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.

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 of 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 that tomb was guarded, protected from that terror in the skies. Remarkable people, these Americans. And that is just the way it is.

INCREDEBLE 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 magician, Ms. Jolene Herfel, most impressed me with 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 William Earl Hilton and his deputies; and Azar 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, Lauren Dickson, Dr. Matthew 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, and 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, 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 Huhn 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.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National POW/MIA Day and to remember the brave Americans who became prisoners of war during their service and those still missing in action.

Since America's founding, hundreds of thousands of Americans have been held as prisoners of war. To this day, more than 80,000 Americans remain missing in action.

These patriots answered the call of duty during some of our Nation's darkest times. Their service and enormous sacrifice must never be forgotten or taken for granted. So I stand here today reaffirming our Nation's commitment to these Americans.

They deserve to return home, and their families deserve answers. That is why every third Friday in September is recognized as National POW/MIA Recognition Day.

Today, I ask that we all pause for a moment to remember these Americans.

Remember their sacrifice, and if they are still missing, pray for their coming.

HONORING THE FALLEN ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) 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 that attack 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 human beings—as 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 Kentucky (Mr. COMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the new year, I was able to join the majority leader and a number of my fellow freshmen on an 8-day trip to Israel.

I would like to thank Leader McCARTHY for organizing this informative and memorable visit, which taught me so much about the importance of the U.S.-Israel relationship and the numerous challenges and opportunities facing our two countries and our other allies in the region.

It is impossible to visit Israel without feeling the weight of history, from Biblical times to modern day. Staying in Jerusalem, seeing Bethlehem up close, viewing Israel from atop the Golan Heights, and traveling all along the Jordan River, all made a lasting impression.

My time in Israel also impressed me on Israel's undeniable security needs in the face of the persistent threat from Iran and its proxies in Syria and Lebanon, as well as the ongoing and violent stem from the long-running conflict with the Palestinians.

Listening to Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's presentation to our congressional delegation greatly enhanced my level of support for Israeli foreign aid, just as listening to the Palestinian Authority's presentation greatly enhanced my opposition to foreign aid for Palestine.

For these reasons, I believe U.S. security assistance to Israel should continue to be a high priority, and I am proud that defense collaboration between our two countries has yielded many important developments, including the Arrow anti-ballistic missile system, which is among the top missile shield technologies in the world.

Considering the growing threat of North Korea's nuclear missile program and Iran's ballistic missile development, it is clear that our efforts in this field are more important now than ever.

In addition to our successful cooperation on defense, the U.S. and Israel also work together on many other issues. One of these issues that is of particular interest to me is agriculture. I never dreamed that Israel's agriculture industry would be as advanced as it was.

Despite a very challenging ecosystem, Israel produces enough food to feed their entire country, as well as boasts a very impressive agriculture export market.

In conclusion, I believe the close working relationship between our two governments will remain critically important for many years to come, and I am grateful for the opportunity to advance these ties in one small way through my visit last month.

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 make schools with additional nutritious food 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 the work being done by 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 siblings for extended periods of time for the good of our Nation. They are unsung heroes, and they, too, deserve our recognition for their sacrifice.

So to the airmen of the 442nd, 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. 2662, the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act, that will begin to treat 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, Rollings 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 schoolday, 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 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:

Hon. Paul D. Ryan, Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5(h) 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. 237 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:
"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, 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 in accordance with paragraph (1).

(3) Providing assistance, through training, exercises, and other means, to build or sustain such 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 informing agencies participating in 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 CITIZENS.—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) REPORT.—(1) WORKSHOP SERIES REPORT.—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 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.

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

(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 gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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 matters with their consideration of this legislation.

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 matters with their consideration of this legislation.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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 is the direct result 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 recommit 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 to respond to these threats.

The Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series (JCTAWS) provides an environment where local fire service, law enforcement, emergency medical 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 operations 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, best practices are communicated to the participants as well as mitigation strategies and resources to address gaps in preparedness.

H.R. 3284 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,

Chief John D. Sinclair,  
President and Chairman of the Board.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC.

PLEO COMMANDS 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 expediting the Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series Act of 2017. FLEOA is the nonpartisan, 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 FBI 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 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 first responders, are well coordinated and thoroughly planned.

The Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series Act 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. This city is one of the major gateways to our Nation’s history, our first responders are on the front lines when our country is most vulnerable.

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

The Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series Act of 2017, FLEOA is the nonpartisan, 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 FBI 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. 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
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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 imperative to provide these resources to local law enforcement agencies in order to protect the United States when it is most vulnerable.

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.

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

DHS INTELLIGENCE ROTATIONAL ASSIGNMENT PROGRAM ACT OF 2017

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2453) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Intelligence Rotational Assignment Program in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2453

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 “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 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 serving in existing analyst positions within the Department’s Intelligence Enterprise and other Department employees 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 gentlewoman 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 terrorist 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 rotation 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 developmental 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 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.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will make the country more safe. I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE.

Washington, DC, September 8, 2017.

Hon. Michael McCaul,
Chairman, House 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 to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Homeland Security by requiring the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Intelligence Rotational Assignment Program (IRAP), to establish an Intelligence Rotational Assignment Program to enable the Department to promote and reward participation.

As discussed in previous correspondence regarding H.R. 2825, we signed a Memorandum of Agreement between Congress and 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. The January 2017 Exchange of Letters clarified that the Department of 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

September 12, 2017
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 will consider the legislative 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 there may be areas of jurisdictional interest that both of our committees will work jointly to vet and clear amendments which may be offered in my name and the Department’s Office of Intelligence and Analysis, we agree to work together to ensure that the House receives the most effective congressional guidance.

Finally, I reiterate my intention that nothing included in the 2017 ‘Memorandum Regarding Authorization of the Department of Homeland Security’ alters the jurisdiction of either 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.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCaul: 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 does not preclude either the Committee on Homeland Security, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, or the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence from authorizing other Intelligence-related activities of DHS. Further, I hope the staff of our committees can continue to closely and expeditiously to 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.
Security or its components, are hereby recog-
nizing our agreement on the following prin-
ciples 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 op-
eration.

2. Committees with jurisdiction over the Department and its components will prioritize the authorization of the Department and any unauthorized or expiring com-
ponent 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 com-
prehensive authorization bill 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 develop-
ment of any comprehensive authorization bill for the Department.

5. The Committee on Homeland Security and the committees with jurisdiction over other components of the Department shall jointly develop a process for the vetting and pre-
clearing of base 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 consider-
ation of any comprehensive authorization bill for the Department, including timely resolution of any matters subject to a se-
quential or additional referral.

7. To the extent there are policy differ-
ces between the committees regarding a provision of the comprehensive authorization bill for the Department, the committees will 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 provi-
sion or a provision reflecting revenue. If the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means makes such a determination, nothing in this agreement shall be construed to preclude authorization or expiring components of the Department shall fall within the jurisdiction of a committee other than, or in addition to, the Committee on Homeland Security.

9. Nothing in this agreement shall be con-
strained or altered to change 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 provi-
sion or a provision reflecting revenue. If the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means makes such a determination, nothing in this agreement shall be construed to preclude the Department 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.

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

Signed,

GREG "WALDEN,
Chair, Committee on Energy and Com-
merce
DEVIN NUNES,
Chair, Permanent Select Committee on In-
elligence
JASON CRAFFTS,
Chair, Committee on Oversight and Gov-
ernment Reform
BILL SHUSTER,
Chair, Committee on Transportation and In-
fraestructure

MICHAEL T. McCaul,
Chair, Committee on Homeland Security
BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Oversight and Government Re-
form
LAMAR SMITH,
Chair, Committee on Science, Space and Tech-
ology
KEVIN BRADY,
Chair, Committee on Ways and Means

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
WASHINGTON, DC, SEPTEMBER 11, 2017.

Hon. DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on In-
terelligence, WASHINGTON, DC, SEPTEMBER 11, 2017.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2453 was over-
whelmingly approved by the Com-
munity of the Department of Homeland Security. The ro-
total program that it authorizes has the potential to not only provide some of the dedicated DHS employees a boost in morale and fresh perspective on the mission, but also to enrich DHS' con-
tributions to the intelligence enter-
prise.

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

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

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 urge my House col-
leagues to support this bipartisan legis-
lation.
bills are virtually identical to specific provisions contained in H.R. 2625, the House-passed “Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act of 2017” for which I wrote to you on June 27, 2017. Among those, 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 the Memorandum Regarding Authorization of the Department of Homeland Security and exchanged letters on January 11, 2017 (January 2017 Exchange of Letters) I am writing to affirm that, consistent with the intent of the House of Representatives, the Intelligence Authorization Act (IAA) is the vehicle that through which Congress authorizes annual appropriations for the CIA, including NIP-funded elements of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Moreover, those letters made explicit that the Committee on Homeland Security does not intend to consider any 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 request a referral of the bill.

In order to expedite the House’s consideration of H.R. 2453, 2468, and 2470, the Committee on Homeland Security recommends that the House expedite consideration of those measures. Moreover, the Committee on Homeland Security continues to be guided by the January 2017 Exchange of Letters, including the Memorandum, Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Best Regards,

DRVIN NUNES
Chairman.

Enclosure.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,

Hon. DRVIN NUNES,
Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,
U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman Nune:

Thank you for your letter supporting the Committee on Homeland Security’s plans to conduct a comprehensive review 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 that the Department is fully authorized, and recognize that this must be done in the context of the Committee on Intelligence’s jurisdiction over the “functions of the Department of Homeland Security,” including those provisions related to the “integration, analysis, and dissemination of homeland security information,” while Rule X(11)(b)(1) 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 “[a]uthorizations for appropriations, both direct and indirect, for . . . the National Intelligence Program as defined in Section 3(6) of the National Security Act;” and 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 provisions related to the “integration, analysis, and dissemination of homeland security information.”

As you also know, the Intelligence Authorization Act (IAA) is the vehicle for authorizing the National Intelligence Program (NIP) as defined in Section 3(6) of the National Security Act;’’ and 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 provisions related to the “integration, analysis, and dissemination of homeland security information.”

As you also know, the Intelligence Authorization Act (IAA) is the vehicle for authorizing the National Intelligence Program (NIP) as defined in Section 3(6) of the National Security Act;’’ and 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 provisions related to the “integration, analysis, and dissemination of homeland security information.”

As you also know, the Intelligence Authorization Act (IAA) is the vehicle for authorizing the National Intelligence Program (NIP) as defined in Section 3(6) of the National Security Act;’’ and 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 provisions related to the “integration, analysis, and dissemination of homeland security information.”

As you also know, the Intelligence Authorization Act (IAA) is the vehicle for authorizing the National Intelligence Program (NIP) as defined in Section 3(6) of the National Security Act;’’ and 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 provisions related to the “integration, analysis, and dissemination of homeland security information.”

As you also know, the Intelligence Authorization Act (IAA) is the vehicle for authorizing the National Intelligence Program (NIP) as defined in Section 3(6) of the National Security Act;’’ and 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 provisions related to the “integration, analysis, and dissemination of homeland security information.”

As you also know, the Intelligence Authorization Act (IAA) is the vehicle for authorizing the National Intelligence Program (NIP) as defined in Section 3(6) of the National Security Act;’’ and 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 provisions related to the “integration, analysis, and dissemination of homeland security information.”
related to these other intelligence and intel-
ligence-related activities of DHS. Further-
more, 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
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.

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. 2453.

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.

PATHWAYS TO IMPROVING HOMELAND SECURITY AT THE LOCAL LEVEL ACT

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the
bill (H.R. 2427) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002, to direct the
Assistant Secretary for State and Local Law Enforcement to produce and dis-
disseminate an annual catalog on Department of Homeland Security training,
publications, programs, and services for State, local, and tribal law enforce-
ment agencies, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2427

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Represen-
tatives of the United States of America in Con-
gress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ‘‘Pathways to
Improving Homeland Security at the Local
Level Act’’.

SEC. 2. ANNUAL CATALOG ON DEPARTMENT OF
HOMELAND SECURITY TRAINING, PUBLICATIONS, PROGRAMS, AND SERVICES FOR STATE, LOCAL, AND TRIBAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGEN-
CIES.

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking ‘‘and’’ at the end;
(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking the pe-
riod and inserting ‘‘; and’’; and
(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

‘‘(G) produce an annual catalog that sum-
maries opportunities for training, publica-
tions, programs, and services available to
State, local, and tribal law enforcement
agencies from the Department and from each
company at and office within the Department
and, not later than 30 days after the date of
such production, disseminate the catalog, in-
cluding by—

‘‘(i) making such catalog available to
State, local, and tribal law enforcement
agencies, including by posting the catalog on
the website of the Department and cooper-
ating with national organizations that rep-
resent such agencies;

‘‘(ii) making such catalog available
through the Homeland Security Information
Network; and

‘‘(iii) submitting such catalog to the Com-
mittee on Homeland Security and the Com-
mitttee on Governmental Operations of the House of Represen-
tatives and the Committee on Home-
land Security and Governmental Affairs and
the Committee on the Judiciary of the Sen-
ate.’’.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursu-
ant to the rule, the gentleman from Wis-
consin (Mr. GALLAGHER) and the gentleman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN) each will control 20 min-
utes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

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 prepare supplemental 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 no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Pathways to
Improving Homeland Security at the Local Level Act, sponsored by the gen-
tlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS),

ensures 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 and prepares an annual report to
the Department of Homeland Security, and to disseminate the catalog to State and local law
enforcement entities within 30 days of
production.

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

rity Information Network. By requir-
ing the Office to share this catalog
trough this existing information shar-

ing platform, it will expand the number of
State and local law enforcement partners who receive it.

This bill is a commonsense measure
focused on increasing transparency on
DHS tools and resources available to
State and local law enforcement.

I commend the gentlewoman from
Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS) for her work on
this measure. She is unable to be
present today because of Hurricane
Irma. Our thoughts and prayers are
with her, her district, and the State of
Florida as recovery efforts continue.

