MccARTHY) for today on account of assisting his family and constituents in recovery efforts from Hurricane Irma.

Mr. MARINO (at the request of Mr. MccARTHY) for today on account of personal reasons.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker’s table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1311. An act to provide assistance in abolishing human trafficking in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary; in addition, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and to the Committee on Homeland Security (ordered to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. 1312. An act to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary; in addition, to the Committee on Education and the Workforce; and to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3732. An act to amend section 1113 of the Social Security Act to provide authority for increased fiscal year 2017 and 2018 payments for temporary assistance to United States citizens returned from foreign countries.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on September 11, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3732. To amend section 1113 of the Social Security Act to provide authority for increased fiscal year 2017 and 2018 payments for temporary assistance to United States citizens returned from foreign countries.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o’clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 13, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

2461. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service; Livestock, Poultry, and Seed Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Rules of Practice Governing Formal Adjudicatory Proceedings Instituted by the Secretary Under Various Statutes [Docket No.: AMS-LPS-16-0051](RIN: 0581-AD58) received August 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2462. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Importation of Hass Avocados From Colombia [Docket No.: APHIS-2016-0022](RIN: 0579-AE29) received August 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2463. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Defense Chemical Demilitarization Program Semi-Annual Report to Congress for September 2017, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1521(j); Public Law 99-145, Sec. 1412 (as amended by Public Law 112-238, Sec. 1421(a)); (126 Stat. 294); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2464. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Division of Regulatory Services, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Teacher Preparation Issues [Docket ID: ED-2014-OPE-0057](RIN: 1840-0022)
Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (Docket No.: 31183; Amrd. No.: 3755) received August 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2490. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (Docket No.: 31144; Amrd. No.: 3756) received August 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2491. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Mosinee, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0355; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-12] received August 23, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2492. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Texas Towns; Pampa, TX and Seminole, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0185; Airspace Doc. No.: 17-ASW-6] received August 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2493. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; St. George, UT [Docket No.: FAA-2016-6162; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-12] received August 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2494. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1987; Directorate Identifier 2017-NM-39-AD; Amendment 2492; AD 2017-15-08 (RIN: 2120-AA46) received August 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2495. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1989; Directorate Identifier 2017-NM-39-AD; Amendment 2492; AD 2017-16-06 (RIN: 2120-AA46) received August 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2496. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0353; Product Identifier 2017-NM-022-AD; Amendment 2492; AD 2017-17-04 (RIN: 2120-AA46) received August 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2497. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of correct liability (Rev. Proc. 2017-44) received August 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2498. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — General Arbitration Rule (Rev. Proc. 2017-44) received August 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.


2500. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Section 365 Treatments of Elective Dividends by Publicly Offered REITs and REICs (Rev. Proc. 2017-46) received August 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2501. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report entitled, “Implementing the Cybersecurity Strategy Act of 2015” for Fiscal Year 2016, pursuant to 6 U.S.C. 1506(a)(1); Public Law 114-113, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2492. A bill to authorize the State of Utah to select certain lands that are available for disposal under the Pony Express Act which were not earlier to be used for the support and benefit of State institutions, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1624. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to identify any entity that is making a financial service available to a former President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BISHOP: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 1626. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to identify any entity that is making financial services available to a former President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. EVANS, Ms. BEATTY, Ms. MAXINE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. SWEWILL of Alabama, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mr. PAYNE: H.R. 3741. A bill to codify the Minority Bank Deposit Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. KRISHNA MOORTHY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mrs. DAVIS of California): H.R. 3742. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide formula grants to States to improve higher education opportunities for foster youth and homeless youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. MEEKS (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. SWEWILL of Alabama, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mr. PAYNE): H.R. 3742. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide formula grants to States to improve higher education opportunities for foster youth and homeless youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. VELOZ: H.R. 3743. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations to ensure airfare fairness in the wake of a disaster or emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. BISHOP: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 3744. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to establish that an Indian group may receive Federal acknowledgment as an Indian tribe only by an Act of Congress; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. LAWRENCE (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. NAPOLEON, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. DESAULNIER): H.R. 3745. A bill to amend the Fair Housing Act to establish that certain conduct, in or around a dwelling, shall be considered to be a violation of the HUD regulations of determining whether a certain type of sexual harassment has occurred under that Act, and for
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other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself and Ms. Mooring)

H.R. 3740. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to facilitate the commer-
cialization of energy and related technolo-
gies developed at Department of Energy facilities with promising commercial poten-
tial; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Com-
mittee on Armed Services, for a period to be
subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provi-
sions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself and Mr. Langevin)

H.R. 3751. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to direct the Election Assistance Commission to develop best prac-
tices for States to use to protect the integ-

ty of elections; to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provi-
sions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NORCROSS (for himself and Mr. Costello of Pennsylvania)

H.R. 3752. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to implement plans to improve the safety of medical facili-
ties of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON

H.R. 3753. A bill to establish the United States Commission on an Open Society with the authority of the Bureau of Consumer Fi-

nancial Protection with respect to persons regulated by a State insurance regulator for
and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOTEIMMER (for himself, Mr. Fitzpatrick, and Mr. Reed).

