



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2017

No. 147

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 12, 2017.

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

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

ARLINGTON CEMETERY'S HONOR GUARD NEVER LEAVE THEIR POST

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the country is recovering from natural disasters that are taking place all over our land: on the West Coast and the Northwest, we have the wildfires; over the weekend, we had Hurricane Irma going through Florida, now through the Southeastern States causing havoc; and then, of course, we are still reeling from the hammering that we received

in Houston and other areas because of Hurricane Harvey, where thousands have lost their homes, over a million cars are destroyed. Natural disasters are taking place.

In the midst of all 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 Ceme-

tery. 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

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7225

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 stayed guarded, protected from that terror in the skies. Remarkable people, these Americans.

And that is just the way it is.

INCREDIBLE WORK DONE AT THE ALEXANDRIA MEGA SHELTER

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

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

In Louisiana, we know too well how devastating hurricanes and flooding can be. When our neighbors in Texas needed help, Louisiana answered the call. At its peak, the Alexandria Mega Shelter housed 1,800 people displaced by Hurricane Harvey.

I visited with some of the victims and the workers, and I want to share with you some of the amazing work that went on there. The shelter provided a roof and a bed for people whose homes were flooded and destroyed; but as a physician, I was most impressed 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, Laura Pickett, Melinda Sanders, Nici English, Dr. David Holcombe, and all those with the Louisiana Department of Health, and emergency and local pharmacies who helped meet the med-

ical needs of all these people displaced at this one shelter.

Recovery from Harvey will be difficult, and now our prayers and thoughts are also with our friends in Florida who are dealing with the effects of Hurricane Irma that just passed. As tragic as these storms can be, they also tend to bring out the best in us as Americans, who always answer the call to serve and help those who are suffering. We are all one big family when these disasters hit.

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

NEW JERSEYANS EMBODY THE BEST AMERICA HAS TO OFFER

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

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

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

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

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

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

JOLENE HERFEL, VICE PRINCIPAL OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate an educator in my district whose dedication to her students has earned her an important award.

Jolene Herfel, who serves as the assistant principal at St. Michael-Albertville High School, was recently named the Vice Principal of the Year by the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals.

Jolene has served as assistant principal at St. Michael-Albertville High School for 9 years. She is known for her strong leadership and commitment to providing students with a great environment in which to learn and a top-notch education.

She has shown her commitment by consistently improving curriculum and implementing many different programs designed to assist her students. One program she created is called Freshman Connections which helps build relationships between incoming freshman students and their upperclassmen peers.

Successful students are the key to our future, so it is important that we recognize educators like Jolene who are guiding our students on the path to success. Congratulations, Jolene, on being named the Vice Principal of the Year. You deserve it.

ST. CLOUD HOSPITAL IS RECOGNIZED AS ONE OF THE MOST WIRED HOSPITALS

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the St. Cloud Hospital for being recognized as one of the most digitally connected hospitals in the Nation. This is not St. Cloud Hospital's first major award. In fact, just last year, they were named one of the top 100 hospitals in the country.

As technology continues to develop and advance, our Nation's hospitals are better suited to provide their patients with the very best care possible, which is exactly what the St. Cloud Hospital does each and every day.

We are proud that the St. Cloud Hospital is a leader in this healthcare industry and in utilizing useful technology, allowing patients to stay in touch with their doctors and nurses, renew prescriptions, gain access to their records, and even take part in virtual physician exams.

This high distinction is the result of the healthcare providers and the information systems staff working for CentraCare Health and the St. Cloud Hospital. Thank you for your service, and thank you for making the St. Cloud Hospital a leader in 21st century healthcare.

THE HUBINS ARE NAMED THE PIZZA RANCH FRANCHISEES OF THE YEAR

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

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

Randall and Sheryl have owned the Pizza Ranch for the past 4 years, and, as a direct result of its success, not only have they been named Franchisee

of the Year, but they were also awarded the Community Impact Award last year.

Opening and operating a franchise business is not an easy job. We appreciate the jobs that people like Randall and Sheryl Hubin create 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.

□ 1015

RECOGNIZING POW/MIA DAY

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise 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 we not only honor these Americans, but we recommit to our promise to search until every missing soldier is accounted for.

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 homecoming.

HONORING THE FALLEN ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman 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 dissipate with time. As years passed, the shock of the 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 the very best in us—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 unthinkable 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 August, 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 instability and violence stemming 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.

□ 1200

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 provide 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 antihunger safety net programs, will work to end hunger now.

RECOGNIZING ALLIANCE FOR A HEALTHIER GENERATION

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

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

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

Since 2007, 18 Pennsylvania schools have been recognized with National Healthy School Awards for their exceptional work. The Healthy Out-of-

School Time program has helped more than 11,000 Pennsylvania children have access to healthier foods and focus on more active community programs outside the classroom.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Nutrition, I am so proud of our schools and our students 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, parents, 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. SCHRADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, for the past few weeks, the country has tuned in to watch as catastrophic hurricanes pummel Texas and Florida, but out West we have been facing our own natural disaster, one that doesn't get nearly as much attention but one that can be equally devastating and destructive. I am talking, of course, about wildfires raging, burning a total of 7.8 million acres. In my home State of Oregon, we currently have 26 active fires.

As a member of this body, I have routinely supported emergency appropriations packages when national disasters strike this country. I have supported funding for Superstorm Sandy. I supported funding last week for Hurricane Harvey, and I will support funding for Hurricane Irma. I have done this because, as an American and as a Member of Congress, it is the right thing to do. I call on my colleagues, now, to also support us in the West. We need to change the way we pay to fight these wildfires.

My good friend from Idaho MIKE SIMPSON and I have once again introduced bipartisan legislation, H.R. 2862, the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act, that will begin to 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, Rolling Harvest Food Rescue, and Solly Farm for all of their hard work in making this program possible. Mr. Speaker, these organizations and all of their generous volunteers are a tribute to our community and to our Nation.

HONORING SCHOOL NUTRITION PROFESSIONALS

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

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

Now, as summer comes to an end and children head back to school, these professionals will be working hard to ensure students receive healthy and appealing meals, which is not an easy task. Each 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 should take pride in the work they do every single day.

Thank you, and keep up the great work.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania) laid before

the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 11, 2017.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(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.

□ 1215

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. 311 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 of the participating jurisdictions and identifying gaps in such plans, operational capabilities, response resources, and authorities.

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

“(3) Providing assistance, through training, exercises, and other means, to build or sustain, as appropriate, the capabilities to close such identified gaps.

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

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

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

“(c) DESIGNATION OF PARTICIPATING CITIES.—The Administrator shall select jurisdictions to host a Workshop Series from those cities that—

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

“(2) have requested to be considered.

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

“(1) Senior elected and appointed officials.

“(2) Law enforcement.

“(3) Fire and Rescue.

“(4) Emergency management.

“(5) Emergency Medical Services.

“(6) Public health officials.

“(7) Private sector representatives.

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

“(e) REPORTS.—

“(1) WORKSHOP SERIES 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 all of the agencies participating in such Workshop Series a report after the conclusion of each such Workshop Series that addresses the following:

“(A) Key findings about lessons learned and best practices from each such Workshop Series.

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

“(2) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section and annually thereafter for the next five years, the Administrator, in consultation with the Director of the National Counterterrorism Center and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and 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.