On behalf of the Committee on Home-

land Security, I want to express our
appreciation to the Judiciary Committee for working with us to move this meas-
ure.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Hon. MICHAEL T. McCaul,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN McCaul: I write with re-
spect to H.R. 2427, the ‘‘Pathways to Improv-
ing Homeland Security at the Local Level Act.’’ As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions that
t 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 fore-
going consideration of H.R. 2427 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legisla-
tion and that our committee will be appro-
priately 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 approval of an appro-
priate number of conferences 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. 2427 and would ask that a copy of our response be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this bill.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, D.C., September 6, 2017.
Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for
your letter regarding H.R. 2427, the ‘‘Path-
ways to Improving Homeland Security at the
Local Level Act.’’ I appreciate your support
in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, under-
stand that the Committee on the Judiciary will forego further consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security
concerns with the mutual understanding that by fore-going consideration of this bill at this
time, the Judiciary does not waive any juris-
diction over the subject matter contained in
this bill or similar legislation in the future.

In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support your request to
have the Committee on the Judiciary rep-
resented on the conference committee.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the
Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you
for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCaul,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2427, Pathways to Improving Homeland
Security at the Local Level Act.

Sixteen years ago, the terrorist at-
tacks of September 11 brought home the reality that terrorism prevention
and preparedness is a shared Federal,
State, and local responsibility.
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 the Department.

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 live 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 of our first responders, so they are trained to protect the homeland.

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, Spe. Steve Perez of the Houston Police Department drowned after his patrol car got stuck on a flooded road. His death 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 provide 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 terrorist incident, Texas would have been left susceptible due to the chaos surrounding our first responders.

It is important to equip our first responders with every opportunity for training in homeland security to ensure that in times of natural disasters such as Hurricane Harvey and the flooding across Southeast Texas, they are prepared to handle any situation they may face, with the smallest amount of lives lost as possible.

The bill would produce an annual catalog with training opportunities and other services available to state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies, which I wish to ensuredress catastrophic flood events.

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.

Through this catalog, 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. 210 et seq.) 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 Secretary, acting through 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.

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

“(1) Empirical data assessing terrorist activity 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 threat information, there is still not a formalized process that evaluates homeland threats in a meaningful and comprehensive way.

The assessment in this bill requires DHS to conduct an analysis and analyze Departmental 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 consume.

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 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 and Federal IT 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 once 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:
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Hon. Michael McCaul,
Chairman, House 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 to make certain 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. 2623, 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 you would be sequentially referred to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence ("the Committee") 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 of Representatives, the 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 request a sequential referral of the bill.

In order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 2453, 2468, and 2470, the 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 matters covered by the bills over the subject matter contained in these bills or any similar measure. It is also conditioned on the Committee on Homeland Security's agreement embodied in the January 2017 Exchange of Letters.

I would appreciate your response to this letter and your agreement with what I have said. I would request that you include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during floor 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,
U.S. Capitol, 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". In my capacity as Chairman of the Committee on 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(I)(3) of the House of Representatives provides: "[t]he Intelligence Committee has 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(11)(b)(1) grants the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence jurisdiction over "proposed legislation . . . relating to the National Intelligence Program (NIP)" and "authorizations for appropriations, both direct and indirect, for the National Intelligence Program (NIP)" as defined in Section 3(6) of the National Security Act."
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 any 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 notify you 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 this letter alters the 2017 "Memorandum Regarding Authorization of the Department of Homeland Security" alterations to the jurisdiction of either 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 to ensure that the Department and its components are authorized on a regular basis.

Sincerely,

Michael T. McCaul

Dear Chairman McCaul: In accordance with paragraph 10 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 reauthorization of DHS that will improve congressional oversight of the Department. As you know, Rule X(11)(b)(1) of the Rules of the House authorizes the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to consider and the House will authorize the elements of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) funded through the National Intelligence Program (NIP).

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 through which Congress authorizes appropriations for the NIP, including for elements of DHS that receive funding through the NIP. The IAA includes a classified schedule that contains data related to the acquisition of the DHS, and a statute by reference, and direction and recommendations in a classified annex to the report of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. By January 2017 the "Memorandum Regarding Authorization of the Department of Homeland Security," shall be construed to grant the Committee on Intelligence jurisdiction over proposed legislation relating to the NIP or authorizations for appropriations for the NIP.

In keeping with these principles, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence will not report to the House any bill that authorizes any elements of DHS funded through the NIP. If any such bill is reported by the Committee on Homeland Security, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence will request a sequential referral of the bill. Understanding, 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. We further agree that I will not oppose non-germane 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 appointment of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence as any committee conference on a DHS-wide authorization bill that includes any provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS.

In accordance with Rule X(11)(b)(2) this understanding does not preclude either the Committee on Homeland Security or the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence from authorizing other intelligence and intelligence-related activities of DHS, including, but not limited to, the Homeland Security Intelligence Program. In keeping with the January 2017 "Memorandum Regarding Authorization of the Department of Homeland Security," our committees will work jointly to vet and clear any provisions of a DHS authorization bill 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 to conduct rigorous oversight of intelligence activities throughout DHS.

The understanding detailed by this letter is intended to provide assurance that it shall not constitute an understanding between our committees in any subsequent Congress.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. 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 assessment 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 terrorist 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 Northeast Florida 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.

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.

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 Representaties of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that—

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.

"(a) 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. 121)).

"(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 Federal law enforcement agencies and the private sector.

"(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 210F 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 (6 U.S.C. 121(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "The Secretary shall ensure that the Chief Intelligence Officer has staff having appropriate expertise and experience to fulfill the responsibilities of the Chief Intelligence Officer.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.
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 Department-wide guidance on the proper procedures for handling and sharing information related to homeland security and terrorism.

The 9/11 Commission Report found that the United States government did not fully share or pool intelligence information prior to the attacks. In response, policies and procedures were reformed 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 my colleagues 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. 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, I rise in support of my legislation, H.R. 2433, the Homeland Security Assessment of Terrorists Use of Virtual Currencies Act.

This measure was considered by the Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence and included in the Committee on Homeland Security’s DHS authorization bill, which passed the House in January.

I want to take time to thank the gentlewoman for her work and for her diligence on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support her bill.

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 my legislation, H.R. 2433, the Homeland Security Assessment of Terrorists Use of Virtual Currencies Act.

Yesterday marked 16 years since the September 11 attacks when 19 terrorists hijacked four passenger planes, two of which struck the World Trade Center towers in my home State of New York.

In the 16 years since the deadliest terrorist attack in American history, the United States has led the global campaign to combat terrorism, thwarting plots and preventing attacks on American soil, identifying and disrupting terrorist networks around the world, hunting down terrorists wherever they hide, and proving that they can and will be brought to justice.

We know that the threat of terrorism is not the same as it was 16 years ago. It is a threat that constantly evolves, and we need to evolve ahead of it. That is why I introduced H.R. 2433.

In recent years, we have seen instances in which members of some terrorist groups have turned to virtual currencies to support themselves and fund their operations. Last year, the Foundation for Defense of Democracies investigated a terrorist funding campaign in which a terrorist group in the Gaza Strip received money in the virtual currency bitcoin. Earlier this year, Indonesian authorities reported that a Syria-based Indonesian with ties...
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, lone-wolf attackers 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, my 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 counter-terrorism 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.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, my friend from New York (Miss RICE), has no other speakers. If the gentlewoman is not in the process of articulating her legislation; therefore, I have no time remaining to outline, explain, and articulate my time.

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 yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support a good, well thought-out, meaningful, and useful bill. H.R. 2433.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) and the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE) each will have 5 legislative days 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. 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.

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.

Sixteen years after the 9/11 attacks by al-Qaeda terrorists on our homeland,
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 Data Framework Act of 2017 was passed, 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 view information against a large number of databases, using different logins, passwords, and legal restrictions.

The DHS data framework was designed to bring together these vital DHS datasets, including travel and cargo information, investigative data, and critical infrastructure data, among others.

The more important element of the framework is the replication of the platform on a classified network to allow classified analysis and vetting of law enforcement data against intelligence information.

Given the importance of the Data Framework Initiative, the need to work with security versus civil liberties, 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 audible.

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 again 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 any 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 civil 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. HURT, 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. HURT 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.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. 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 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; ensure that all information of a DHS office or component that falls within the scope of the information sharing environment, and any information or systems required to support mission needs and capability requirements of the homeland security enterprise, is included; and 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 jeopardize the protection of sources, methods, or activities; compromise a critical national security investigation; be inconsistent with the other federal laws or regulations; or 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.

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

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 sharing of important satellite data is provided by the United States-European Commission Cooperation Arrangement 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 for the office is continually identified as a problem area.

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

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 in response to any written 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,

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,

WASHINGTON, DC, SEPTEMBER 12, 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 and 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 conferences to any House-Senate conference for this 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,

John 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 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:

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.

(c) GENERAL LEAVE.

Mr. BARR. 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 Hazleton, Pennsylvania, I have long known that it will be the police officer on the streets of Hazleton, Shamokin or Shippensburg, not some analyst in Washington, who will recognize when a member of our community has radicalized or been recruited by a gang or terrorist sect.

That is one of the reasons why I worked with the committee to introduce H.R. 2443, the Department of Homeland Security Classified Facility Inventory Act.

My bill strengthens information sharing between local, State, and Federal law enforcement by requiring the DHS to maintain an inventory of facilities certified to store information classified above the secret level.

This is a follow-up to the Fusion Center Enhancement Act of 2017, which I first introduced last Congress and has successfully passed the committee in the House.

I come from a State with three fusion centers: the Pennsylvania Criminal Intelligence Center, known as PaCIC, in Harrisburg; Delaware Valley Intelligence Center in Philadelphia; and the 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, H.R. 2443 is an important piece of legislation. It has strong support on both sides of the aisle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Barletta) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2443, as amended?

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2443, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, 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 that this bill, as well as Department employees, 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 that this bill, as well as Department employees, will ensure that the Department does not invest in new facilities in areas already covered, in turn, reducing the chances of wasteful spending.

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. 2443 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 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.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 2443, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2443, 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. Barletta) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2443, 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.

TERRORIST RELEASE ANNOUNCEMENTS TO COUNTER EXTREMIST RECIDIVISM ACT

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2471) to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to share with State, local, and regional fusion centers release information from a Federal correctional facility, including the assessed risk of terrorism, in accordance with standard information-sharing procedures and policies.

This Act may be cited as the "Terrorist Release Announcements to Counter Extremist Recidivism Act" or the "TRACER Act".

SEC. 2. TERROR INMATE INFORMATION SHARING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Attorney General and in consultation with other appropriate Federal officials, shall, as appropriate, share with State, local, and regional fusion centers release information pertaining to an individual who is convicted of a Federal crime of terrorism who poses a terrorist threat; in accordance with standard information-sharing procedures and policies.

(1) for homeland security purposes; and

(2) regarding individuals convicted of a Federal crime of terrorism (as such term is defined in section 2332b of title 18, United States Code).

(b) SCOPE.—The information shared pursuant to subsection (a) shall be—

(1) for homeland security purposes; and

(2) regarding individuals convicted of a Federal crime of terrorism (as such term is defined in section 2332b of title 18, United States Code).

(c) PERIODIC THREAT ASSESSMENTS.—Conduct a threat assessment on individuals who are convicted of a Federal crime of terrorism who poses a terrorist threat, at least annually.

(d) PRIVACY PROTECTION.—Nothing in this Act precludes the establishment of a list or registry of individuals convicted of terrorism.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McCaul. 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.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the victims of the 9/11 attacks and to voice my support for the TRACER Act.

Mr. Speaker, 16 years ago, 19 cowardly terrorists hijacked four airplanes and used them as missiles to kill 3,000 innocent people. The souls that were lost belonged to moms and dads, brothers and sisters, sons and daughters.

It was a day that we will never forget. Each year, as we look back, we all remember something different about that morning. There are those who remember getting a phone call and listening to a frantic voice on the other end. Some remember running into the streets as the Twin Towers fell and feared for their lives. Others saw the Pentagon in flames and wondered who did this and why.

There are many other images and thoughts that are seared into our minds. However, we can also remember the heroism of our first responders, the bravery of our police officers who raced to the scene and charged up the stairs of the World Trade Center to save their fellow countrymen.
We can picture strangers helping strangers navigate through the dust and debris in downtown New York, and we can be grateful for the courageous passengers on United Airlines Flight 93 who saved an untold number of lives and perhaps the very city that we stand in here today.

Yesterday morning, I stood at Ground Zero in New York and listened to each of the victims’ names that were read. I remembered a nation that came together and stood by one another as we recovered from this heinous attack.

September 11 showed the entire world that terrorists could knock our buildings down, but they could not dent the American spirit. In the act of wrath, we pledged to work with one another and prevent such a tragedy from ever happening again.

Today, we are still engaged in a generational fight to defeat Islamist terrorism, but I believe we will eventually win that fight as long as we pursue policies that will make it easier to protect our homeland and the American people.

One of the lessons we learned from 9/11 was the need to strengthen information sharing among Federal, State, and local authorities, and while we have taken steps to address this in the past, we need to do more.

The TRACER Act, introduced by Congressman RUTHERFORD, would require the Department of Homeland Security to share with local and regional fusion centers important information regarding potential risks posed by persons who have previously convicted on charges related to terrorism. More specifically, it would allow DHS to share the expected place and date of release of these incarcerated terrorists.

Preventing attacks and law enforcement officials with this information will allow them to minimize potential risks to their communities by countering extremist recidivism. This legislation is an opportunity to strengthen coordination between all levels of law enforcement and help keep Americans safe.

Again, I would like to thank Congressman RUTHERFORD for all of his hard work on this legislation, and I hope that his constituents and the entire State of Florida make a strong recovery in the aftermath of Hurricane Irma.

As someone who has personally toured devastated communities back home in the State of Texas as a result of Hurricane Harvey, it is clear that there are still many long days ahead. However, we can be very thankful for the men and women at DHS, including FEMA and the United States Coast Guard, as well as thousands of local first responders and volunteers who have been called to action.

The American people deserve to know that all levels of government are working together to keep our homeland safe, and I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

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. 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-over-the-shoulder return of terrorists currently incarcerated in a Federal correctional facility.