H.R. 3747. A bill to require financial institu-
tions to freeze the assets of individuals ar-
rested under federal law for participating in
domestic terrorism or providing material sup-
port to terrorists, to establish a national clear-

inghouse for information on incidents of ho-
ping domestic terrorism, and persons providing material support to terrorists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently de-
termined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall with-
in the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York (for him-
self, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILINE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. DeLAURO, Mr. DUTCH, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MENTZEL, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KRANNA, Mr. KRISHNAAMOORTHI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCACHIN, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PERRY of North Carolina, Mr. QUISELY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. TITTUS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DILANEY, Ms. PINSKER, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. KHIUEN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SEAN GARAMENDI, Ms. S. TSHE-PORTER, Mr. PETRONE, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. HECK)

H.R. 3748. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an option for individuals who are ages 50 to 64 to buy into Medicare, to provide for health insur-
ance market stabilization, and for other pur-
poses; to the Committee on Energy and Com-
mmerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subse-
cuently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida (for him-
self, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MEERKS, Ms. WIL-
son of Florida, Ms. LEE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. KAPTEUR, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. MCGOV-
ERN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MICHELLE Lujan Grisham of New Mexico, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mrs. FUDOE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. VELA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. PAYNE)

H.R. 3749. A bill to amend the Food and Nu-
trition Act of 2008 to provide for a standard medical expense deduction under the supple-
mental nutrition assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agri-
culture, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a pe-
riod to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdicti-
on of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MICHELLE LÚJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself and Mr. POE of New Mexico)

H.R. 3750. A bill to amend the Energy Pol-
icy Act of 2005 to facilitate the commer-

cionalization of energy and related technolo-
gies developed at Department of Energy facilities with promising commercial poten-
tial; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Com-
mittee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provi-
sions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DE SANTIS

H.R. 3737. Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I: The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for car-
rying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitu-
tion in this Government of the United States, or in any Department or Offi-
cier thereof.

By Mr. McGOVERN

H.R. 3736. Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, United States Constitu-
tion

By Mr. MEEEKS

H.R. 3741. Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

The necessary and proper clause of the Constitu-
tion and the interstate commerce clause.

By Ms. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois

H.R. 3742. Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution and its subse-
quent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ

H.R. 3743. Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

“The Congress shall have Power to . . .

provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States;”

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah

H.R. 3744. Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3

By Mrs. LAWRENCE

H.R. 3745. Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, “To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. DUFFY

H.R. 3746. Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 1, clause 1 (relating to the general Welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).
By Mr. GOTTKEIM:
H.R. 3747. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States.

H.R. 3750. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article One of the United States Constitution, located at section 8, clause 18.

H.R. 3752. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article One of the United States Constitution, located at section 8, clause 18.