“(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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous 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. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

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

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

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

H.R. 3284, as amended, authorizes the Joint Counterterrorism Awareness

Workshop Series for 5 years and delineates the activities that are required to be part of each workshop, including a review of current plans, policies and procedures, and an examination of the roles and responsibilities of each participating agency.

H.R. 3284 ensures that the whole community—from government officials, law enforcement, fire, EMS, and public health officials to the private sector—participates in the workshop.

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

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

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

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

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION

OF FIRE CHIEFS,

Fairfax, VA, July 21, 2017.

Hon. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FITZPATRICK: On behalf of the nearly 12,000 fire and emergency service leaders of the International Association of Fire Chiefs (IAFC), I express our support for H.R. 3284, your legislation to authorize the Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series (JCTAWS). These multidisciplinary exercises help local jurisdictions prepare for the threat of complex, coordinated terrorist attacks.

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

The JCTAWS exercises provide an environment where local fire service, law enforcement, 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 options and learn how to best protect their communities. The exercises also bring together resources from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the National Counterterrorism Center, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to leverage the strengths of these major agencies. After a jurisdiction hosts a JCTAWS exercise, key findings are communicated to the participants as well as mitigation strategies and resources to address gaps in preparedness.

The IAFC endorses this legislation and thanks you for authorizing funding for this critical exercise program. We look forward

to working with you to pass this legislation this year.

Sincerely,

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

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT
OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC.

FLEOA COMMENDS FITZPATRICK, MURRAY,
DONOVAN FOR FIRST RESPONDERS BILL

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

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

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Throughout our Nation’s history, our first responders have always stood for peace, security, and ordered liberty that make our communities great and our country strong. For this we are eternally grateful. As we remember those who gave their lives on September 11, we, unfortunately, recall that the threats of coordinated terrorist attacks are not going away. Today it remains critical that our first 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. BARRAGÁN. 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 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 multicity 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. I represent the Port of Los Angeles—America’s port. It touches every congressional district and faces a variety of threats that require coordinated preparation and response from Federal, State, and local agencies.

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

Importantly, this bill requires that, at the conclusion of each event, the FEMA Administrator, in consultation with the NCTC and FBI Directors and officials from the participant city hosting the workshop series, provide all participants with an after-action report that includes key findings about lessons learned and best practices from the event, and potential mitigation strategies and resources to address gaps identified during the event.

I strongly support this counterterrorism training program, and I believe that Congress should show its support for the program by enacting this legislation. I urge my House colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

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

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

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the House Committee on

Homeland Security, I rise in support of H.R. 3284, “Joint Counterterrorism Awareness Workshop Series Act of 2017.”

This bipartisan bill would formally authorize the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to hold counterterrorism workshops with state and local officials in order 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.

The coordination program under the measure would include:

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

2. Identifying Federal, State, and local resources available to address the gaps identified;

3. Providing assistance, through training, exercises, and other means, to build or sustain, as appropriate, the capabilities to close such identified gaps;

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

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

6. Identifying and sharing best practices and lessons learned from each Workshop Series.

I would like to take the time to thank FEMA for their response to Hurricane Harvey and their efforts with Hurricane Irma.

Since Hurricane Harvey, 617,000 individuals have registered for assistance through FEMA with 13,585 interactions with survivors taking place. FEMA is an integral part of security for survivors of catastrophes. By providing these workshops, we will continue to provide security when our country is most vulnerable.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

During Hurricane Harvey, Texas first responders were facing double effort with both a hurricane and flood; preventing proper response to a homeland security event should it have happened.

It is important to include in their training, a resource for first responders to learn how to manage a terror threat during a catastrophic event such as Hurricane Harvey.

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

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

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

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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 Intelligence 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 as determined appropriate by the Chief Human Capital Officer and the Chief Intelligence Officer.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

There is an existing IRAP, but based on oversight efforts over the past year, it is clear the DHS needs a more integrated, coordinated, and transparent 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 professional development opportunities to analysts by exposing them to the legal authorities, collection capabilities, and data sets associated with different intelligence offices across the DHS. It also is an important building block in the development of homeland security intelligence as a core competency above and beyond individual mission areas at the Department.

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

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

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 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. 2825, the House-passed “Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act of 2017” for which I wrote to you about on June 27, 2017. Accordingly, since H.R. 2453, 2468, and 2470 implicate National Intelligence Program (NIP)-funded activities, I expect that they would be sequentially referred to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (the Committee).

As discussed in previous correspondence regarding H.R. 2825, we signed a Memorandum Regarding Authorization of the Department of Homeland Security and exchanged letters on January 11, 2017 (January 2017 Exchange of Letter), to clarify the Committee’s exclusive jurisdiction over NIP-funded elements of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). The January 2017 Exchange of Letters affirmed that, consistent with the Rules of the House 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 any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matter contained in these bills or any similar measure. It is also conditioned on the Committee on Homeland Security's adherence to the agreement embodied in the January 2017 Exchange of Letters.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding and 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,
Washington, DC, January 11, 2017.

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

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

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

The Committee on Homeland Security does not intend to authorize any elements of the Department that are funded through the National Intelligence Program ("NIP") as part of the Department authorization bill it reports to the House this Congress, although 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 as nongermane any amendments which may be offered in my committee's markup related to the NIP-funded elements of the Department. I further agree to consult 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 in the full House. That amendment will contain the

text of any legislative provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS previously reported by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. If the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has not reported any provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS, you will not offer an amendment. Understanding, however, that both of our committees have a jurisdictional interest in the Department's Office of Intelligence and Analysis, we agree to work together to ensure that the Office 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.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,

Washington, DC, January 11, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

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 House of Representatives grants the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence sole 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 functions related to the "integration, analysis, and dissemination of homeland security information."

As you also know, the Intelligence Authorization Act (IAA) is the annual vehicle 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 of authorizations, incorporated into the statute by reference, and direction and recommendations in a classified annex to the report of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Nothing in the January 2017 "Memorandum Regarding Authorization of the Department of Homeland Security," shall be construed to grant the Committee on Homeland Security jurisdiction over proposed legislation relating to the NIP or authorizations for appropriations for the NIP.

In keeping with these principles, the Committee on Homeland Security will not report

to the House any bill that authorizes any elements of DNS 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 you will oppose as nongermane all amendments related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS in markup in the Committee on Homeland Security. If any amendments related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS are subsequently offered during consideration by the full House, you agree to consult with me before taking action.

Finally, we agree that you will support the appointment of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to any committee of 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 paragraph 5 of 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 limited to the 115th Congress. It shall not constitute an understanding between our committees in any subsequent congress.

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

Sincerely,

DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman.

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

We, the chairs of the committees with jurisdiction over the Department of Homeland

Security or its components, are hereby recording our agreement on the following principles for the 115th Congress:

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

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

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

5. The Committee on Homeland Security and the committees with jurisdiction over 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 consideration of any comprehensive authorization bill for the Department, including timely resolution of any matters subject to a sequential or additional referral.