It is our hope that those who were convicted of providing materiel support to foreign terrorist organizations or taking or offering support of ISIL or an al-Qaeda affiliate have turned away from their terrorist past. However, in an age where lone-wolf terrorist attacks are more common, it just makes sense to let local law enforcement know when a former terrorist is returning to the community they are entrusted to safeguard.

I support this bill that seeks to improve situational awareness at all levels of law enforcement to potential 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 Chairman. The TRACER Act, introduced by Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. It is bipartisan, ensures that State and local law enforcement have greater access to Federal counter-terrorism information and, most importantly, neighborhoods; when terrorists are released back into the communities, they at least know who they have in their neighborhoods.

I also want to applaud Congressman RUTHERFORD, who cannot be here today because of Hurricane Irma. My thoughts and prayers are with the State of Florida as they continue to respond to the devastation from that devastating hurricane.

Mr. Speaker, 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. McCaul) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2471, as amended.
(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.

Any additional information that is deemed necessary by the Secretary.

(2) DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENT.—In carrying out the data collection for purposes of inclusion under subsection (e), the Firefighter Registry, with respect to diagnoses and treatment of firefighters diagnosed with cancer, 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. 200b(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 (e), 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 Act. At minimum, the strategy shall include the following:

(A) Identified minimum participation targets for volunteer, paid-on-call, and career firefighters.
(B) A strategy for increasing awareness of the Firefighter Registry and maximizing participation among volunteer, paid-on-call, and career firefighters to meet minimum participation targets.
(C) Additional steps that may be required to ensure the equitable representation of groups identified in paragraph (5).

(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit the strategy described in paragraph (2) to 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 2 years 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 outlines 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.

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 931, the Firefighter Cancer Registry Act of 2017, introduced by my friend and colleague from the Energy and Commerce Committee, Representative CHRIS COLLINS from New York, who we will hear from shortly, will create a national registry to collect information to better understand cancer incidence in firefighters.

These heroic first responders experience occupational health risks every day. In my district, it is oftentimes from forest fires, like we are having all summer long. This past weekend I saw firsthand what our firefighters face as they battle a number of fires raging in Oregon, putting themselves in harm's way to save property, infrastructure, lives, watersheds, habitats, and our forests.

I was deeply reminded yesterday morning, as I watched some of the news coverage that took us back 16 years ago to 9/11, and seeing the scenes of the buildings collapsing and burning and the people emerging, individual citizens, first responders, firefighters, as well as the people and smoke, you realize just the peril that our first responders often find themselves in. They rush into buildings to save lives, put themselves in harm's way, and we deeply appreciate what they do. That is why this legislation is an important step to help them.

Nationally, we have this problem with our firefighters. They came to us and said: We need this registry, going back to the West and what we face, and I saw it when I flew across the country to come here, not only are there fires and smoke throughout Oregon, but also all across the West: Colorado, Montana, Wyoming, hill and valley choked with smoke.

Close to 8 million acres burned in wildfires so far this year; more than half a million in Oregon on both public and mostly private lands. Thousands of residents have had to be evacuated. Firefighters, of course, stayed behind. They do what they do.

Multiple studies have shown a correlation between firefighting and cancer. However, the reasons behind this are not fully understood. We owe it to these first responders to understand the causal link to cancer. Having better data to identify why firefighters are at an increased risk for some cancers, hopefully protective measures and ultimately reduce some of the hazards that they face when putting their lives on the line.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York (Mr. COLLINS) for his work on this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members from Oregon?

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. GREEN, I yield.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members from Oregon?

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 931, the Firefighter Cancer Registry Act of 2017. Yesterday we recognized the sixteenth anniversary of the September 11 terror attacks. The tragic
events on that day exhibited the heroism our firefighters and other first responders 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 firefighters run into burning buildings and other environments, they often do not know whether carcinogens or hazardous materials might be lurking beneath the rubble or hidden in the smoldering embers.

Unfortunately, the risks of firefighting surpass the scene of the fire. These men and women are exposed to dangerous smoke and chemicals that pose serious health risks as they fight the blaze. In the days and weeks that followed, we see firefighters 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, along with my colleagues Representative BILL PASCRELL, introduced the Firefighter Cancer Registry Act. This bill will require the CDC to establish a registry to track cancer incidence in the firefighting industry. The bill authorizes the 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.

In the days and weeks that followed, our firefighters were exposed to dangerous smoke and chemicals that pose serious health risks as they fight. These men and women are exposed to dangerous smoke and chemicals that pose serious health risks as they fight the blaze. In the days and weeks that followed, we see firefighters 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, along with my colleagues Representative BILL PASCRELL, introduced the Firefighter Cancer Registry Act. This bill will require the CDC to establish a registry to track cancer incidence in the firefighting industry. The bill authorizes the 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.

While we know that firefighters are routinely exposed to a variety of known carcinogens in chaotic and uncontrolled environments, we do not have a good sense of the full picture of the negative impacts of the exposure.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, firefighters are at higher risk for certain kinds of cancer, including lung, breast, and kidney cancer, when compared with the general population.

Despite the knowledge we have gained through these studies, many have been limited by small sample sizes and an underrepresentation of key demographic groups.

The first step to finding solutions is understanding the nature of the problem. Further public health research on this topic is needed so we can start thinking about 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 diagnosed with this deadly disease. The creation of a specialized firefighter cancer registry would provide scientists and medical professionals with the detailed national data that will allow them to study the relationships between firefighters’ exposure to dangerous fumes and harmful toxins and increased risk for several major cancers. In the future, this information could also allow for better protective equipment and prevention techniques to be developed.

This bill enjoys strong support from major fire organizations across our Nation, including the International Association of Firefighters, the Congressional Fire Services Institute, the National Volunteer Fire Council, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, the National Fallen Firefighters 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 important task. We cannot delay in getting them the help they need. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to pass this bill swiftly so we can work on getting it through the Senate and onto the President’s desk.
Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 931, the Firefighter Cancer Registry Act.

In 2015, a 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 incidences 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 did mark 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 bills 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. 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 short 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 one of a series of bills that would: 1. expand the park boundary 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 colleagues who are 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.

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 gentleman from Hawaii for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge 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 achieved, it is true, and the issue of whether we are a free 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 press corps, the Army, 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, on 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—then 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 very well, 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.
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 the country’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 there are 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 Historical 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 a very special way.

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, make sure that that area will 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 part of the event and the 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 historic. 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 this bill to include the seven residences that we can make sure that this will be a protected area, so that the history will not be forgotten and so 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, we appreciate all those who have spoken on the significance and the story of history. I want to thank Mr. Hill of Arkansas for leading this bill. The House Speaker, Mr. BISHOP, of Utah. Mr. Speaker, Mr. BISHOP, I urge the passage of this particular bill, those who have sponsored this bill, that it is significant, and this is the primary example of what we are attempting to do. Once again, Mr. Speaker, I am appreciative of Mr. Hill of Arkansas for leading 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 historic. 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 this bill to include the seven residences that we can make sure that this will be a protected area, so that the history will not be forgotten and so 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, we appreciate all those who have spoken on this particular bill, those who have sponsored this bill. This bill is something I think is really significant. It says something that is very positive for 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question was taken. The yeas and nays were ordered. The yeas and nays were ordered.
XVIII, 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. 3354.

Will the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) kindly take the chair.

The Acting Chair. The Clerk will read the title of the bill.

Mr. CULBERSON. 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. Chair, is at the desk and has been agreed to by both sides.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) each will control 10 minutes.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise 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.

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. CULBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address the gentlewoman’s comments, very briefly.

I wish 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 safety and we are praying for those on the road to recovery.

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

Mr. CULBERTSON. 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, prevent, and prepare for disasters, 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.

Well, the truth is, there is an answer and a proven solution that actually worked. It was the 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 expanded to 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 were ignored by the previous 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 all Members 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 help those folks get back on the road to recovery.

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

Mr. CULBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise 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, 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 that rely on 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 removing barriers 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, $16 trillion U.S. economy, and employed 6 million Americans. Additionally, minority-owned businesses are twice as likely to generate sales through exports, as compared to non-minority owned firms, due to their language and cultural ties.

While their economic contributions are significant, minority-owned businesses struggle in acquiring private capital and securing government contracts at disproportionate rates, compared to non-minority owned businesses.

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 with the Weather Prediction Center. Keeping these two centers 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. The 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 systems upgrades, and develop software and data products to meet local office needs. According to the Weather Service’s assessment of its performance during Hurricane Matthew (2016), “[Weather Forecast Offices] were unanimous in their support of having a local [IT Officer] present to address issues before, during, and after hurricane season.” In addition, a significant number of IT Officers are also trained, experienced meteorologists who can augment the forecasting staff during extreme weather.

I think 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, is included in the en bloc amendment, and would increase funding for the MBDA by $5 million in Fiscal Year 2018.

With three MBDA Business Centers in Florida, 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 that rely on 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 removing barriers 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, $16 trillion U.S. economy, and employed 6 million Americans. Additionally, minority-owned businesses are twice as likely to generate sales through exports, as compared to non-minority owned firms, due to their language and cultural ties.

While their economic contributions are significant, minority-owned businesses struggle in acquiring private capital and securing government contracts at disproportionate rates, compared to non-minority owned businesses.

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 with the Weather Prediction Center. Keeping these two centers 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. The 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 systems upgrades, and develop software and data products to meet local office needs. According to the Weather Service’s assessment of its performance during Hurricane Matthew (2016), “[Weather Forecast Offices] were unanimous in their support of having a local [IT Officer] present to address issues before, during, and after hurricane season.” In addition, a significant number of IT Officers are also trained, experienced meteorologists who can augment the forecasting staff during extreme weather.

I think 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, is included in the en bloc amendment, and would increase funding for the MBDA by $5 million in Fiscal Year 2018.

With three MBDA Business Centers in Florida, 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 that rely on 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 removing barriers 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, $16 trillion U.S. economy, and employed 6 million Americans. Additionally, minority-owned businesses are twice as likely to generate sales through exports, as compared to non-minority owned firms, due to their language and cultural ties.

While their economic contributions are significant, minority-owned businesses struggle in acquiring 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 secure 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. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the Chairman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) and Ranking Member SERRANO for including this amendment in the en bloc amendment. I would also like to thank my colleagues, Representatives BUTTERFIELD, JACKSON LEE, and VELAZQUEZ for their co-sponsorship of my amendment, and for their previous work on these important issues.

Mr. Chairman, the en bloc amendment also includes my amendment, number 95, which increases funding for the Office of Juvenile Justice Programs’ Youth Mentoring Grants by $5 million—restoring those grants to the Fiscal Year 2017 enacted level.

These grants allow local jurisdictions to develop, expand or sustain youth mentoring efforts using evidence-based best practices.

Mr. Chairman, improving outcomes for disadvantaged youth requires more than simply expanding opportunities at school, because the challenges they face often extend beyond the schoolhouse door.

In my 27 years in law enforcement, I saw this first-hand. As Chief of Police for the City of Orlando, I had the honor of founding Operation Positive Direction—a program through which OPD Officers mentor Orlando youths.

Across the nation, youth participating in these programs show improvements in their perception of social support and acceptance, their family relationships and a decrease in antisocial behaviors. Youth that meet regularly with their mentors are 55 percent more likely to go to college.

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

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 $30 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, MetalloIn 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 8 million.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to restore 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’s amendment.

Mr. Culberson, Mr. Chairman, I claim the 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 no 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. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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 $15,000,000)”.

Page 265, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $15,000,000)”.

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 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 $15,000,000)”.

Page 264, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $15,000,000)”.

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 to the National Science Foundation’s Computer and Information Science and Engineering research directorate, commonly known as CISE.

CISE supports research in computing, communications, information security, and advanced computing. Through their NSF-supported work, our Nation’s scientists have been able to develop innovative solutions to energy, climate change, and national security.
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. Ensuring these investments are 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 computing, and as technology evolves, so do the skills that are needed to succeed. 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.

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 participation 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.

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 FY2018, I am pleased that NASA has provided some research in this bill, 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 scientific research. And while we would like to see higher levels of funding for the National Science Foundation for FY2018, I am pleased that NASA has provided some research in this bill, 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 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 (Mr. 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 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. 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 navigate the legal system, but it takes professional help to navigate the legal system. Whenever we travel, people say we are poor—which most people 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. COHEN. 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. 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 both parties in favor of access to justice, at that time, being the main supporter of it.

The bill only provides $300 million for Legal Services, which is a cut of $55 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 don’t do 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. It is important to note 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 money in the conference, I will work with you in conference to find them some extra support.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. Chairman, 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. It is important to note 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 money in the conference, I will work with you in conference to find them some extra support.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. Chairman, 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. It is important to note 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 money in the conference, I will work with you in conference to find them some extra support.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. Chairman, 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. It is important to note 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 money in the conference, I will work with you in conference to find them some extra support.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.
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 protect the 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 Network of ballistic Information Networks, 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 thefts of firearms from Federal firearms provees. 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 explosive 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 those past 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 to reduce 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 slip 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 House Report 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 604, 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 in.

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

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. This 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 Dahmert of Wisconsin was convicted of burglary. In 1986, he was granted relief and allowed to own firearms once again. 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 gain and own firearms. He was arrested that same year for first degree wanton neglect of an infant and sentenced to 6 months confinement and 2 years probation.

These are only a few examples. It is important to point out that the gentleman’s amendment makes no distinction 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 1988, 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 ATF to have their gun rights restored, this would require the efforts 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 imperfect, 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 obviously 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. SCHUMER 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.

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 the applicant 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 designee 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 303, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $20,000,000)".

Page 596, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $10,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and the Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, this amendment would reprogram $10 million from the prison account and put it in the juvenile justice programs designed to reduce recidivism, gang violence, and gun crimes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE, a fellow member on the Judiciary Committee, has been a leader on this issue, and she is right in her approach, understanding that working with juveniles early will save money in the long run and see that they don't get into the prison pipeline that so often takes young people and ruins their lives and costs our communities and our taxpayers a great deal of money.

Our Federal prisons are presently funded $7 billion for administration, operation, 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 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.

This amendment invests in our youth population at the front end with rewards on the back end, as these folks don't end up in the prison system; supports programs that have shown consistent success in curtailing gang violence and gun crime.