H.R. 3753. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
section 1 of article I, and clause 18, section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions to reflect the following:
H.R. 36: Mr. Francis Rooney of Florida, Mr. Loudermilk, and Mr. Higgins of Louisiana.
H.R. 38: Mr. Davidson and Mr. Gallagher.
H.R. 233: Mr. Ryan of Ohio and Ms. Kastner.
H.R. 294: Mr. Kilmer.
H.R. 299: Mr. Estes of Kansas.
H.R. 365: Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 463: Mr. Garrett.
H.R. 489: Ms. Speier.
H.R. 490: Mr. Simpson.
H.R. 596: Mr. Grothman and Mr. Capuano.
H.R. 539: Mr. Cohen.
H.R. 548: Mr. Krishnamoorthi.
H.R. 604: Mr. Brooks of Alabama.
H.R. 632: Mr. Sires.
H.R. 644: Mr. Davidson and Mr. Labrador.
H.R. 662: Mr. Costello of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 681: Mr. Young of Iowa.
H.R. 596: Mr. Larsen of Washington.
H.R. 721: Ms. Blunt Rochester and Mr. Gottkeimer.
H.R. 741: Mr. Fortenberry.
H.R. 750: Mr. Swalwell of California.
H.R. 754: Ms. Garrard, Mr. Panetta, Mrs. Larsen of Washington, Mrs. King of Maryland, Mr. Stewart, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Mrs. Blackburn, Mr. Yooh, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, and Mr. Mitchell.
H.R. 2454: Mr. Brucato.
H.R. 2580: Mr. Yooh.
H.R. 2591: Mr. LaHood.
H.R. 2683: Mr. Burgess.
H.R. 2867: Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico.
H.R. 2701: Mrs. Bustos, Mr. Donovan, and Mr. Langevin.
H.R. 2713: Mr. Bähr and Mrs. Bustos.
H.R. 2722: Mr. Grottkeimer, Mr. Tinkham, Mrs. Yooh, Mr. Poe of Texas, and Mrs. Hartledge.
H.R. 2733: Mr. Nolan and Mr. Himbs.
H.R. 2749: Mr. Pascrell, Mr. Mitchell, and Mrs. Napoleoni.
H.R. 2790: Mr. Viskosky.
H.R. 2797: Mr. Jeffries and Mr. Khuri.
H.R. 2801: Ms. Lofgren.
H.R. 2806: Mr. Cook.
H.R. 2832: Mr. Francis Rooney of Florida and Mr. Roe.
H.R. 2871: Mr. Jones, Mr. desJarlais, and Mr. Wittman.
H.R. 2890: Mr. Quigley and Mr. Rush.
H.R. 2902: Mr. Fitzpatrick and Mr. Swalwell of California.
H.R. 2909: Mr. Williams, Mr. Cole, Mr. Luetkemeyer, and Mr. Burgess.
H.R. 2926: Mr. Faso, Mr. Rothfus, and Mr. Marino.
H.R. 2942: Mr. Levin.
H.R. 2953: Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois, Mr. Roe of Tennessee, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Walberg, Mr. Messner, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Emmer, and Mr. Olson.
H.R. 2955: Mr. Mica of Florida.
H.R. 2971: Mr. Loebsack, Mr. Allred of Texas, and Mr. Jaworski.
H.R. 2980: Mr. Amash, Mr. Fortenberry, Mr. Walsh of Pennsylvania, Mr. Mooney, Mr. Taylor of Pennsylvania, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Hunter.
H.R. 3409: Mr. Walberg, Mr. Huizenga, and Mr. Upton.
H.R. 3441: Mr. Jody B. Hice of Georgia, Mr. Hollingsworth, Mr. Palmer, Mr. Smith of Missouri, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Hensarling, Mr. Loudermilk, Mr. Westerman, Mr. Smith of Nebraska, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Flores, and Mr. Womack.
H.R. 3497: Mrs. Dingell, Mrs. Radewagen, Mr. King of Iowa, Mr. Yoho, Mr. Jones, Mr. Franks of Arizona, Mr. Ratcliffe, Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, and Mr. Young of Alaska.
H.R. 3513: Ms. Slaughter and Mr. Welch.
H.R. 3549: Mr. Wittman.
H.R. 3570: Mr. Aderholt.
H.R. 3593: Ms. Slaughter.
H.R. 3640: Mr. Biggs.
H.R. 3666: Mr. Langevin.
H.R. 3673: Mr. LaMalfa.
H.R. 3674: Mr. LoBiondo.
H.R. 3688: Mr. Bacon and Mr. Blum.
H.R. 3697: Mr. Zeldin and Mr. Arrington.
H.R. 3699: Mr. Soto.
H.R. 3710: Mr. Serrano and Ms. Slaughter.
H.R. 3731: Mr. King of New York.
H.R. 466: Mr. Smith of Washington.
H. Res. 51: Mr. Krishnamoorthi.
H. Res. 31: Mr. Larson of Connecticut.
H. Res. 161: Ms. Brownley of California, Ms. Moore, Mr. Moulton, and Mr. Loebach.
H. Res. 220: Mr. Capuano.
H. Res. 443: Mr. Sensenbrenner and Mr. Pocan.
H. Res. 466: Ms. Titus, Mr. Pocan, Mr. Smith of Washington, and Mr. Lance.
H. Res. 467: Mr. Capuano.
H. Res. 495: Mr. Grijalva, Ms. Pingree, Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, Mr. Hastings, Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas, and Mr. McGovern.
H. Res. 505: Mr. Gomez, Mr. Garamendi, Mr. Walz, and Mr. Poe of Texas.
H. Res. 507: Mr. Gutiérrez.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 3697 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.