7. To the extent that there are policy differences between the committees regarding a provision of the comprehensive authorization bill 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 provision or a provision affecting revenue. If the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means makes such a determination, nothing in this agreement shall be construed to preclude that chair from exercising an additional or sequential referral over the measure, or a point of order under clause 5 (a) of Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

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

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

Signed,

GREGG “WALDEN,
*Chair, Committee on
Energy and Commerce*

DEVIN NUNES,
*Chair, Permanent Select
Committee on
Intelligence*

JASON CHAFFETZ,
*Chair, Committee on
Oversight and Government Reform*

BILL SHUSTER,
*Chair, Committee on
Transportation and
Infrastructure*

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
*Chair, Committee on
Homeland Security*

BOB GOODLATTE,
*Chair, Committee on
the Judiciary*

LAMAR SMITH,
*Chair, Committee on
Science, Space and
Technology*

KEVIN BRADY,
*Chair, Committee on Ways
and Means.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, September 11, 2017.

HON. DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NUNES: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2453, H.R. 2468, and H.R. 2470. I appreciate your support in bringing these very important pieces of legislation before the House of Representatives, and appreciate the willingness of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to forego seeking a sequential referral.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing a sequential referral on these bills at this time, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in any of these bills or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on any of these bills be necessary, I would support your request to have the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence represented for provisions within your jurisdiction on the conference committee.

Additionally, the Committee on Homeland Security recognizes and appreciates the importance of the Memorandum Regarding Authorization of the Department of Homeland Security and the letter exchange on January 11, 2017. The Committee on Homeland Security contends that per such agreement the bills considered on the floor today do “not intend to authorize any elements of the Department that are funded through the National Intelligence Program (NIP). . . . but may include Department-wide provisions that could affect Department elements that happen to receive funding through the NIP.”

I will insert copies of this exchange in the Congressional Record during consideration of these bills 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 consume.

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

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

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

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

The DHS Intelligence Rotational Assignment Program Act seeks to provide DHS employees with the opportunity to do a rotational assignment within the DHS’ Intelligence and Analysis division.

By establishing this program, officers and analysts across the DHS who have a passion for keeping our Nation secure would be provided the opportunity to develop or broaden their intelligence and counterterrorism skills. Organizations with such programs find that they yield benefits far beyond what the individuals who participate learn.

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

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2453 was overwhelmingly approved by the Committee on Homeland Security. The rotational program that it authorizes has the potential to not only provide some dedicated DHS employees a boost in morale and fresh perspective on the mission, but also to enrich DHS’ contributions to the intelligence enterprise.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 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. 2825, the House-passed “Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act of 2017” for which I wrote to you about on June 27, 2017. Accordingly, since H.R. 2453, 2468, and 2470 implicate National Intelligence Program (NIP)-funded activities, I expect that they would be sequentially referred to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (the Committee).

As discussed in previous correspondence regarding H.R. 2825, we signed a Memorandum Regarding Authorization of the Department of Homeland Security and exchanged letters on January 11, 2017 (January 2017 Exchange of Letter), to clarify the Committee’s exclusive jurisdiction over NIP-funded elements of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). The January 2017 Exchange of Letters affirmed that, consistent with the Rules of the House 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 any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matter contained in these bills or any similar measure. It is also conditioned on the Committee on Homeland Security’s adherence to the agreement embodied in the January 2017 Exchange of Letters.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding and 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,
Washington, DC, January 11, 2017.

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.”

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

The Committee on Homeland Security does not intend to authorize any elements of the Department that are funded through the National Intelligence Program (“NIP”) as part of the Department authorization bill it reports to the House this Congress, although 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 as nongermane any amendments which may be offered in my committee’s markup related to the NIP-funded elements of the Department. I further agree to consult 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 in the full House. That amendment will contain the text of any legislative provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS previously reported by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. If the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has not reported any provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS, you will not offer an amendment. Understanding, however, that both of our committees have a jurisdictional interest in the Department’s Office of Intelligence and Analysis, we agree to work together to ensure that the Office 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.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, January 11, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
*Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
Washington, DC.*

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 House of Representatives grants the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence sole jurisdiction over “proposed legislation . . . relating to . . . the National Intel-

ligence 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 functions related to the “integration, analysis, and dissemination of homeland security information.”

As you also know, the Intelligence Authorization Act (IAA) is the annual vehicle 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 of authorizations, incorporated into the statute by reference, and direction and recommendations in a classified annex to the report of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Nothing in the January 2017 “Memorandum Regarding Authorization of the Department of Homeland Security,” shall be construed to grant the Committee on Homeland Security jurisdiction over proposed legislation relating to the NIP or authorizations for appropriations for the NIP.

In keeping with these principles, the Committee on Homeland Security 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 you will oppose as nongermane all amendments related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS in markup in the Committee on Homeland Security. If any amendments related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS are subsequently offered during consideration by the full House, you agree to consult with me before taking action.

Finally, we agree that you will support the appointment of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to any committee of 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 paragraph 5 of 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 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 disseminate an annual catalog on Department of Homeland Security training, publications, programs, and services for State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes, 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 Representatives of the United States of America in Congress 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 AGENCIES.

Section 2006(b)(4) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 607(b)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(G) produce an annual catalog that summarizes opportunities for training, publications, programs, and services available to State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies from the Department and from each component and office within the Department and, not later than 30 days after the date of such production, disseminate the catalog, including 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 cooperating with national organizations that represent such agencies;

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

“(iii) submitting such catalog to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.”.

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.

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 remarks and include extraneous materials 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 Pathways to Improving Homeland Security at the Local Level Act, sponsored by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS), ensures that State and local law enforcement will continue to receive valuable information on DHS resources and programs available to law enforcement.

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 enforcement agencies from 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 Security Information Network. By requiring the Office to share this catalog through this existing information sharing 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 Homeland Security, I want to express our appreciation to the Judiciary Committee for working with us to move this measure.

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,
Washington, DC, September 5, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: I write with respect to H.R. 2427, the “Pathways to Improving Homeland Security at the Local Level Act.” As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions within H.R. 2427 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. 2427 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any (House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 2427 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this bill.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, 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 “Pathways to Improving Homeland Security at the Local Level Act.” I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on the Judiciary will forego further consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of this bill at this time, the Judiciary does not waive any jurisdiction 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 represented 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 consume.

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 attacks 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 for State, local, and tribal law enforcement.

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 evolve with the current terrorist threat landscape.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This bipartisan bill would amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002, to direct the Assis-

tant Secretary for State and Local Law Enforcement to produce and disseminate an annual catalog on Department of Homeland Security training, publications, programs, and services for State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes.

The coordination program under the measure would include:

1. Producing an annual catalog that summarizes opportunities for training, publications, programs, and services available to State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies from the Department and from each component and office within the Department;

2. Making such catalog available to State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies, including by posting the catalog on the website of the Department and cooperating with national organizations that represent such agencies;

3. Making such catalog available through the Homeland Security Information Network; and

4. Submitting such catalog to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

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

During relief efforts after Hurricane Harvey and the widespread flooding in Houston, Sgt. Steve Perez of the Houston Police Department drowned after his patrol car got stuck on a flooded road. 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 provided with proper tools and trainings in handling rescues in these conditions, we would see less of loss of life among both citizens and responders.

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

During Hurricane Harvey and the flooding that followed, if there were to have been a homeland security 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 disaster 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 ensure address 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. 121 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.

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

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

"(2) An evaluation of current terrorist tactics, as well as ongoing and possible future changes in terrorist tactics.

“(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.

“(4) Detailed information on all individuals denied entry to or removed from the United States as a result of material support provided to a foreign terrorist organization (as such term is used in section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189)).