Violence among our youth is a health epidemic that must be addressed; therefore, we must support professionals that possess practical experience in epidemic control for violence prevention, and that show success working with the most vulnerable and at-risk youth population when addressing this health epidemic.

Within the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the following programs focus on violence prevention: Forum, Community Based Violence Prevention, and Defending Childhood. The CBVP explicitly calls for and supports the health approach; hence, this amendment provides funding for organizations such as community-based violence prevention programs that have shown great success.

Cure Violence, a health-based organization operating in several cities and States, including Chicago and New York and Philadelphia and others, has shown great success and also shown success in Puerto Rico. They have had 100 percent reduction in homicide retail in Chicago, a 41 to 73 percent drop in shootings in five of eight communities in Baltimore; they have had a 56 percent drop in killings, and 44 percent other places.

In essence, this is putting money in a place where we can save money, save youth, save lives.

Mr. Chair, I ask that we support this amendment that Ms. JACKSON LEE has brought forth. It makes a lot of common sense.

Mr. Chair, 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. Chair, this amendment would cut the Bureau of Prisons' operations by $10 million. This is a serious cut. The Bureau of Prisons performs an essential function in keeping our streets safe and protecting the people of America.

We have already funded the youth mentoring programs in our bill today at $75 million. It is 25 percent above the request, because of the value of these programs.

I certainly agree with the gentleman 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
contract flexibility that enables the Bureau of Prisons to manage its contracts in a way that benefits both the agency and the taxpayer. This includes contracts for halfway houses, reentry facilities, and juvenile detention.

This order would strip the Bureau of Prisons of putting pressure on them and putting inmates in more danger, putting officers and staff in greater danger. If we want prisoners to get healthcare and rehabilitation, Mr. Chairman, and prisoners and staff to be safe, we have to adequately fund the Bureau of Prisons.

Mr. Chair, 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.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, thank you for this opportunity to discuss Amendment 108 to the “CJS Appropriation Act of 2017.”

This amendment will save thousands of lives within our youth population by decreasing our federal prison funding of $7,070,248,000, available for the administration, operation and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional institutional facilities. Of this amount, up to $20,000,000 is made available for the use of contract confinement.

My amendment seeks to reduce this account by a mere $10,000,000 for juvenile justice programs designed to reduce recidivism, gang violence and gun crime.

These juvenile justice programs help protect our most vulnerable children through treatment, education, training, and mentoring, not incarceration.

According to the Justice Policy Institute, locking up juveniles costs an average of $407.58 per person per day and $148,767 per person per year.

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

This amendment invests in our youth population at the front end with a greater return before the damage becomes irreversible at the back end.

This amendment supports programs that have shown consistent success in curtailing gang violence and gun crimes.

Research shows that violence among our youths is a health epidemic that must be addressed with appropriate measures beyond incarceration.

Therefore, we must support professionals that possess practical experience in epidemic control for violence prevention, and that show success working with the most vulnerable and at-risk youth population when addressing this health epidemic.

Within the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the following programs focus on violence prevention: Forum, Community Based Violence Prevention (CBVP), and Defending Childhood. The CBVP explicitly calls for and supports the health approach.

Hence, this amendment provides funding for organizations such as community-based violence prevention programs that statistically have shown much success.

For example, Cure Violence, a health-based organization that operates in, several cities and states, have 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 100% reduction in homicide retaliation 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; in Miami, a 25% reduction; and in Philadelphia, the reduction shooting rate was significantly larger than any reduction compared to non-program police districts.

Unlike incarceration costs 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 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 address the epidemic taking place in 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. COHEN. 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 now 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 House Resolution 504, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today, once again, to highlight the hypocrisy reflected here of the party that claims to be the law-and-order party, because, once again, the Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bills before us have zeroed out funding for the COPS Hiring Program.

This critical program provides Federal grants to local and state governments for the hiring and retention of police officers. Despite the fact that this vital program helps ensure that we have enough cops on the beat in our communities, the House Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bills have cut or eliminated funding for the COPS Hiring Program since the Republicans took control of this House in 2011.

So every year, Representative DAVE REICHERT and I, co-chairs of the Congress’s Law Enforcement Caucus, come to the floor to offer an amendment to shift funding back to the COPS Hiring Program to show support for local police hiring programs. We do this dance every year, but no one seems to learn from it because here we are again with a bill that zeros out funding for this program.

Our amendments pass with overwhelming support, often by voice vote. The Senate sees this strong support and ends up funding the program in the final appropriations package. In fact, both the Senate and President have proposed funding the COPS program at $207 million.

Typically, we have regular order in the House when considering appropriations bills. That means we would have an open rule to allow us to offer any amendment to shift funds in this bill. However, this is not the case this year, Mr. Chairman.

Our dance with the Appropriations Committee would have continued this year, but the Rules Committee prevented any substantive amendment to boost funding for the COPS Hiring Program from moving forward.

This amendment enjoyed the support of law enforcement organizations across America, including the Major County Sheriffs Association. They were dismayed at the decision to eliminate the COPS Hiring Program.

The amendment before us enjoys the support of law enforcement organizations, such as the National Association of Police Organizations, Fraternal Order of Police. In their letter of support, NAPO wrote that they are “very concerned that H.R. 3354 does not provide funding for the COPS Hiring Program.”

The FOP writes: “... we must continue to fund the COPS Hiring Program.”

Mr. Chairman, I include these letters in the RECORD.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PASCRELL: On behalf of the Major County Sheriffs of America...
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
WOMEN’S ORGANIZATIONS (FRW)

Hon. KEVIN O. McCARTHY,
Majority Leader, House of Representa
tives, Washington, DC.

Hon. TRI-KEY MARTIN,
Minority Leader, House of Representa
tives, Washington, DC.

Hon. STENY H. HOYER,
Minority Whip, House of Representa
tives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND REPRESENTATIVES
McCARTHY, PELOSI and HOYER: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our strong support for an amendment, introduced by Representatives William J. Pascrell, Jr. (D–NJ) and David G. Reichert (R–WA), which would increase by $100 million the appropriations for the hiring program administered by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) at the U.S. Department of Justice.

In 1994, Congress established the COPS Office and Community Policing Services (COPS) Hiring Program. NAPO is a coalition of police units and associations from across the United States that serves to advance the interests of America’s law enforcement through legislative and legal advocacy, political action, and education. Founded in 1978, NAPO now represents more than 1,000 police units and associations, 241,000 sworn law enforcement officers, and members across the United States. NAPO seeks to share a common dedication to fair and effective crime control and law enforcement.

NAPO is very concerned that H.R. 3541 does not provide funding for the COPS Hiring Program. This vital program has assisted more than 13,000 jurisdictions with over $14 billion in funding to hire more than 127,000 community police officers across the United States. A big part of the success of the original program was its reliance on local police agencies in defining what their communities needed. In addition to the hiring and retention of much needed officers, this funding program has contributed to continued success in combating crime, drug use, and gangs; preventing and combating the manufacture, distribution, and use of illegal drugs; promoting officer safety and wellness; and addressing emerging law enforcement needs. It is vital that this program continue to be funded.

The Pascrell/Reichert Amendment #109 rights this wrong by providing necessary funding to the COPS Hiring Program. As major cities across the country are facing an increase in violent crime for the first time in years and community-police relations are strained, now is the time to put additional stresses on state and local police forces by leaving them short-handed. Further, this funding will be essential to police and sheriff departments affected by Hurricanes Harvey and Irma as they look to rebuild.

Mr. PASCRELL. Hiding behind procedural shenanigans to dodge support for our Nation’s law enforcement officers and then pontificating when 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, a way 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. PASCRELL’s amendment to increase COPS 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 abilities 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 taxpayer public. In these challenging times for law enforcement, it is critical 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. PASCRELL 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. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CULBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I have no objection to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, 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 “(reduced by $30,200,000) (increased by $30,200,000)”. The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Smith) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill and endorse division C, the CJS appropriations bill developed by Chairman CULBERSON. 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 $90.2 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 CULBERSON, for his support of this amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. 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 CULBERSON for his support and very 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 Tsumani Warning, Education, and Research Act enacted into law earlier this year?

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. 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 to support your amendment to increase the Byrne JAG Grant Program.

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 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. Chair, we know that racial discrimination still exists in America. We are immensely grateful for the thousands of police officers of whom we could not be prouder. We are grateful for the 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.
whatever institution it wants to that files this. And if we don’t think that happens, Mr. Chairman, I am just going to say two words: Lois Lerner.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), on behalf 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 1 that would relieve small businesses from this unnecessary and burdensome requirement. EEOC already has a huge backlog of cases involving actual complaints of discrimination that need to be resolved, people who need to be protected. We should focus on doing their job, clearing up the backlog, 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. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my, my, my, here we go again. Another bill to protect the derelicts of big business, allowing them to hide crucial data from public scrutiny, in a form that would disclose pay disparities in the workplace.

It is a law, Mr. Chairman, that businesses must pay equal pay for equal work. So why is it that women and minorities make much less money than their white male counterparts doing similar work?

Mr. Chairman, let’s pass this amendment. Root out pay discrimination, because it is time that all Americans are paid for their hard work and not for their gender or the color of their skin.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I just say that it is absolutely true if we were looking at similar work, but the bill does not look at similar work. It looks at huge categories like, for instance, professionals in a hospital that include neurosurgeons and nurses. It is not similar work.

This is the worst kind of data gathering you can have by the Federal Government because, again, they use this to go after employers that they want to go after.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, if you hear the opposition to this amendment, you would think that discrimination does not exist in this country any longer. Oh, how I wish that were the case.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment. This amendment would strike the harmful EEOC rider which blocks the EEOC from collecting data on the expanded EEO–1 form. This data collection would allow EEOC to better examine pay patterns by industry and/or geographic region and/or employer or establishment. We should conduct a comprehensive statistical analysis, and evaluate the context of the discrimination allegations.

The EEOC will use the data primarily for early assessment of allegations of discrimination based on sex, ethnicity, or race. In short, the newly expanded form will be critical to closing gender and race wage gaps. Preventing the collection of this information will result in less oversight and more wage discrimination.

Mr. Chair, I strongly support the amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. 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. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the form is not a comprehensive tool. 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. Chairman, 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).
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 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 quotas, 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). The amendment is empowering the local regional council to manage the striped bass 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. Chairman, the hardworking fishermen 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 away or arbitrate.

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. 117 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. 57. 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.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia. 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 reentry 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 the losses to their paychecks to subsistence fees would be a significant hurdle to successful reentry—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 offenders. 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.

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 for his work on this issue in the previous Congress. I ask my colleagues 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 gentleman 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 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. 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 Acting CHAIR. 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 sportsmen and sportswomen in Ohio and from around the country.

Under the Obama administration, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives—the ATFE—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 allowed the exemption for certain 5.56-millimeter ammunition, including the M855, because the ATFE 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 ATFE 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 ATFE from using funds to reclassify M855 ammunition. Again, this amendment codifies the ATFE'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 ATFE attempted to do in 2015.

I also thank the Chairman 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. 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 armored-piercing capability 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. Not 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 work to make sure that this rule is not put back into place.

As long as I am chairman of the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, I will always zealously protect the unambiguous Second Amendment rights of every American to keep and bear arms.

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? What is that is this 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. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment number 119 will not be offered.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment that amendment No. 120 will not be offered.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman 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:

Sect. 112. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to relocate the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s Southeast Fisheries Science Center located in Virginia Key, Florida.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk designates the amendment.

The amendment No. 120 is offered by Mr. SERRANO.

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:

Sect. 112. 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 Acting CHAIR. The Clerk designates the amendment.
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 an increase in crime. 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 perpetuate the prison industrial complex, we will find it harder and harder to reduce our bloated prison population and make meaningful reforms to our criminal justice system.

Last year, an investigative reporter for The Nation uncovered horrible conditions at private correction facilities. Inmates were not receiving basic medical care, even items required by the Bureau of Prisons. In one case, they were kept in rows of bunk beds in un-air-conditioned domes, baking in the heat and the sun. In another case, the poor conditions sparked riots by the inmates.

Now, don’t get me wrong. I feel no sympathy for violent criminals who have no remorse for what they did and deserve to be locked away for their crimes. But our Founders knew that we have an obligation to maintain order for human life, and they enshrined it in our Constitution by protecting against cruel and unusual punishment. When this report came to light, President Obama’s Attorney General, Loretta Lynch, said: To act. The President issued a memorandum saying that we would phase out the use of private prisons, partially by seeking to reduce mandatory minimum sentences to the reentry process for individuals who have made mistakes and are serving their sentences. No one should profit from our prison system.

That is what I plan to reintroduce the End For-Profit Prisons Act—legislation that will reverse the Trump administration’s policy of simply reversing President Obama’s ban on the use of private prisons for Federal prisoners, 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 sentences. One should profit from our prison system.

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 Lynch. Tonight, we can say that making money off of incarcerating individuals is simply inconsistent with American values.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to join me in voting “no,” and 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 clear to my colleagues what 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? Will you send them 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 taxpaying money.

My experience with the private prisons that have been provided 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. This amendment puts the risk to public safety, but for the damages it will do to the hardworking people of America.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to join me in voting “no,” and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield this time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to join me in opposing this amendment. 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 overseas bases, and the Great Lakes initiative, including the National Ocean Policy) developed under such Executive Order.

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. 804. 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 overseas bases, and the Great Lakes initiative, 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 ocean 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 advance, and activities that have been made by Congress to fund those activities. 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 intent. It authorizes the agencies essentially 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. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, in closing, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. FLORES) for his work on this amendment, and I support it. We have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chair, 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 overturned constitutional statutory burdens and cost funds.

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 and to try to go around Congress. These actions have 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 statutes 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. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, 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. 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. 1615. None of the funds made available by this Act under the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program may be used in contravention of section 242 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) and a Member 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 flout 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 a weapon, 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 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 deportations 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 Federal funds by jurisdictions 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 overturn 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 police would 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 communities 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 boon 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 helping 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 1/2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1/2 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 constituents 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’s immigration policy are that a local law enforcement agency has to certify that they are cooperating 100 percent of the time with Federal authorities about individuals in local jails or State prisons. That is all this is.