“(5) The efficacy and spread of foreign terrorist organization propaganda, messaging, or recruitment.

“(6) An assessment of threats, including cyber threats, to the homeland, including to critical infrastructure and Federal civilian networks.

“(7) An assessment of current and potential terrorism and criminal threats posed by individuals and organized groups seeking to unlawfully enter the United States.

“(8) An assessment of threats to the transportation sector, including surface and aviation transportation systems.

“(c) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—The assessments required under subsection (a)—

“(1) shall, to the extent practicable, utilize existing component data collected from the field; and

“(2) 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.

“(d) FORM.—The assessments required under subsection (a) shall be shared with the appropriate congressional committees and submitted in classified form, but—

“(1) shall include unclassified summaries; and

“(2) may include unclassified annexes, if appropriate.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (d) of section 201 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(27) To carry out section 210G (relating to homeland threat assessments).”

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents 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 threat assessments.”

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

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 remarks and include 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, I am pleased to speak in favor of this bill on behalf of Congressman MIKE ROGERS. He is dealing with the aftereffects of Hurricane Irma, which is the tropical storm affecting his district.

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 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 incorporate 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 required by H.R. 2470 can inform the Department's budgeting and planning 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. BARRAGAN. 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 as-

essment 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 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:

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 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. 2825, the House-passed “Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act of 2017” for which I wrote to you about on June 27, 2017. Accordingly,

since H.R. 2453, 2468, and 2470 implicate National Intelligence Program (NIP)-funded activities, I expect that they would be sequentially referred to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (the Committee).

As discussed in previous correspondence regarding H.R. 2825, we signed a Memorandum Regarding Authorization of the Department of Homeland Security and exchanged letters on January 11, 2017 (January 2017 Exchange of Letter), to clarify the Committee's exclusive jurisdiction over NIP-funded elements of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). The January 2017 Exchange of Letters affirmed that, consistent with the Rules of the House 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 any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matter contained in these bills or any similar measure. It is also conditioned on the Committee on Homeland Security's adherence to the agreement embodied in the January 2017 Exchange of Letters.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding and 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,
Washington, DC, January 11, 2017.

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."

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

The Committee on Homeland Security does not intend to authorize any elements of the Department that are funded through the National Intelligence Program ("NIP") as part of the Department authorization bill it reports to the House this Congress, although 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 as nongermaine any amendments which may be offered in my committee's markup related to the NIP-funded elements of the Department. I further agree to consult 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 in the full House. That amendment will contain the text of any legislative provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS previously reported by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. If the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has not reported any provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS, you will not offer an amendment. Understanding, however, that both of our committees have a jurisdictional interest in the Department's Office of Intelligence and Analysis, we agree to work together to ensure that the Office 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.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, September 8, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: I understand H.R. 2453, 2468, and 2470 are slated for consideration on the suspension calendar next week. All three bills amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 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. 2825, the House-passed "Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act of 2017" for which I wrote to you about on June 27, 2017. Accordingly, since H.R. 2453, 2468, and 2470 implicate National Intelligence Program (NIP)-funded activities, I expect that they would be sequentially referred to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (the Committee).

As discussed in previous correspondence regarding H.R. 2825, we signed a Memorandum Regarding Authorization of the Department

of Homeland Security and exchanged letters on January 11, 2017 (January 2017 Exchange of Letter), to clarify the Committee's exclusive jurisdiction over NIP-funded elements of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). The January 2017 Exchange of Letters affirmed that, consistent with the Rules of the House 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 any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matter contained in these bills or any similar measure. It is also conditioned on the Committee on Homeland Security's adherence to the agreement embodied in the January 2017 Exchange of Letters.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding and 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,
Washington, DC, January 11, 2017.

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

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

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

The Committee on Homeland Security does not intend to authorize any elements of the Department that are funded through the National Intelligence Program ("NIP") as part of the Department authorization bill it reports to the House this Congress, although

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 as nonergone any amendments which may be offered in my committee's markup related to the NIP-funded elements of the Department. I further agree to consult 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 in the full House. That amendment will contain the text of any legislative provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS previously reported by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. If the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has not reported any provisions related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS, you will not offer an amendment. Understanding, however, that both of our committees have a jurisdictional interest in the Department's Office of Intelligence and Analysis, we agree to work together to ensure that the Office 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.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,

Washington, DC, January 11, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL McCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

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 House of Representatives grants the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence sole 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 functions related to the "integration, analysis, and dissemination of homeland security information."

As you also know, the Intelligence Authorization Act (IAA) is the annual vehicle

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 of authorizations, incorporated into the statute by reference, and direction and recommendations in a classified annex to the report of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Nothing in the January 2017 "Memorandum Regarding Authorization of the Department of Homeland Security," shall be construed to grant the Committee on Homeland Security jurisdiction over proposed legislation relating to the NIP or authorizations for appropriations for the NIP.

In keeping with these principles, the Committee on Homeland Security 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 you will oppose as nonergone all amendments related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS in markup in the Committee on Homeland Security. If any amendments related to the NIP-funded elements of DHS are subsequently offered during consideration by the full House, you agree to consult with me before taking action.

Finally, we agree that you will support the appointment of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to any committee of 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 paragraph 5 of 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 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.

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 evaluation of current terrorist tactics, as well as ongoing and possible future changes in terrorist tactics;

3. An assessment of criminal activity encountered or observed by officers or employees of components in the field which is suspected of financing terrorist activity; and

4. Detailed information on all individuals denied entry to or removed from the United States as a result of material support provided to a foreign terrorist organization (as such term is used in section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189));

5. The efficacy and spread of foreign terrorist organization propaganda, messaging, or recruitment;

6. An assessment of threats, including cyber threats, to the homeland, including to critical infrastructure and Federal civilian networks;

7. An assessment of current and potential terrorism and criminal threats posed by individuals and organized groups seeking to unlawfully enter the United States; and

8. An assessment of threats to the transportation sector, including surface and aviation transportation systems.

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

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

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

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

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

Additionally the assessment may incorporate relevant information and analysis from other agencies of the Federal Government, agencies of State and local governments (including law enforcement agencies), as well as

the private sector, disseminated in accordance with standard information sharing procedures and policies.

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

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

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

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

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

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1245

UNIFYING DHS INTELLIGENCE ENTERPRISE ACT

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2468

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Unifying DHS Intelligence Enterprise Act”.

SEC. 2. HOMELAND INTELLIGENCE DOCTRINE.

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

“SEC. 210G. HOMELAND INTELLIGENCE DOCTRINE.

“(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. 485)).

“(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(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4))) and Federal law enforcement of homeland security information and terrorism information assists such entities in carrying out their respective missions.

“(c) FORM.—The guidance required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

“(d) ANNUAL REVIEW.—For each of the five fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year that begins after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall conduct a review of the guidance required under subsection (a) and, as appropriate, revise such guidance.”.

(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(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The Secretary shall also provide the Chief Intelligence Officer with a staff having appropriate expertise and experience to assist 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 RICE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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 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, 16 years ago, an unprecedented attack against the United States revealed immense gaps in how the United States approached domestic security and information sharing. As a result, the Department of Homeland Security was established to consolidate

22 existing Federal agencies and reshape the domestic intelligence and counterterrorism structure in the United States.

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

DHS needs to follow the model of many other members of the intelligence community and produce an intelligence doctrine that clearly articulates roles and priorities across the DHS Intelligence Enterprise. The lack of this internal structure reflects a painful legacy from the pre-9/11 era in which bureaucracies operated as silos and were poorly coordinated.

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

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

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

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

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

products and help the Department better serve the intelligence community and its State and local partners.

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

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

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

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

The 9/11 Commission Report found that the U.S. Government did not fully share or pool intelligence information prior to the attacks. In response, policies and procedures were 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 the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) for his work on this important legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

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

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

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

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 SECURITY ASSESSMENT OF TERRORISTS USE OF VIRTUAL CURRENCIES ACT

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 2433) to direct the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Intelligence and Analysis to develop and disseminate a threat assessment regarding terrorist use of virtual currency.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2433

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 Security Assessment of Terrorists Use of Virtual Currencies Act".

SEC. 2. THREAT ASSESSMENT ON TERRORIST USE OF VIRTUAL CURRENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Intelligence and Analysis, as authorized by section 201(b)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121), shall, in coordination with appropriate Federal partners, develop and disseminate a threat assessment regarding the actual and potential threat posed by individuals using virtual currency to carry out activities in furtherance of an act of terrorism, including the provision of material support or resources to a foreign terrorist organization. Consistent with the protection of classified and confidential unclassified information, the Under Secretary shall share the threat assessment developed under this section with State, local, and tribal law enforcement officials, including officials that operate within State, local, and regional fusion centers through the Department of Homeland Security State, Local, and Regional Fusion Center Initiative established in section 210A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124h).

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "foreign terrorist organization" means an organization designated as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

(2) The term "virtual currency" means a digital representation of value that functions as a medium of exchange, a unit of account, or a store of value.

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Homeland Security Assessment of Terrorists Use of Virtual Currencies Act introduced by the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE) is an important measure targeting new ways terrorists may be raising or transferring funds through the use of virtual currencies.

The bill directs the DHS Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, in

coordination with Federal partners, to develop and disseminate a threat assessment regarding the actual and potential threat posed by individuals using virtual currency to carry out activities in furtherance of an act of terrorism, including the provision of material support or resources to a foreign terrorist organization. It also directs the Under Secretary to share this threat assessment with State, local, and Tribal law enforcement officials through the National Network of Fusion Centers.

As the threat of terrorism evolves, so do the methods to finance and support the actors who plot to attack the United States. The Federal Government must evolve as well to meet these novel and technologically-based challenges. This bill positions the Department to detect the new digital-based methods in terrorist financing and support methods that have already been utilized and to prepare for those that are soon to follow.

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 this very House in July.

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

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, my friend from New York has done an excellent job in outlining, explaining, and articulating her legislation; therefore, I have no other speakers. If the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE), has no other speakers, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2433 is an important piece of legislation that received overwhelming bipartisan support in the Committee on Homeland Security. Enactment of H.R. 2433 will ensure that the Department of Homeland Security closely monitors this evolving threat so that we are prepared to prevent terrorists from using virtual currencies to finance attacks on the U.S. and around the world. I encourage my colleagues to support my legislation, H.R. 2433.

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. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2433.

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.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY DATA FRAMEWORK ACT OF 2017

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2454) to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a data framework to provide access for appropriate personnel to law enforcement and other information of the Department, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2454

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 Data Framework Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY DATA FRAMEWORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall develop a data framework to integrate existing Department of Homeland Security datasets and systems, as appropriate, for access by authorized personnel in a manner consistent with relevant legal authorities and privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties policies and protections. In developing such framework, the Secretary shall ensure, in accordance with all applicable statutory and regulatory requirements, the following information is included:

(1) All information acquired, held, or obtained by an office or component of the Department that falls within the scope of the information sharing environment, including homeland security information, terrorism information, weapons of mass destruction information, and national intelligence.

(2) Any information or intelligence relevant to priority mission needs and capability requirements of the homeland security enterprise, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(b) DATA FRAMEWORK ACCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that the data framework required under this section is accessible to employees of the Department of Homeland Security who the Secretary determines—

(A) have an appropriate security clearance;

(B) are assigned to perform a function that requires access to information in such framework; and

(C) are trained in applicable standards for safeguarding and using such information.

(2) GUIDANCE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

(A) issue guidance for Department of Homeland Security employees authorized to access and contribute to the data framework pursuant to paragraph (1); and

(B) ensure that such guidance enforces a duty to share between offices and components of the Department when accessing or contributing to such framework for mission needs.

(3) EFFICIENCY.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall promulgate data standards and instruct components of the Department of Homeland Security to make available information through the data framework under this section in a machine-read-

able format, to the greatest extent practicable.

(c) EXCLUSION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may exclude from the data framework information that the Secretary determines access to or the confirmation of the existence of could—

(1) jeopardize the protection of sources, methods, or activities;

(2) compromise a criminal or national security investigation;

(3) be inconsistent with the other Federal laws or regulations; or

(4) be duplicative or not serve an operational purpose if included in such framework.

(d) SAFEGUARDS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall incorporate into the data framework systems capabilities for auditing and ensuring the security of information included in such framework. Such capabilities shall include the following:

(1) Mechanisms for identifying insider threats.

(2) Mechanisms for identifying security risks.

(3) Safeguards for privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties.

(e) DEADLINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure the data framework required under this section has the ability to include appropriate information in existence within the Department of Homeland Security to meet its critical mission operations.

(f) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—

(1) OPERATIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the data framework required under this section is fully operational, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide notice to the appropriate congressional committees of such.

(2) REGULAR STATUS.—The Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees regular updates on the status of the data framework required under this section, including, when applicable, the use of such data framework to support classified operations.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" has the meaning given the term "appropriate congressional committee" in section 2(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101(2)).

(2) NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.—The term "national intelligence" has the meaning given such term in section 3(5) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(5)).

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.

□ 1300

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Sixteen years after the 9/11 attacks by al-Qaida 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 was created, 22 component agencies were brought together with different missions, databases, and legal authorities.

The DHS personnel have to deal with a costly, cumbersome process to search and vet 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 other 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 weigh 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 for 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 systems 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. HURD, for introducing this commonsense legislation, and I urge my House colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

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

I thank Mr. HURD for his diligence on this bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

develop a data framework to integrate existing DHS datasets and systems for access by authorized personnel in a manner 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 intelligence relevant to priority 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 criminal or 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And today, two weeks later, thousands of Texans are still without permanent and stable housing situations.

That is why the additional \$7.4 billion in CDBG funding provided in the legislation is desperately needed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

This 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 support the mission of the Department of Homeland Security to develop and maintain a unity of effort approach to security our nation from terrorist threats.

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

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2442

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Federal Information Resource to Strengthen Ties with State and Local Law Enforcement Act of 2017” or the “FIRST State and Local Law Enforcement Act”.

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

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

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

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

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

“(A) Efforts to coordinate and share information regarding Department and component agency programs with State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies.

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

The Office for State and Local Law Enforcement is authorized in section 2006(b) of the Homeland Security Act and is located within the DHS Office of

Partnership and Engagement. The office largely serves as a source of information on DHS resources available to State and local law enforcement partners, as well as a point of contact for questions regarding DHS policies and programs.