If a State prison or local jail is housing someone who was in the country illegally when they committed the crime and were sentenced, before they are released, current Department of Justice policy adopted last summer, being enforced today by Attorney General Sessions, says you have to tell 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 adopted last summer, is, if you want Federal money, follow Federal law, or don’t ask.

I support the gentleman’s amendment.

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

Mr. BUCK. 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. 2. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for activities prohibited 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.

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 asset forfeiture really allows local law enforcement to break laws 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 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 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. The practice and 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 rights. It is now our job to prove that we are innocent until proven guilty. That is ridiculous. Vote for this amendment and protect the freedom of our people.

Mr. Chair, 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 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 property, and 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 prop-
erty rights.
Mr. Chairman, I yield back the bal-
ce of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gen-
tleman 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

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 fol-
ows:

At the end of division C (before the short
title), insert the following:

Sec. 1. None of the funds made avail-
able by this Act may be used to pay a per-
formance 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 remission or mitigation in judicial for-
feiture 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 rec-
ommendation 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 Mem-
ber opposed each will control 5 min-
utes.

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 re-
turned home and opened a store in
Georgia. Mr. Clyde had an insurance
policy that only covered up to $10,000
in off-premised losses. So like any rea-
sonable 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 $850,000.

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 Federal law known as
structuring, which is the intentional
avoidance of Federal reporting require-
ments by staying below $10,000 in cash
deposits. This law was intended to
catch large-scale criminal enterprises,
mobsters, terrorists, and human traf-
fickers, 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 le-
gitimate 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 say-
ing: 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. What 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 $125,000, 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. Chair-
man, 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 il-
legal activity.

But there is still the prob-
lem of those people who are already
victims of this abuse by our govern-
ment in civil asset forfeiture.

Now, since launching a bipartisan
investigation of the IRS’s civil asset
forfeiture practices a couple of years
ago, the IRS has apologized for past be-
havior, which is good; they worked
quickly to reach out to possible vic-
tims, which is great; and they subse-
quently 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 con-
ducting illicit or criminal 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 out-
standing 255 cases. This is completely
unacceptable. The Federal Government
took legally earned money from tax-
payers, and the Department of Justice
didn’t have the majority of these peo-
ple a response, including Andrew Clyde.

The amendment agreed to 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 Depart-
ment 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 Depart-
ment of Justice to do anything ex-
traordinary, Mr. Chairman. We are
simply asking them to do the 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 op-
posed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objec-
tion, the gentleman from Texas is rec-
ognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I
strongly support the amendment. I will
work with Mr. ROSKAM as the REP 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 House 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
the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank
the gentleman for his support.

I thank the chairman for his assur-
ance and his hard work on this. I am
confident that this amendment 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 ob-
tuse and they have been ridiculous. I
have been embarrassed by the inter-
actions 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 bal-
ce of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is
on the amendment offered by the gen-
tleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order
to consider amendment No. 129 printed in

AMENDMENT NO. 129 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to
consider amendment No. 129 printed in

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 fol-
ows:

At the end of division C (before the short
title), insert the following:

Sec. 1. None of the funds made available
by this Act may be used to pay a per-
formance award to any officer or employee of
the Money Laundering and Asset Recovery
Section of the Department of Justice under title section 384 or 450a of title 5, United
States Code, prior to the date on which the
Department of Justice rules on all petitions
for remission or mitigation in judicial for-
feiture 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 rec-
ommendation 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 Mem-
ber opposed each will control 5 min-
utes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman
from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, in re-
cent years, we have seen a growing
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 government seizes and keeps property for alleged involvement in crimes that are typically for lower-level or minor crimes. Law enforcement agents are rewarded for seizing property, and these seizures can be used to fund police departments. This system has been criticized for being overly aggressive and for lacking sufficient safeguards to protect property owners from abuse.

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, McCLEINOTCK, 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. 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.

The new policy allows State and local law enforcement to circumvent State and local 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 criminal activity without convicting, indictment, 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 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, a woman from 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

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.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank my colleagues, Mr. SENNDRENNER, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. MOONEY, for cosponsoring 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 controversial 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 presumption of innocence 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 criminal activity without convicting, indictment, 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 criminal activity.

The new policy revives a controversial 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 presumption of innocence 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 criminal activity without convicting, indictment, 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 criminal activity.

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 said they found a 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.

With 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 co-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 needlessly 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. 141 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI OF OREGON

Page 734, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $15,270,000) (increased by $15,270,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 144 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

Page 735, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $1,000,000)”.

Page 740, line 19, 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 $10,000,000)”.

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 19, 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. 152 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. 159 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. 175 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. 177 OFFERED BY MR. DERAULDER OF MICHIGAN

Page 767, line 24, insert “(increased by $13,232,847)” after the dollar amount.

Page 806, line 25, insert “(reduced by $13,232,847)” after the dollar amount.

AMENDMENT NO. 181 OFFERED BY MS. 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. 183 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. 196 OFFERED BY MR. DEBAULDER OF PENNSYLVANIA

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. 17 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of division F (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 1. 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 $10,000,000, 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. 179 OFFERED BY MS. SEWELL OF ALABAMA

At the end of division F (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 1. 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. 1. 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.
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 daughter and 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 her home town of Moore, Oklahoma. 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 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 my 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. The gentlewoman from Connecticut can use these Student Support grants to help every 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 to promote long-term economic independence to ensure their well-being.

This issue was first brought to my attention by the Modesto Center for Human Services, which supports individuals and families in Stanislaus County, California. The Modesto center provides youth services, mental health services, substance abuse treatment, family resource centers, shelter services, and community projects. The center relies on an existing Transitional Living Programs grant. The TLP grants are critical to helping homeless youth find employment and transition back into the community.

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 income 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.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the ranking member, for yielding time to me and for her leadership and work on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, 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 are still dealing with 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 and 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 passing.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO), my friend.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this en bloc amendment, specifically the amendment I offered with Congresswoman BONAMICI.
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 permanently increase funding for State assessment grants, the amount authorized for these grants in the Every Student Succeeds Act but, notably, $3.9 million more than that which was included in the legislation we are acting on.

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 bi-partisan 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 appropriated for these grants in the 2018 Budget, would increase funding for the Black Lung Benefits Act by $10 million is equal to the permanently authorized amount.

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 enactment of binding coal dust exposure limits in 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). The increase in black lung disease has burdened schools and students for the high-stakes testing culture that has eroded lung function even after a miner leaves work in our nation's mines.
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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 few dollars. I, and especially, understand 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 their 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 the inclusion of 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. Chair, 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, the ages of 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 program. Do we invest 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 supporting the 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 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.

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 Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KILDEE. 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. 130 OFFERED BY MR. MITCHELL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 133 printed in House Report 115–297.

Mr. MITCHELL. 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 706, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $351,216,900)".
Page 706, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $24,900,000)".
Page 708, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $43,100,000)".
Page 708, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $9,450,000)".
Page 708, line 27, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $21,750,000)".
Page 715, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $10,646,100)".
Page 715, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $17,560,000)".
Page 718, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $4,112,900)".
Page 718, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $9,450,000)".
Page 718, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $11,437,700)".
Page 721, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $53,147,000)".
Page 721, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $35,997,500)".
Page 727, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $54,460,000)".
Page 727, line 30, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $27,253,900)".
Page 770, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $39,286,100)".
Page 805, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $43,100,000)".
Page 812, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $8,900,000)".
Page 817, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $24,900,000)".
Page 856, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $531,216,900)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.
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 we are on 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 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 over-eager 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 protecting 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% cut in 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 we are determining how to control spending, and we are efficient, and we save money, and we are effective, and we save programs that we hold dear.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the efforts of the chairman, and I, in fact, all of the appropriations efforts. In fact, this week we will pass a full set of appropriations bills out of the Senate—something that has not happened here 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 think big. 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 Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL). The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 134 OFFERED BY MR. POCAN

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL). The amendment was rejected.
from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I am doing this on behalf of Ms. DELAUR. 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 them up to 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 140investigations. OSHA has only enough funding to inspect every workplace under its jurisdiction every 189 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, I urge my colleagues to support 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 Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN). The question was taken, and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. POCAN. 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.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

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 standing by 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 don’t inspect companies that could have workplace violations, when we can’t 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, by 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 is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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
Department of Labor’s most important functions. I think, however, we just disagree on the most effective ways the Federal Government can help with that effort. This bill actually increases compliance assistance programs at the OSHA expense, just that, so I will oppose the gentleman’s amendment which would offset the increases to OSHA enforcement by reducing critical compliance assistance efforts that many of our Members strongly support.

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chairman, this is moving money. We have enough money for compliance education. The problem is that it is like having driver education knowing that the next sheriff is 4,000 miles away—you are not going to get caught driving. We need Federal boots on the ground.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. LOWEY).

Ms. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of my friend Ms. MENG’s amendment which would restore the Women’s Bureau to its FY 2017 funding level. Women now comprise almost half of the Nation’s workforce, and their contributions are vital to the country’s economic prosperity. But there continue to be barriers to women’s full and equal participation in many careers and industries. Women continue to earn less than men in the same positions, which means the research and policy advocacy supported by the Women’s Bureau continues to be as important as ever.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support Ms. MENG’s amendment which would restore the Women’s Bureau to its FY 2017 funding level. Women now comprise almost half of the Nation’s workforce, and their contributions are vital to the country’s economic prosperity. But there continue to be barriers to women’s full and equal participation in many careers and industries. Women continue to earn less than men in the same positions, which means the research and policy advocacy supported by the Women’s Bureau continues to be as important as ever.

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 back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MITCHELL). The Acting Chair recognizes the gentleman from the Northern 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. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 717, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $1,064,000)”.

Page 718, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert “increased by $1,064,000”.

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. 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 of Labor Statistics, Price and Cost of Living Division by the same amount.

This increase would restore the proposed cut the underlying bill would make to the Women’s Bureau while still allowing the BLS Prices and Cost of Living Division to be funded at 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 funding within the Bureau itself, to as 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. Chairman, I urge support for this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ROYDEN DAVIS of Illinois). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman’s amendment, and I certainly support the Women’s Bureau at the Department of Labor.

Many provisions in this bill were eliminated or substantially reduced to stay within our allocation. In contrast, the Women’s Bureau was reduced by a relatively modest $1 million. The administration budget request proposed reducing the Women’s Bureau by $0.5 million, clearly a reduction the committee did not agree with in the bill.

I understand the importance of many of these programs, and these are some of the difficult decisions that have to be made, and fund bipartisan priorities in this bill like increases in funding to the NIH and to TRIO and yet still stay within our allocation. I expect and hope that as the process moves forward and we negotiate a bipartisan funding agreement, we will have further discussions regarding the funding of the Women’s Bureau.

Mr. Chairman, I regret having to oppose the gentlewoman’s amendment at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, I want to reiterate the importance of the Department of Labor Women’s Bureau. I believe our government, especially, should have whatever advice, suggestions, and research that is needed to help all departmental agencies develop policies that further advance the interests of working women. Women currently in our country make, on average, 77 cents to every dollar that a man makes, and that amount is even lower for women of color. This Bureau would work on issues surrounding equal pay, employment rights of pregnant women and women who are breastfeeding in the workplace, and workplace violence. Women are also disproportionately represented in apprenticeships for women and women of color.

These are important issues, and our government needs to do better, and I believe Members of both parties should care about this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG).

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, again, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and 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 (Ms. MENG) were postponed.

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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 34, 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 my colleagues, Congressman SETH FOSTER. 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 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, businesses, 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. 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. 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 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 779, line 18, after the 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 2016 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 system.

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 2018 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 2019 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 on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG). The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 142 OFFERED BY MS. MENG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 142 printed in House Report 115–297.

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 $4,800,000)”.

Page 736, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $2,800,000)”.

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 to support the amendment that I have offered to increase funding for the very successful Healthy Start program, adding $24.8 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 neurotoxin. Of course, we 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.
As the gentleman knows, again, our subcommittee received an allocation below last year’s level. As a result, we did not have the ability to increase funding for some programs, this one included.

The gentleman’s amendment offsets the increase with a reduction in the resources for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out his responsibilities. A reduction of this size would hinder the Secretary’s ability to administer the program effectively. For this reason, I oppose the amendment.

I want to assure my friend, as we work our way through this process, I am going to try and work with him to see if we can find a way to actually increase those funds, but at this point, we simply don’t have them available.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, again, I would just encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

I do appreciate very much my friend from Oklahoma’s sincere support for the effort. Let’s hope that the amendment passes. If it does not, I do look forward to working with him in order to ensure that every child who could potentially benefit from this program does, in fact, have that opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I again urge my colleagues to support 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. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KILDEE. 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 Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 149 printed in House Report 115–297.

Mr. FLORES. 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 740, line 7, insert “(increased by $40,000,000)” after the dollar amount.

Page 740, line 8, insert “(increased by $40,000,000)” after the dollar amount.

Page 741, line 7, insert “(increased by $40,000,000)” after the dollar amount.

Page 741, line 12, insert “(increased by $40,000,000)” after the dollar amount.

Page 756, line 21, insert “(decreased by $20,000,000)” after the dollar amount.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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% 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 its current 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 also made 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 created at 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 include a targeted increase of $400 million for research on Alzheimer’s disease, as well as increases for each institute center, including the National Institute of Mental Health.
Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

Ms. TENNEY. 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.

MS. TENNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, 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 the past 2 years, Democrats on the Labor-HHS Subcommittee have worked closely with Chairman Tom Cole to increase the NIH budgets 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 account. Keep in mind that the CMS Program Management account is already cut by a $324 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 funding?

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 disabilities, 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. The Acting Chair will designate the amendment.

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. 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. 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 5, after the dollar amount, insert ``(increased by $14,000,000)''.

Page 763, line 3, after the first dollar amount, insert ``(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 764, line 1, 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. I am proud to represent the 22nd District of New York, a once thriving hub of innovation and manufacturing. My district has suffered the fate of too many Rust Belt communities.