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

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

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

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,

Washington, DC, September 5, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,

Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,

Chairman.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2442, the “Federal Information Resource to Strengthen Ties with State and Local Law Enforcement Act of 2017”. I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Judiciary will forego further consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of this bill at this time, the Judiciary does not waive any jurisdiction 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 Judiciary represented 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.

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

Mr. Speaker, today we consider H.R. 2442, a bill to require the DHS to submit an annual report to Congress on the activities of the Office for State and Local Law Enforcement.

This bill, authored by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), seeks to highlight the activities of this important hub of outreach to State and local law enforcement within the DHS.

The report is to include detailed information on those efforts, including steps taken to improve them and performance metrics to evaluate the effectiveness, and feedback received from State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies.

Yesterday, the Committee on Homeland Security released a staff report that looked at the DHS’ progress, over the past decade, at implementing the 9/11 Commission Act.

With respect to information sharing, it found that policies and procedures have been reformed, at all levels, to ensure that critical national security information is shared, and recommended that the DHS continue to refine its channels for sharing such information to ensure that they evolve to address the threat, landscape, and stakeholder needs.

Constructive engagement, through the Office for State and Local Law Enforcement, is central to this effort.

Sixteen years after the September 11 attacks, it is important that we stand together and recommit ourselves to doing all we can to prevent future terrorist attacks. I urge my House colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

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

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

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY CLASSIFIED FACILITY INVENTORY ACT

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2443

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Department of Homeland Security Classified Facility Inventory Act”.

SEC. 2. INVENTORY.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) the location of such facilities;

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

(3) the entities that operate such facilities; and

(4) the date of establishment of such facilities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) and the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

Having served as mayor of 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 Southwestern 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.

□ 1315

More and more, State and local officials are now getting the security clearances they need to get important national security information that will help them; however, gaps remain.

This bill will ensure that DHS is tracking the specific location of all the Department's secure facilities and make this information available to the appropriate State and local personnel as well as Department employees.

To be honest, it is frustrating that this legislation is even needed. Congress and DHS share the same goal of keeping our communities safe. We must make it clear that information needs to be shared to allow for proper oversight both now and in the future. Our State and local law enforcement officials are professionals and leaders of our communities. However, far too often, I have heard complaints that Federal officials do not take local information seriously simply because someone has not been able to obtain a certain security clearance. My legislation will help address this concern.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

H.R. 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 information sharing, establish the DHS intelligence enterprise, and support the National Network of Fusion Centers. It is important that DHS' partners at all levels know where to go to access classified information, particularly when a terrorist or other national security incident occurs.

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 name, charging date, and expected place and date of release, of certain individuals who may pose a terrorist threat, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2471

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 "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 through the Department of Homeland Security Fusion Center Partnership Initiative under section 210A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124h), as well as other relevant law enforcement entities, release information from a Federal correctional facility, including the

name, charging date, and expected place and date of release, of certain individuals who may pose a terrorist threat.

(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.—Consistent with the protection of classified information and controlled unclassified information, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall coordinate with appropriate Federal officials to provide State, local, and regional fusion centers described in subsection (a) with periodic assessments regarding the overall threat from known or suspected terrorists currently incarcerated in a Federal correctional facility, including the assessed risks of such populations engaging in terrorist activity upon release.

(d) PRIVACY PROTECTION.—Prior to affecting the information sharing described in subsection (a), the Secretary shall receive input and advice from the Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, the Officer for Privacy, and the Chief Intelligence Officer of the Department of Homeland Security.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed as requiring 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) and the gentleman from New York (Miss RICE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today 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 brave firefighters and 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 this very building 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 aftermath, 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.

This act, 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 individuals who were 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.

Providing 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 my home 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. 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 overall threat from known or suspected 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 other actions in support of ISIL or an al-Qaida 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.

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 counterterrorism 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 and recover 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.

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.

FIREFIGHTER CANCER REGISTRY ACT OF 2017

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 931) to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a voluntary registry to collect data on cancer incidence among firefighters, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 931

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 "Firefighter Cancer Registry Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. POPULATION-BASED REGISTRY FOR FIREFIGHTER CANCER INCIDENCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall develop and maintain, directly or through a grant or cooperative agreement, a voluntary registry of firefighters (referred to in this section as the "Firefighter Registry") to collect relevant history and occupational information of such firefighters that can be linked to available cancer registry data collected by existing State cancer registries.

(b) USE OF FIREFIGHTER REGISTRY.—The Firefighter Registry shall be used for the following purposes:

(1) To establish and improve collection infrastructure and activities related to the nationwide monitoring of the incidence of cancer among firefighters.

(2) To collect, consolidate, store, and make publicly available epidemiological information related to cancer incidence and trends among firefighters.

(c) RELEVANT DATA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the voluntary data collection for purposes of inclusion under the Firefighter Registry, the Secretary should seek to include the following information:

(A) Identifiable information from a representative sample size, as determined by the Secretary under subsection (d)(2)(A), of volunteer, paid-on-call, and career firefighters, independent of cancer status or diagnosis.

(B) With respect to individual risk factors and work history of firefighters, available information on—

(i) basic demographic information, including the age of the firefighter involved;

(ii) a listing of status of the firefighter as either volunteer, paid-on-call, or career firefighter;

(iii) the number of years on the job and a detailing of additional employment experience that was either performed concurrently alongside firefighting service, before, or anytime thereafter;

(iv)(I) a measure of the number of fire incidents attended as well as the type of fire incidents (such as residential house fire or commercial fire); or

(II) in the case of a firefighter for whom information on such number and type is not available, an estimate of such number and type based on the method developed under subsection (d)(2);

(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 information relevant to a cancer incidence study or general health of firefighters not available in existing cancer registries.

(C) Any additional information that is deemed necessary by the Secretary.

(2) **DIAGNOSES AND TREATMENT.**—In carrying out the data collection for purposes of inclusion under 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. 280e(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 (b), 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).

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

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

(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 30 days after the date of the completion of the strategy.

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

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

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

(5) **ENSURING REPRESENTATION OF UNDER-REPRESENTED GROUPS IN REGISTRY.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall take such measures as the Secretary deems appropriate to encourage the inclusion of data on minority, female, and volunteer firefighters in the Firefighter Registry established under this section.

(e) **CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary shall, on a regular basis, seek feedback regarding the utility of the Firefighter Registry established under this section and ways the Firefighter Registry can be improved from non-Federal experts in the following areas:

(1) Public health experts with experience in developing and maintaining cancer registries.

(2) Epidemiologists with experience in studying cancer incidence.

(3) Clinicians with experience in diagnosing and treating cancer incidence.

(4) Active and retired volunteer, paid-on-call, and career firefighters as well as relevant national fire and emergency response organizations.

(f) **RESEARCH AVAILABILITY.**—The Secretary shall develop and make public a process for de-identifying data from the Firefighter Registry and making such data available without a fee for research or other purposes. Such process shall provide that such data shall be made available for such research purposes only if there is an agreement to make findings, journal articles, or other print or web-based publications derived from such research public or available to the relevant stakeholders identified in subsection (e).

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

(h) **AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS.**—To carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated \$2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2018 through 2022.

SEC. 3. CUT-GO COMPLIANCE.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

□ 1330

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

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 on 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, caked in dust and toxins and dealing with smoke, you realize just the peril that our first responders often find themselves in. They rush into buildings to save lives, and we deeply appreciate what they do. That is why this legislation is an important step to help them.