Against the backdrop of crushing taxes and soaring costs, it is harder than ever for my constituents to find good-paying jobs that match their skills. A tragic result of this lack of opportunity has been increasing poverty, especially among our most vulnerable populations.

In addition to supporting commonsense pro-growth policies in Congress to reduce regulations and encourage innovation, programs like the Community Services Block Grant play a vital role in addressing the unmet needs of our neighbors.

CSBG funding directly supports programs aimed at reducing poverty and assisting low-income individuals, the homeless, and the elderly. It allows States and community action agencies in every district to build the flexibility to improve living conditions, increase self-sufficiency, and foster strong family support systems.

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 CSBG 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.

I am grateful that this committee has recognized the importance of this program, and I am especially thankful for Chairman Cole’s leadership on this issue. The committee has expressed a willingness to work with me to ensure that the final appropriations bill worked out in conference includes robust funding for this CSBG Energy Assistance 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. Chair, 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)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.
Page 770, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $3,819,000)”.  

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.  

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.  

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.  

Mr. Chairman, I co-chairman of the bipartisan Congressional Lung Cancer Caucus, I want to first express my appreciation for allowing my amendment to be made here in order and for the work of the committee.  

May no mistake that these extra funds that are in my measure, the $3.8 million for cancer research at the National Cancer Institute, are urging that it be spent on lung cancer, in particular.  

Those extra funds will make an enormous difference in battling lung cancer, which, as all know, is the most deadly of all the cancers.  

As many of you know, my daughter, Katherine, was diagnosed with stage IV nonsmoking small cell lung cancer almost 2 years ago. Thanks to medical research and the daily prayers of so many of my colleagues here in the House, Katherine is still with us.  

But like so many thousands of others, she is still courageously and desperately fighting for her future. We can provide those people with some real hope and support for their determination, as well as additional research dollars that are so desperately needed.  

As you know—or may not know—we have made little or no progress in the last 20 years in combating lung cancer. There is still a survival rate of something less than 1 or 2 percent.  

But make no mistake, the money that this committee and this Congress and this House has provided for research not just in cancer, but many of the other fields, has played a critically important role in increasing our life expectancies—played the lead role in increasing our life expectancies in this country. In my grandfather’s time it was 47, and now it is almost 80.  

But one of the areas where we just haven’t been able to make any progress at all is in lung cancer research. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this modest request for a modest amount of money to be added to helping us make some progress in lung cancer research in the way that we have done for so many other forms of the disease.  

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

Mr. COLE. 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 Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.  

There was no objection.  

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to advise my friend we certainly intend to accept his amendment, and I look forward to working with him as we go forward on the bill. I think there are some other areas where we can increase funding, as well, that would fit with my friend’s objective.  

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I express my thanks and gratitude, 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. NOLAN).  

The amendment was agreed to.  

AMENDMENT NO. 154 OFFERED BY MS. CLARK OF MASSACHUSETTS  

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 154 printed in House Report 115–297.  

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DeLAURO), I offer amendment No. 154.  

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.  

The text of the amendment is as follows:  

Page 751, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $219,620,000)”.  

Page 770, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $219,620,000)”.  

Page 865, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $11,710,000)”.  

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.  

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.  

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would restore funding for the mental health programs cut in this bill. Specifically, it would reverse the $142 million in cuts to SAMHSA’s mental health block grant and restore funding for Project AWARE State grants and Healthy Transitions, which were both eliminated in the underlying bill.  

For so long, mental health issues were relegated to the shadows, approached with the shame and misunderstanding that only exacerbates pain for people and their families; but today, we know how widespread these issues are, and we need to approach them without stigma and treat them the same way we would treat other illnesses.  

According to Mental Health America, one in five adults has a mental health condition, yet more than half of Americans with a mental illness receive no treatment. Many families without health coverage or whose coverage will not cover mental health or recovery programs rely on services funded by SAMHSA’s mental health block grant. This amendment would restore those funds.  

This amendment also restores funding for Project AWARE and the Healthy Transitions Grant program, which were created in the aftermath of the Sandy Hook school shooting, which took the lives of 6 adults and 20 beautiful children. In response to this tragedy, the administration and Congress came together to support several new programs to help communities identify and treat behavioral disorders.  

The Project AWARE program, often referred to as a mental health first aid, seeks to increase awareness of mental health issues among our children, train teachers and other school staff to identify and respond to mental health issues, and connect children to the appropriate behavioral health services.  

Healthy Transitions improves access to treatment and support services for young adults with serious mental health conditions.  

Together, we can make our communities more welcoming, compassionate, and safe for everyone, and restoring this funding is an essential part of that effort.  

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

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 gentleman’s concern. She is a very valuable member of the subcommittee. This is an area in which she not only has considerable passion, but considerable expertise. However, as the gentleman 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’ administrative 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 gentleman and, certainly, our good mutual friend from Connecticut whom she is representing 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 gentleman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).  

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes polled for two.  

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.  

The motion was agreed to.
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

September 12, 2017

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 a resolution thereon.

LITTLE ROCK CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL NATIONAL HISTORICAL SITE BOUNDARY MODIFICATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2611) to modify the boundary to the National Historic Site, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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 390, nays 0, not voting 43, as follows:

(Roll No. 485)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAHS—390</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguilera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amodei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks (IN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barletta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (MI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (UT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumenauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, Brenda F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady (TX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks (AL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks (IN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown (MD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bustos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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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 address 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 night of Friday, 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 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; and

Whereas, on Saturday, August 12, 2017, ahead of the scheduled start time of the planned march, counter-protesters and counter-demonstrators gathered at Emancipation Park in Charlottesville; and

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; and

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; and

Whereas the Charlottesville community is engaged 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, 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 as the community heals 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) use all resources available to the President and the President’s Cabinet to address the growing prevalence of those hate groups in the United States; and

(B) the Attorney General to work with—

(i) the Secretary of Homeland Security to investigate thoroughly all acts of violence, intimidation, and terrorism, White supremacists, White nationalists, neo-Nazis, the Ku Klux Klan, and associated groups in order to determine if any criminal laws have been violated and to prevent those groups from fomenting and facilitating additional violence; 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. 3354.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROYDEN DAVIS) kindly resume the chair.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 155 offered by Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. 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:

Amendment No. 155 offered by Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I want to speak on this amendment, which provides some additional funding for assisted outpatient treatment and the JTJA.

The underlying bill has in it $15 million, and we are asking for it to be raised to $20 million. First of all, I want to say where the money is coming from. This is within the budget of the Senate. This is not additional spending. It is not additional spending. But over my years of investigating mental health in the United States and the conditions, and then led to my introduction of the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, which, by the way, this House passed. This level of funding was authorized in the bill. It is already authorized. It is to come from the SAMHSA account, not new spending.

Let me describe what assisted outpatient treatment is. Understanding that there are about 60 million Americans with mental illness, and 10 million have severe mental illness, it is important to note that our prisons are filled with people who have mental illness. On some level, 60 to 80 percent of people in jail have a mental illness. That is no place to be treating someone. But, unfortunately, they may have a crime they committed, and in many cases it could simply be vagrancy, it could be other issues, too, where they may have become violent, they may have had other problems associated with that, but a person with mental illness is 10 times more likely to be in prison than to be in a hospital bed.

We don't have enough hospital beds. Ninety percent of the psychiatric hospital beds in this country have been closed down since the 1950s. Now we need 100,000 more, but instead what we do as a society, we throw them in prison.

So rather than having someone, if we can't put them in a hospital, can't get...
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 that is 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 violent thing like; 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. This 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 form 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 who were successfully treated were 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-
potent in their case manager’s ability to help them; 87 percent had fewer in-
carcerations; 83 percent had fewer ex-
perienced arrests—and the point is, they had an increased number of ar-
estors prior to being in AOT, and then after the case manager declined precipitously.

Eighty-one percent said AOT helped them get and to stay well; 77 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 dam-
gaged individuals with a severe mental illness, but only 4,500 psychiatric beds are available in all of the Texas hos-
pitals combined.

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.

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 surplus, 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 great reluctance that I opposed this particular amendment, earlier, when we actually accepted.

But the amendment increases fund-
ing for programs currently funded at $15 million, the same as last year. As the gentlewoman 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-
ferent 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 to-
night we can really think about Congresswoman 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-
grams. In the bill under consideration today, SAMHSA’s mental health pro-
gram is already cut by $291 million. That is a 20 percent cut.

Unfortunately, this amendment would further reduce funding for crit-
tical 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 psy-
chiatric 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 serv-
ices.

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 bipartisan budget deal that lifts the sequestration caps and provides significant funding for mental health and substance abuse pro-
grams 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-
gnosed 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-
nesses 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 ERs, or jails. This effort 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 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 Acting 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 have a choice, and this amendment provides 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. KELLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. 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. Thegentlewoman 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 prevention of 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 served women about 904,000—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 23 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 is provided 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, and offsets 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 ensure expectant mothers have 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.
But this is about adoption. This is not about anything else. This is not about taking anything away from anybody. This is about giving them the opportunity to understand the options that they do have in an unplanned pregnancy.

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chair, as I close, while this amendment focuses on adoption services, we cannot ignore what is missing 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 Communities 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, the 2 million families in the United States. 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 rise.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MITCHELL). The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. MITCHELL, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Nation, 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.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3897, CRIMINAL ALIEN GANG MEMBER REMOVAL ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM SEPTEMBER 15, 2017, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 22, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–307) on the resolution (H. Res. 513) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3697) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to aliens associated with criminal gangs, and for other purposes, and providing for proceedings during the period from September 15, 2017, through September 22, 2017, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to H. Res. 513, the Chair will now call for the question on the amendment to fund Title X (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. MITCHELL (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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 rise.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MITCHELL). The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. MITCHELL, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Nation, 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, with Mr. MITCHELL (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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 rise.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MITCHELL). The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. MITCHELL, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Nation, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3354) making appro-
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—two 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 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. 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, life span, including persons in rural, medically underserved, and vulnerable communities.

Peer support has improved health outcomes while lowering healthcare costs. In fact, there is growing evidence that peer-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, person-centered care to those who need it the most.

Many studies have shown the vast benefits to patients who utilize peer support. For example, a recent study 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 gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman’s concern. He raises, I think, a genuinely important issue.

Our committee understands the value of the Behavioral Health Workforce Education and Training program, which is why we did not accept the administration’s budget request which actually canceled the program.

Our committee, as my friend knows, received an allocation that was lower than fiscal year 2017, so we had to make some tough decisions. I want my friend how we will work with him going forward and see if we can arrive at a solution that he finds more satisfactory in the final bill.

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

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I claim the remainder of my time.

A straightforward amendment. I know from personal experience that it works. It is a cost-saving measure, and it really helps people suffering from mental illness. We should recognize the need out there. It is still great, even as I reflect upon my community mental health center, Change, Incorporated.

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 gentleman from New York (Mr. LUJÁN), 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 15, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by $100,000,000)”.

Page 794, line 15, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by $100,000,000)”.

Page 794, line 19, after the dollar amount insert “(decreased 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 children, more than 87,000 in my home State of New York, rely on afterschool programs supported through the 21st Century Community Learning Centers 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 both her proposal. 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 my 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. It has grown from one to come and visit and see what these programs do, which is provide important support 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.

□ 1945

AMENDMENT NO. 36 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 ‘‘(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 Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, this, I think, is a very modest amendment, which is to 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. And truly, 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 conference, I will gladly take another look at the student Achievement 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. Chairman, 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—

Now, 60 years after Brown v. Board of Education, the data shows that many schools and communities continue to suffer from the vestiges of segregation and that many of our Nation’s largest school districts are segregated along racial and economic lines.

Now, I just have to say, when I started elementary school, schools were segregated in El Paso, Texas. Sixty years later, it is really something. We have come a long way, but we have a long way to go. This amendment, the Magnet Schools Assistance Program—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 am 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 tiny as I my 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, so 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 in 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...
if we can also make some progress in that area. But at this time, I am going to continue to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, may I ask how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania). The gentleman from Connecticut has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, again, briefly, I appreciate the gentleman’s comments, I would just note, though, if you go back 10 years ago, the disparity between charter school funding at the Federal level versus magnet schools was two to one in favor of charters.

We are at a point today where, with this budget, it will be four to one in terms of disparity between the two. I would acknowledge the gentleman’s comments that there are some areas where charter schools have provided great benefits, but there is no question that, in terms of breaking down racial isolation, schools have a much better batting average, and that has been studied and reported over the years.

My daughter attended a magnet school in the Hartford area, and again, with a racially diverse population, and again, it is probably the most highly rated high school, secondary school, in the State of Connecticut, according to U.S. News and World Report.

So again, the quality of magnet schools. I think, are high in the record in terms of their goal, which is to break down racial isolation. I think that surpasses charter schools.

This amendment would leave a 7.7 percent increase in funding for charter schools. It is not an attack on charter school funding. It just simply restores last year’s level of spending for magnet schools, a very modest measure.

And again, I look forward, hopefully, to working with the gentleman, but I really feel that this is too much to protect magnet school funding, and that is why I would ask the Chamber to support this amendment.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to assure my friend I certainly don’t take the amendment as an attack on charter schools. I think it’s high in the record to say that this is not asking too much to protect magnet school funding, and that is why I would ask the Chamber to support this amendment.

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

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 115–297.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. 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 801, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $70,246,000)”. Page 802, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $70,246,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, our Nation is facing a skills gap, a student completion crisis at both the high school and college levels, and record levels of student debt. The status quo is unacceptable. We must do better for our students by truly supporting career and technical education as a pathway to success.

CTE has been shown to dramatically increase school graduation rates, increase postsecondary access, and, most importantly, get students to a degree and a well paying career. More than 75 percent of CTE concentrators pursued postsecondary education shortly after high school, and four out of five students earned a credential or were enrolled 2 years later.

Dual enrollment allows high school CTE students to earn college credit and significantly increase their likelihood of pursuing and completing college, all while saving their families money.

The key is that CTE students often don’t need an extensive 4-year education, as many attend a great 2-year technical college and then head right into the workplace with little debt and skills to excel.

We must fight this narrative—one of my colleagues are still pushing to the 2-year technical degree is a lesser educational option. This way of thinking is simply harmful to our Nation’s students and our Nation.