Nationwide, we have this problem with our firefighters. They came to us and said: We need this registry.

Again, 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 will hopefully lead to better 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 good work on this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. 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 are present. Such exposures have resulted in cancer becoming the leading cause of line of duty death among firefighters. My grandfather was a captain in the Houston Fire Department and died of cancer.

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

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

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

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

Sixteen years ago yesterday, on September 11, 2001, we witnessed a horrible tragedy that will leave an impression on generations of Americans forever. Through this tragedy, we witnessed the heroic actions of America's brave first responders working and volunteering in the days and weeks that followed.

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

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

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

families, our homes, and our communities.

Unfortunately, the risks of firefighting surpass the scene of the fire. These men and women are exposed to dangerous smoke and chemicals that often result in a lifetime of health trouble. We see firefighters all across the United States with higher rates of cancer than the general population, and it is vital that we learn more about this correlation.

That is why I, along with my colleague, 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 community. This comprehensive 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 information is essential to the development of future protocols, safeguards, and the development of equipment that will better protect these men and women.

Firefighters put their lives at risk every day, and Congress should do all it can to shed light and reduce the health hazards they face. I would like to commend Chairman WALDEN and Ranking Member PALLONE of the full committee, and Chairman BURGESS and Ranking Member GREEN of the Health Subcommittee for a bipartisan showing of support during both markups of this legislation. I cannot think of a more relevant week to bring this legislation to the House floor. I urge the rest of my colleagues to support the Firefighter Cancer Registry Act, as we honor tragic losses of September 11.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 931, the Firefighter Cancer Registry Act. I want to thank my partner, the gentleman from New York (Mr. COLLINS), for introducing this bill. I thank as well Chairman WALDEN, Ranking Member PALLONE, Dr. BURGESS, and Mr. GREEN for helping to shepherd our bill through the Energy and Commerce Committee and onto the floor day.

As co-chair of the Congressional Fire Services Caucus and lead Democratic sponsor of this bill, I am proud to stand up for the brave men and women of our fire service. It is these individuals who put their lives on the line day in and day out to keep our communities safe.

In addition to ensuring that our first responders are prepared in advance of disasters and other emergencies, we must also ensure that they receive the necessary medical care and services after answering the call of duty.

When the courageous men and women in the fire services enter dangerous situations, they do not stop to ask whether they are subjecting themselves to long-term health risks.

Yesterday, across this Nation, we honored the first responders that answered the call of duty after the terrorists attacked us on September 11. Many of those brave men and women gave their lives, and many more are living with long-term health problems stemming from the time they spent at toxic Ground Zero.

As evidenced on that day, many before and since, our first responders do whatever is necessary to keep our communities safe. That is why we must have their backs.

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, and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, firefighters are at higher risk for certain kinds of cancer, including brain cancer, leukemia, lung cancer, 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 working to find ways to alleviate this risk.

I am pleased that H.R. 931 is on the floor today. It would create a national cancer registry for firefighters diagnosed with this deadly disease. The creation of a specialized firefighter cancer registry will 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 the 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 National 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. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), the chairman of the

Subcommittee on Health, the gentleman who helped move this legislation forward, and leads our committee on matters of health.

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

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

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

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

Yesterday did mark the 16th anniversary of the 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 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), another very important member of our Energy and Commerce Committee, who I know had many constituents horribly affected by the tragic events of 9/11.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of the Firefighter Cancer Registry Act sponsored by my close friends, Congressman COLLINS and Congressman PASCRELL.

Congressman COLLINS has been involved in this issue for many years, including as an Erie County executive in western New York. Congressman PASCRELL has spent his entire public career in defense of firefighters as mayor of Paterson, as a member of the State legislature, and for more than two decades as a Member of Congress.

□ 1345

This bill will direct the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to collect data on cancer incidence among firefighters. We need this data to help save the lives of the brave heroes who put their lives on the line every day.

The CDC will compile critical information like risk factors and the dangers to which firefighters are exposed. This information collected on a vol-

untary basis will help develop better protective equipment and prevention techniques that can be disseminated across the country.

It is fitting that we consider this legislation this week as our Nation mourns the somber anniversary of the September 11 attacks. This country can never forget the images of firefighters, police, EMS, and other first responders initiating rescues and putting themselves in grave danger, both during and after the attacks.

Many lives were lost that day and, in the years that have followed, from the rescue and recovery work. Let's do all we can to make sure this information and best practices are shared so that we can protect as many lives as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LITTLE ROCK CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE BOUNDARY MODIFICATION ACT

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2611

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site Boundary Modification Act".

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

Section 2 of Public Law 105-356 (112 Stat. 3268) is amended—

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

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

"(b) BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.—The boundary of the historic site is modified to include the 7 residences on South Park Street in Little Rock, Arkansas, consisting of 1.47 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled 'Central High School National Historic Site Proposed Boundary', numbered 037/80,001, and dated August, 2004."; and

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

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

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary";

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

"(3) COORDINATION.—The Secretary"; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise

and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I thank my colleague who is in our Chamber today, civil rights pioneer and courageous actor JOHN LEWIS, for his sponsorship.

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 in the United States Senate.

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

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor at this time to yield such

time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), a civil rights pioneer and legend.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in 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. The actions changed the heart and the soul of our Nation, and we must admit today that our country is a better country and we are a better people because of these children, the mothers and fathers, the teachers, and many of our citizens.

When Little Rock, Arkansas, leaders attempted to desegregate Central High School, the Governor fought back. He chose to stand on the side of hate and bigotry. It took a determined mayor, a strong President, the U.S. 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, listening to the radio, and reading the newspapers, we were deeply inspired. We were moved to do something, to say something. I said to myself: We need to stand up the same way the people and students in Little Rock are standing up. I remember thinking that I could—that I must—find a way to get in the way.

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

I remember 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.

□ 1400

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

H.R. 2611 would modify the park's boundary and expand the park's authority to enter into cooperative agreements. The proposed boundary modification would include seven privately owned residences on South Park Street, consisting of 1.47 acres. The cooperative agreement authority provided by the bill will allow the National Park Service to give financial and technical aid to the property owners to preserve the facades and maintain the ambience of a 1957 historic scene.

Images of the South Park Street properties are inextricably associated with the 1957 events. As images of the Little Rock Nine, crowds of protesters, the public, and the National Guardsmen appeared in newspapers across the Nation and were broadcast live through the emerging media of television, the neighborhood became as recognizable as the high school itself.

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

In 1996, the surrounding neighborhood, including these seven privately owned homes, was listed on the National Register of Historic Places as the Central High School Neighborhood Historic District. The designation recognized the neighborhood's association with the significant events of 1957 as well as the architectural characteristics and qualities that remain relatively unchanged from that period.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On September 25, 60 years ago, Dwight Eisenhower had the courage and leadership—one of the reasons I respect him so much as a President—to

order the Army 101st Airborne Division to go down to Little Rock to Central High School and to escort these nine kids through that first year and lead them to a school year like no other has ever been.

This situation was, in my estimation, a pivotal moment in our Nation's civil rights history as well as our education history. We have often talked about how buildings and monuments are used to interpret history. That is exactly what Mr. HILL is attempting to do here with a significant site in America'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 Historic Places.