My amendment increases funding for State grants by $60 million, transferring the funding from an increase to TRIO and GEAR UP. It does not cut funding to TRIO and GEAR UP but continues funding these programs at fiscal year 2017 levels, the highest funding levels in program history.

The TRIO and GEAR UP programs received significant funding increases over the past decade, including a $50 million increase in 2017, leaving the programs with proposed funding $230 million above their 2007 level.

Instead of an increase for TRIO and GEAR UP this next fiscal year, my amendment makes an overdue investment in career and technical education and in our Nation’s students.

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 the way 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
isn’t the right path for everyone. Unfortunately, too often, success has been defined by the 4-year-or-bust model, leaving students who would be better served by current technical education behind, out in the cold, and leaving job creation behind because we are not funding for in-demand workers.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. CLARK), a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding me time.

While this amendment increases career and technical education funding, a worthy goal that I support, it comes at the expense of funding for critical higher education programs that support low-income and minority students.

Career and technical education funds help ensure students are well prepared for further education employment in high-skilled, high-demand jobs in the 21st century economy.

In days before the election, President Trump, in reference to CTE, said: “We’re going to start it up big league.” Secretary DeVos, a few months ago, said: “...this administration is committed to supporting and highlighting career and technical education.”

Despite these promises, the Trump-DeVos budget cuts CTE by $168 million, or 15 percent.

I am glad to see my colleagues on the other side of the aisle proposing to increase our investment in this critical area, but I am deeply concerned that the other side of the aisle proposing to decrease funding for 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 opportunity available.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment and try to fund both more robustly.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Ranking Member Lowey, I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

The Acting CHAIR [Mr. MITCHELL]. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, as the co-chair of the 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 opportunities to the larger pool of talent in our country in order to be able to beat the next iPhone.

I will give you a really good example, Mr. Chairman. There is a student who happens to live in southeastern Minnesota. As a matter of fact, he lives in the Second Congressional District. He was not a homeless student living in poverty, but he participated in a TRIO program at a university in Minnesota’s Second District. Now, as a graduate student at Johns Hopkins University, he is the founder of a biomedical startup company with the mission of launching technology to innovate a disease diagnostic tool that has been found to be cost effective and will be utilized worldwide.

Hunter Lin could not have benefited from a 2-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 closed to the idea of 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- to 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 affirms the importance of 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. SCOTT, 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 annualized everywhere 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 appeared 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. 168 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 168 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 “(increased 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 $83,759,340)”.

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. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time to oppose the amendment.

So I know this is a passion and a sincere commitment. I remind my friend, he knows I know he would have preferred more, but this bill is $5 billion less than it was last year. He certainly had some success, and success that I agree with, but in this particular case, if I understand the gentleman’s amendment correctly, it would basically cut education administration by $43 million, a roughly 10 percent cut across the board in the administrative areas.

Or is it just a 2 percent cut in everything?

Mr. GROTHMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. No. It is a 2 percent cut in education administration, inspector general, and student aid.

Mr. COLE. Okay. But substantial reductions, and in programs that have already been cut. So for that reason, I would oppose my friend’s additional cuts, but I would hope to work with him going forward in something that I know he knows is a far greater driver of our debt, and that is entitlement reform. That is where the money is.

We end up fighting every year over discretionary accounts that are relatively minor compared to the behemoths of Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and the other so-called mandatory programs. They are only mandatory because Congress doesn’t have the courage to pick up the law and actually deal with them. So I am going to work with my friend in that area because I know he is sincere.

In this case, I feel compelled to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve 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. COLE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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 and practices that need to 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 even more. 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 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 Act- ing Chair announced that the noes appear to have it.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I de- mand 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. 169 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 “(increased 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 in strong opposition to this 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 overstuffed their bounds and dippled their hands into the day-to-day business operations of hardworking American families.

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 with 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 much needed reform. 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.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, which would cut the NLRB’s budget by nearly $100 million below the House bill, which is already $25 million below the fiscal year 2017 level.

Under this amendment, the NLRB would be required to furlough 1,500 employees for at least 140 days. That means 1,500 employees across 26 States would be unpaid for nearly 5 months. As a result, the NLRB would develop a backlog of 10,000 to 12,000 cases, which would indefinitely delay the resolution of pending cases of unfair labor prac- tices.

Perhaps my colleagues don’t realize that most of the NLRB’s work is not controversial. At the regional level, about 21,000 charges are filed every year, and 95 percent of those charges are dismissed or resolved within 60 to 70 days after an investigation of facts. In other words, 19 of 20 charges filed are resolved without litigation.

For charges taken to the board, about 70 percent of the decisions are unanimous, meaning they are bipartisan. That is how the process is supposed to work.

Why would we cripple an agency that is tasked with enforcing Federal labor laws? Does the majority believe that labor laws should not be enforced? Should a worker who is unlawfully fired for exercising their rights be met with a sign on the door that says, “Closed. Will reopen in 5 months?”

Closing the NLRB for 5 months would exacerbate disputes between employers and employees, and create a harmful disruption to our economy.

Mr. Chair, I urge that we reject this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to 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 would have to consider for themselves, I guess, whether the average State would even need 30 employees. Here we are just
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 America's workers who have worked in factories, mines, and other industries in an unsafe manner and in a timely manner under the law.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject 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 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.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 171 printed in House Report 115-297.

AMENDMENT NO. 172 Offered by Mr. MEADOWS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 172 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. MEADOWS. 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 9 (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 $7,897,000).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 501, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I want to start out this evening by recognizing the fine work of Chairman COLE. I can tell you that there are many times in this Chamber that they want to pit members of my conference against appropriators. This is not one of those times. I just want to rise and acknowledge the great work of Chairman COLE and Chairman FEELING-HUYSSEN, and, truly, of the entire Appropriations Committee.

Regardless of whether my amendment passes or not, I plan to vote for the underlying bill. Yet, with this commonsense amendment that we put forth, Mr. Chairman, we are really looking to try to make sure that we rightsize a group that has been under attacked and this is all about the coal industry.

What we have found is that under the previous administration, there was an unbelievable attack on all fossil fuels, but specifically the coal industry.

This actually goes about rightsizing MSHA, which is the mine safety and health group that will inspect the mines. What we found is that we have fewer mines to actually inspect. My amendment is real straightforward. It is saying: let’s rightsize that particular group. Let’s get the number of employees that we have there by 10 percent. They have less mines to inspect. I can tell you, coming from a State that has mining in every one of the counties that I have the privilege of serving, what we need to understand is that it is not about safety of mine workers, because I am for the safety of mine workers; we really need to look at being responsible with the hardworking American taxpayer dollars. That is what this amendment is about.

Mr. Chairman, the hour is late, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Knowing, Mr. Chairman, of the gentleman’s commitment to families, and I know that the gentleman’s family is committed to their children, I am totally shocked that this amendment will be addressed tonight on the floor of the House. This amendment, my friend, would cut personnel. Mothers and fathers will be directly affected by this. This amendment will cut the personnel whose responsibility it is to ensure the safety and health of our Nation’s coal miners.

The proposed amendment, my friend, would cut the Mine Safety Health Administration coal enforcement personnel by 10 percent; would result in the Mine Safety Health Administration being forced to violate Federal law because it would be unable to fulfill its statutorily mandated duty to inspect underground coal mines every 3 months. We have seen what happens, my friends, when mandatory inspections are cut back and the number of experienced mine inspectors are reduced to coal miners that cut corners on safety.

Following the massive explosion in 2010, at Upper Big Branch, which killed 29 coal miners in West Virginia, the worst coal mine disaster in the country in four decades, investigators found that mine management had consistently violated basic safety standards such as ventilation and rock dusting intended to prevent coal dust explosions. The number of violations at that mine were among the highest in the Nation.

The ultimate responsibility, my friends, for that disaster lays squarely at the feet of mine management, including its CEO Don Blankenship, who was criminally convicted of a misdemeanor and served the maximum of 1 year for conspiring to violate mine safety standards.

It is also clear from the internal review that due to budget cuts during the Bush administration, MSHA, the Mine Safety and Health Administration, became severely short staffed. There were too few inspectors to meet the requirements for mine safety inspections. You cannot undertake mine safety and health and expect to adequately protect the lives of miners. We know what happens when safety takes a back seat to profits. People die.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the distinguished ranking member of the Education and 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 perform 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 . . . mission of all of the coals—and mining industry must be the health and safety of its most precious resource—the miner.’’ This amendment abandons Congress’ commitment to America’s miners and should be rejected.

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.

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
U.S. Congress, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the United Mine Workers of America, I strongly 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. Since when an agency is on the rise, we should be looking for ways to increase enforcement and oversight of mining
operations, not make it harder to ensure that our miners are safe.

America’s miners put their lives and limbs on the line every single day for us. Our government has a responsibility to do all it can to ensure that they come home to their loved ones at the end of their shift. This amendment is another critical step to protect miners at greater risk. I strongly urge that it be rejected.

Sincerely,

Cecil E. Roberts

Mrs. LOWEY. In closing, this amendment would irresponsibly cut staffing by 10 percent at an agency responsible for the safety and health of our Nation’s coal miners. Mr. Chairman, lives are at stake.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment. I urge my colleagues to reject it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to acknowledge my dear friend from New York and her impassioned plea, but we have made news here tonight. All of a sudden, the people on the aisle opposite are all about the coal miners. Where has that debate been for the last 8 years?

We start talking about kids and family. What about the coal miners’ kids and families? We have got 33 percent less of those that are being actually operated right now, 35 percent. We have 43 percent less coal miners. We are talking about kids and all the things that we need to be doing, and we have cut back on the coal mining. Why don’t we cut back on the inspectors who, according to our numbers, have 35 percent less mines to actually inspect?

It is time that we rightsize the government. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support it. I thank the work of the chairman.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a closing remark to my good friend from North Carolina, and I like to address a closing remark to my good friend from New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a closing remark to my good friend from North Carolina, and I know that my good friend and I have worked together, Mr. Chairman, on many important issues.

I would just like to say again that whether there are 1,000 miners or 50 miners, and I understand the gentleman’s concern about the closing of mines, but we have a responsibility to those who are still working in those mines to make sure that they are safe. I would ask my colleagues to vote against this amendment because it is absolutely vital that we protect those outstanding workers who are supporting their families and make sure they are safe.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Meadows).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. LOWEY. 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 North Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 173 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 173 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. WALBERG. 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:

Title I—Representation

Section 1227. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the final rule on ‘‘Representation—Case Procedures’’ published in the Federal Register by the National Labor Relations Board on December 15, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 74308 et seq.) or any rule of the same substance.

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, too, want to thank Chairman Cole for the good effort on this piece of legislation.

I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 3354 that would block the NLRB from enforcing the extreme and partisan ambush election rule. Under the ambush election rule, workers are being rushed into union elections before they have the opportunity to consider all the consequences.

According to one report, since the ambush election rule took effect, union elections have been organized 38 percent faster than under the old rule. Thus, the ambush election rule took effect, the union election process typically took 38 days. Now, workers may have as few as 11 days to consider whether joining a union is the best decision for themselves. Eleven days is simply not enough time for workers to make an important decision that impacts their job and their paycheck.

In addition to speeding up the process, the NLRB’s rule greatly limits an employer’s ability to communicate with its employees through the pre-election period.

To make matters worse, employers have as little as 7 days to find legal counsel and appear before an NLRB election officer—7 days. This is a taxing time constraint, especially on small businesses with limited resources and a lawyer team that is nonexistent.

But workers are the ones who are really hurt the most. As a former union worker myself, I respect the right of workers to join a union, but they deserve a real choice in the matter and the opportunity to hear from both sides of the debate. At the very least, they deserve privacy as they come to their decision, but this rule forces employers to hand over their employees’ personal information, including phone numbers, work schedules, home addresses, e-mail addresses, and work locations.

The NLRB should ensure fair and transparent elections. Instead, the board implemented a rule chilling employer free speech and restricting the rights of workers.

By adopting this amendment to block the ambush election rule, we can restore the rights of workers and employers in union elections.

I would note that there is still more to be done beyond blocking funding of this extreme rule. The Workforce Democracy and Fairness Act, 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 vote in the 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. Chair, 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 gentlewoman is recognized for 3 minutes.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chair, 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.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, 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.

The Acting CHAIR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. WALBERG that
would block the National Labor Relations Board election streamlining 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 streamlining 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 prior 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 NLRA’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 erosion of union density has weakened the middle class and exacerbated wage stagnation by breaking the essential link between increasing worker productivity and rising wages.

This amendment undermines workers in their 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 streamlining 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 back-end 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.

This amendment offers the workforce person to get their act together is not a streamlining 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 give 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 cooperate, 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.

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 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. 174. Each amount made available by the 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 gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. Blackburn) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman 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 $156 billion for fiscal year 2018. 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
rank-and-file employees that are there in these various agencies—over at the Department of Education and at Labor and HHS—and make certain that they are saving that one penny out of a dollar, because we hit a pretty dubious mark with this next year.

Our national debt now is at $20 trillion, and because of this, because of the responsibility that we have to our children, to 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.

But the important thing to realize is future generations, my grandchildren that are now 8 and 9 years old, are paying for programs that we are refusing to address the growth in these programs that are committing money they have not earned, taxes they have not paid, because we are $20 trillion in debt.

It is time to make these changes, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

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 cancer funding or Alzheimer’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 I strive to 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 that. So now, in 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 hear, well, you would take from this 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 do it with 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, and many 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 at a deficit in debt. We are staring at 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 the 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 brain 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 weakens 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 had 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 115–297.

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. 2. For “Health Resources and Services Administration—Maternal and Child Health” for establishing and carrying out grants to eligible entities to develop, maintain, or enhance infant and early childhood mental health promotion, intervention, and treatment programs for children up to 12 years of age, as authorized by section 399Z–2 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–6) there is hereby appropriated, and the amount otherwise provided for this Act for “Health Resources and Services Administration—Program Management” is hereby reduced by, $5,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Report 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 is for infant and early childhood mental health promotion, intervention, and treatment. It provides $5 million in grants to develop, maintain, or enhance infant and early childhood mental health promotion, intervention, and treatment.
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 in the American Health Care Act last year in Congress in which it was passed 422–2—near unanimous.

The importance of this is that, across the United States, up to one in five children experience 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 distributed properly.

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 what can we do about children? We are already dealing with alarming rates of child 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 and adolescents. 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 to children. It appears to me 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—by my friend 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. This public of public health 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 dollar we 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 don’t have the ability to do that, but we can’t do it everyplace.

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 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 simply are not 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 pressures.

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, I want to say that I have a smaller allocation than it had last year. I think most of the public health people tell us that this amendment be adopted.

Mr. MURPHY. 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 work so hard 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 nondefense 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 reserve the balance of my time.

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 work so hard 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 nondefense 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 reserve the balance of my time.

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 work so hard 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 nondefense 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 reserve the balance of my time.

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 work so hard 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 nondefense 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.
The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of amendment No. 176, 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.

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 amendment to boost the behavioral health 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 psychologists, no psychiatrists, and no clinical social worker. So for children with primary mental health problems, it is a desert for treatment.

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.

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 amendment to boost the behavioral health 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 Schizophrenia 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? Travel from one office 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 face.

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 22, 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 budget.

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 massaging care. SAMHSA, instead, spends their money on ridiculous, embarrassing programs: making fruit smoothies if you are stressed, $400,000 on a website for toddler sing-along songs, getting in touch with your animal workshops, 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.

It makes no sense to me. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. 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 got funding for in the 21st Century Cures Act, we funded to the hilt. Frankly, we didn’t get funding for, we still authorized.

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 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 additional 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 very things, including my friend’s amendment, that my side 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. Chairman, again, I rise not in opposition to this amendment, but I support this effort by my colleague as well.

Let’s increase 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 impact that that has on families.

This is a false crisis. There is $5 billion 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 sequestration caps on both defense and non-defense, and draft a reasonable Labor-HHS bill that adequately funds mental health and substance abuse prevention programs. 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. Members of Congress have an opportunity to put a small amount of money to make a big difference for children who cannot get the care.

What we can do and what my colleague from Oklahoma said is we need to cut some things. One of them is the ridiculous wasteful spending at SAMHSA. If they can fund $400,000 websites for people going to luxurious hotels, they can certainly do something that actually puts providers there so children 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 decide 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 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COLE. 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 Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 179 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 179 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 now be instructed in the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division F (before the short title), insert the following:

She says: For “Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration—Mental Health” for establishing and operating the National Institute of 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 Surveillance and Program Support” is hereby reduced 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 yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am an amendment at the desk.

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

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

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 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. ___. 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 530F of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290b–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.

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 hospital, and no bed 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 1980s 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 has not promise.

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, they can’t find 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 by? 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 inpatients and jail inmates. NASPER funding supports the development of opioid monitoring programs allowing 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.

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.

During any epidemic, it is important to first help those in need and provide support to individuals and first responders who are 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 this crisis, 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 Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division F (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. 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 2313(c)(1) of title 41, United States Code, in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term Labor Standards Act, and in 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 Acting CHAIR. 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 False Claims 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 under a government contract. 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 to compete on an unlevel playing field with those who cut corners.

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 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 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 removed.

There are existing requirements for reporting and addressing violations of labor laws by Federal contractors. 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 denied review and redo of an EEOC undertaking 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 submitted to Congress to support 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 Representatives Ellison, Grijalva and Pocan to 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 EEOC seeks to prevent implementation of this ill-advised proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the CONCERT a letter from the American Civil Liberties Union.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

VOTE YES ON AMENDMENTS 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. 3354, the Make America Secure and Prosperous Appropriations Act, 2018:

1. AMENDMENT NO. 113 (PRESERVING FUNDING FOR THE EEOC/EEO-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) revised Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO-1) data collection. The Harris Amendment, adopted by Representatives DeLauro, Frankel, and Scott to the FY18 CJS appropriations bill, would preserve funding for this critical tool to lift the cloak of secrecy that shrinks 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 decreased disparities, facilitated employers’ good faith efforts to comply with equal pay laws, and identified appropriate targets for federal enforcement of nondiscrimination.

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 denied review and redo of an EEOC undertaking 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 submitted to Congress to support 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 Representatives Ellison, Grijalva and Pocan to the FY18 Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill, would withhold federal funding in order to prevent implementation of this ill-advised proposal.

This amendment, offered by Representatives Ellison, Grijalva and Pocan to the FY18 Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill, would ensure that no resources 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,
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. 17 OFFERED BY MR. GIBBS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 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. None of the 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. 29622 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 confidential 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 conflicts 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 them 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 long-standing requirements that certain employers in high-risk industries submit summary injury and illness data to OSHA, which 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 over-turned.

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 employer information being released on, as I said, the Freedom of Information Act request.

Furthermore, OSHA has failed to demonstrate any evidence that this rule will effectively prevent 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 more than once every 159 years, that is 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 when employers impose sanctions or reduce bonuses for work-related injuries.

This amendment would upset this important rule which allows OSHA to target their resources to inspect those that really need inspecting. This amendment would upset 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 workplace 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.
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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.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly, the Committee rose: and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GIBBS) 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 (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.

SETOFFICE RURAL SCHOOLS PROGRAM

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

Mr. LA MALFA. 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, 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 revenue for road money.

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.

LEEVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CURRELO 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 BILL 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; and 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. LA MALFA. 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 — teacher preparation issues.

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.

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 5 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.
AD07) 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 Transportation and Infrastructure.

2482. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., (Type Certificate Amendment Provided to Foreign Aviation Authorities for FY 2016), 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.

2483. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Augusta S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0256; Directorate Identifier 2017-CE-011-AD; Amendment 2017-14-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) 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.

2484. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Regional Aircraft [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0379; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-016-AD; Amendment 2017-15-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) 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.

2485. 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-2016-9307; Directorate Identifier 2016-9055; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-076-AD; Amendment 39-18970; Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2486. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9304; Directorate Identifier 2016-SW-013-AD; Amendment 39-18979; Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2487. 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-2016-9305; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-028-AD; Amendment 39-18969; Amendment 2017-14-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) 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.

2488. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0759; Product Identifier 2017-NE-27-AD; Amendment 39-18988; Amendment 2017-16-11] (RIN: 2120-AA69) 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.

2489. 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-2017-0758; Product Identifier 2017-NE-27-AD; Amendment 39-18988; Amendment 2017-16-11] (RIN: 2120-AA69) 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.


Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous; (Dock No.: 31113; Amdt. No.: 3758) 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 (Dock No.: 31144; Amdt. 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 (Dock No.: FAA-2017-0035; Airspace Dock 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 (Dock 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, and Amendment of Class E Airspace; St. George, UT (Dock No.: FAA-2016-1816; Airspace Dock 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 (Dock No.: FAA-2017-0039; Directorate Identifier 2017-7922) received August 17, 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 (Dock No.: FAA-2017-0039; Directorate Identifier 2017-7922) (Rev. Draft No.: 2017-39-1514; Amendment 39-18983; 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.

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 (Dock No.: FAA-2016-0533; Product Identifier 2017-VM-022-AD; Amendment 39-18994; 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.


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 HCs (Rev. Proc. 2017-45), 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. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 114-113, Sec. 107(a)(1); (28 Stat. 2961); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

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. 2516. A bill to authorize the State of Utah to select certain lands that are available for disposal under the Pony Excemption, in order to conserve the land to be used for the support and benefit of State institutions, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 115-306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1629. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury, in making loans or other financial assistance to States, to ensure financial stability for States and the Nation; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia: Committee on Rules. 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 for an Education Department, 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. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mr. PAYNE): H.R. 3743. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, and title 28, United States Code, to require the Attorney General to provide for the collection and distribution of monies resulting from the collection of fines, penalties, and other obligations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. CONNOLLY: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 4176. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to aliens associated with criminal gangs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education, and the Workforce.

Mr. JOHN CONyers JR.: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2514. A bill to make the Fair Housing Act of 1978 applicable to Indian Tribal Governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. GREEN: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3744. A bill to establish a Federal Housing Act that would extend the Fair Housing Act to Indian Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3745. A bill to extend the Trade Act of 1974 to Indian Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. CONNOLLY: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 3746. A bill to amend the Indian Education Act to establish a Federal Housing Act for Indian Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. MOSS: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3747. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to fund educational programs to establish an Indian Education Act for Indian Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. BUTCH GORDON: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3748. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to fund educational programs to establish an Indian Education Act for Indian Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. McKEE: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3749. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, and title 44, United States Code, to require the Attorney General to provide for the collection and distribution of monies resulting from the collection of fines, penalties, and other obligations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[Omitted from the Record of September 11, 2017]
other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself and Ms. MOORE): H.R. 3749. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to facilitate the commercialization of energy and related technologies developed at Department of Energy facilities with promising commercial potential; 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 provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself and Mr. LANDEN)_: H.R. 3751. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to direct the Election Assistance Commission to develop best practices for States to use to protect the integrity of elections and to make the election technology improvement grants to States for adopting and applying such best practices in the administration of elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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.

By Mr. NORCROSS (for himself and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania): H.R. 3752. A bill to direct the Veterans Affairs Secretary to develop and implement plans to improve the safety of medical facilities 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 Open Societies. . .

By Mr. MEEEKS: H.R. 3744. A bill to provide for the costs of the section 203 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, 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.

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida (for himself, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. DESANTIS): H.R. 3746. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to clarify the authority of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection with respect to persons regulated by a State insurance regulator and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COTTERIM (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. REED): H.R. 3747. A bill to require financial institutions to freeze the assets of individuals arrested under suspicion of participating in domestic terrorism or providing material support to terrorists, to establish a national clearinghouse for information on incidents of homegrown ''lone wolf'' terrorism, 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 determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. DELAURTE, Mr. DRUTCH, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. KEATING, Mr. KRANNA, Mr. KRISHNA-MORST, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCE ARCHIN, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DE LA NEY, Ms. PIDNERE, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. KIHUNE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SHEA-FRANTOR, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. HECK): H.R. 3748. A bill to amend title XVII 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 insurance market stabilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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.

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MEEEKS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. LEE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. KAPUR, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. MCCOV- E RN, Ms. SPEER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MICHELLE L. LUDGE of New Mexico, Mr. NORTON, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. VELA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. PAYNE): H.R. 3749. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to provide for a standard medical expense deduction under the supplemental nutrition assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, 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.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself and Mr. ROCHA of New Mexico): H.R. 3750. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to facilitate the commercialization of energy and related technologies developed at Department of Energy facilities with promising commercial potential; 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 provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DESANTIS: H.R. 3737. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia: H.R. 3738. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I: The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the fore- going Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

By Mr. McGOVERN: H.R. 3739. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, United States Constitution.

By Mr. MEEEKS: H.R. 3741. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: The Necessary and proper clause of the Constitution and the interstate commerce clause.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois: H.R. 3742. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I of the Constitution and its subse- quent amendments and further clarified and specified by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. VELÁQUEZ: H.R. 3743. Congress has the power to enact this legislation 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 legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, clause 3 By Mrs. LAWRENCE: H.R. 3745. Congress has the power to enact this legislation 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 Office thereof.”

By Mr. DUFFY: H.R. 3746. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, section 8, 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).

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representa- tives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitu- tion to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DESANTIS: H.R. 3737. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 (The Presi- dent . . . “shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, who Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law: but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Depart- ments.”). Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (“The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common De- fense and general Welfare of the United States . . .”). Article I, Section 8, clause 18 (“The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the fore- going Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.”).
H.R. 3750. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 allows Congress 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.

By Mr. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. SCHRADER, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. YOHO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 2796: Mr. WOLF of Virginia.

H.R. 3751. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3747: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. ROSE of Texas.

H.R. 3748: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. COLE, Mr. LUTTMERMEYER, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 3749: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 3750. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 3753. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3752. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 3754: Mr. Sessions, Ms. BASS, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. Michael F. Doyle of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3755: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 3756: Mr. COLE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BLOOMER, Mr. BUCK, Mr. GIGANTE of New York, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3757: Mr. Garth and Mr. Por of Texas.

H.R. 3758: Mr. SCHMITZ of Minnesota, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BURCH, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 3759: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 3760: Mr. ROSE of New York.

H.R. 3761: Mr. JONES, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 3762: Mr. SA ´ NCHEZ and Mr. BROWN of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3763: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 3764: Mr. RUBEN of New Mexico, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 3765: Mr. Desaulnier and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 3766: Mr. Sessions, Ms. BASS, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. Michael F. Doyle of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3767: Mr. GARRETT and Mr. POR.

H.R. 3768: Mr. BOYNTON.

H.R. 3769: Mr. COLE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BLOOMER, Mr. BUCK, Mr. GIGANTE of New York, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3770: Mr. Garth and Mr. Por of Texas.

H.R. 3771: Mr. BARR and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 3772: Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 3773: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 3774: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 3775: Mr. Visclosky.

H.R. 3776: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. KIehicles.

H.R. 3777: Mr. FASO, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 3778: Mr. Levin.

H.R. 3779: Mr. ROONEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MESSER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 3780: Mr. GRUDNIAKA.

H.R. 3781: Mr. LIECHTENSTEIN.

H.R. 3782: Mr. BUNN.

H.R. 3783: Mr. MURPHY and Mr. CUMMINS.

H.R. 3784: Mr. SCHMITZ of Minnesota, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BURCH, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 3785: Mr. RUBEN of New Mexico, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 3786: Mr. Garth and Mr. Por of Texas.

H.R. 3787: Mr. McNerney and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3788: Mr. McGovern and Mr. FLECK.

H.R. 3789: Mr. ANTHONY H. ALBIONO.

H.R. 3790: Mr. GARRETT and Mr. POR.

H.R. 3791: Mr. JONES, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 3792: Mr. COLE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BLOOMER, Mr. BUCK, Mr. GIGANTE of New York, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3793: Mr. GARRETT and Mr. POR.

H.R. 3794: Mr. BURCH, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 3795: Mr. COLE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BLOOMER, Mr. BUCK, Mr. GIGANTE of New York, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3796: Mr. Garth and Mr. Por of Texas.
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.