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

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 connected to 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 women 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 and we can expand the area of this historic site so that we can make sure that this will be a protected area, so that the history will not be forgotten and so 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 commitments, about our priorities, and 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 behalf of this particular bill, those who have worked on this bill, and those who have sponsored this bill. This bill is something I think is really significant. It says something that is very positive about this country and helps us to remember that which is positive about this country.

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

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, H.R. 2611.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 504 and rule

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.

□ 1412

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, with Mr. MCCLINTOCK (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Friday, September 8, 2017, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 77 printed in House Report 115-297 offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) had been postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CULBERSON OF TEXAS

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. Chairman, is at the desk and has been agreed to by both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 3 consisting of amendment Nos. 81, 82, 84, 86, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 102, 103, 107, 110, and 111 printed in House Report 115-297, offered by Mr. CULBERSON of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS

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

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MR. REICHERT OF WASHINGTON

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

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

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

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

Page 291, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 292, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MRS. DEMINGS OF FLORIDA

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 86 OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY OF CONNECTICUT

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

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI OF ILLINOIS

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

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI OF ILLINOIS

Page 260, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,200,000) (increased by \$1,200,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 90 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI OF OREGON

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

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI OF OREGON

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

AMENDMENT NO. 93 OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN OF FLORIDA

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 95 OFFERED BY MRS. DEMINGS OF FLORIDA

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

Page 296, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 96 OFFERED BY MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

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

Page 291, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

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

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS

Page 269, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,500,000)".

Page 298, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,500,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

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

Page 291, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$7,000,000)".

Page 294, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$7,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MS. MCSALLY OF ARIZONA

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR. ISSA OF CALIFORNIA

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

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

Page 293, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 293, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 102 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN OF TENNESSEE

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

Page 298, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$4,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 103 OFFERED BY MS. BROWNLEY OF CALIFORNIA

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

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

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

Page 295, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 107 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 110 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE OF RHODE ISLAND

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

AMENDMENT NO. 111 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 295, line 1, strike "\$12,000,000" and insert "\$14,000,000".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1415

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

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

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

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

Veterans courts keep our heroes struggling with addiction or a mental health condition from going to jail, instead providing them with the care they need and a second chance.

Our Nation's military is returning home from a decade and a half of war with invisible wounds: PTSD, depression, TBI, trauma, and more. Researchers are continuing to find links between substance abuse and combat-related mental health struggles.

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

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

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

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

As we all know, drug overdose deaths in our country have dramatically increased since the turn of the century. Over the past decade alone, overdose deaths have increased by more than 400

percent. In 2015, more Americans died from opioids than in the Vietnam war. Mr. Chairman, that is astonishing.

This is a national emergency. I have seen the effects firsthand in my district. In 2016, nearly one-fifth of all opioid-related deaths in South Carolina took place in my district.

My amendment would provide more funds to opioid prevention by transferring \$7 million from the DOJ General Administration account to the opioid abuse reduction activities. More than ever, we must provide 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 my 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 program and coastal monitoring and assessment programs that give our coastal community the tools they need to understand and address these threats.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address the gentlewoman's comments, very briefly.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for bringing this matter to the House's attention. Harmful algal blooms are an important issue, especially to the State of Florida. We know how dangerous they are and the terrible effect they have had on our friends in Florida, who are already suffering the effects of this hurricane. Our prayers and thoughts are with them. All of us in Houston understand the severity of the problem they face, and we are praying for them and look forward to helping them in any way we can.

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

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

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the chair for yielding and for all his hard work in working together with us to address the issue of gun crime in this country.

As everyone knows, over the last several years especially, high-profile shootings and violent crime have caught the attention of Americans all

across this country and sparked a debate about what should be done to reduce gang violence and gun crime in the United States.

Well, the truth is, there is an answer and a proven solution that actually worked for many years when I 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 changed 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 was 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 serve to help those communities as they get back on the road to recovery.

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

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

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

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

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

My first amendment (No. 89) directs the National Weather Service not to cut \$1.2 million from the Climate Prediction Center, one of its National Centers for Environmental Protection. The Service is further directed not to consolidate the functions of the Climate Prediction Center into the Weather Prediction Center. Keeping these two centers separate 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, energy, and public health. Its 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, 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, including one in my home 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 assisting 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 to the \$16 trillion U.S. economy, and employed 6 million Americans. Additionally, minority-owned businesses are twice as likely to generate sales through exports, compared to non-minority owned firms, due to their language and cultural ties.

While their economic contributions are significant, minority-owned businesses struggle in 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 business.

I want to thank Chairman 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 VELÁZQUEZ for their co-sponsorship of my amendment, and for their previous work on these important issues.

Mr. Chair, 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. Chair, 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, Florida, 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 46 percent less likely to start using illegal drugs, and youth that face opportunity gaps, but have a mentor are 55 percent more likely to go to college.

Again, I want to thank Chairman CULBERSON and Ranking Member SERRANO for including amendment number 95 in the en bloc amendment as well. I would also like to thank my colleagues, Representatives LANGEVIN and BUTTERFIELD, not only for their co-sponsorship of my amendment, but for their continued leadership on these issues.

I urge all my colleagues to support the en bloc amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), my good friend.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the chairman about the COPS Hiring Program.

Managed by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, or COPS, the COPS Hiring Program is vital to State and local law enforcement agencies. The program provides our communities with the much-needed funding to hire law enforcement officers and meet public safety demands.

Since its beginning, the COPS Hiring Program has placed more than 129,000 officers in communities across the United States to advance policing and crime prevention efforts.

Make no mistake, these officers are necessary for the safety of our neighborhoods, constituents, and loved ones. Staffing challenges not only jeopardize the safety of our men and women in uniform, but also directly lead to the breakdown and trust between law enforcement and our communities.

From my over 33 years of experience in law enforcement, I know that police departments and sheriffs' offices must have the staff necessary to engage with their communities and proactively respond to their needs, instead of running from one call to the next.

COPS Hiring is a proven program that studies have shown reduces crime without a corresponding increase in arrests. Effective policing lowers crime rates and builds strong community relationships. Throughout my time in Congress, I have been fighting to keep this program funded. It is the same this year.

While I appreciate that the bill before us includes a \$100 million increase for Byrne-JAG law enforcement grant program, and I thank the chairman for his efforts, I am disappointed that it doesn't provide funding for the COPS Hiring Program.

As this process moves forward, I urge the chairman to include funding for the COPS Hiring Program. We must continue this program that has been so important to State and local law enforcement. This program is not just good for those who put their lives on the line every day, but it benefits all citizens as our country works to bridge the gap between law enforcement and the communities they serve.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Washington for his service to the people of Seattle, the people in his State, his service here, and for his devotion to this program.

I absolutely recognize the importance of the COPS Hiring Program and what an important impact it has had on the safety of local communities. We are especially grateful to our first responders in southeast Texas, southwest Louisiana, and the people of Florida. I don't know what we would do without our first responders. Our police officers and firemen have done a magnificent job in the wake of these terrible storms that we have had.

Given the staffing shortages and the current issues facing our law enforcement, the COPS program is especially important. As you know, the Senate has funded the COPS program in its

bill, and I look forward to working with the gentleman to make sure the COPS program is funded in conference.

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the chairman, and I just mention that I know in my heart his compassion and dedication to the men and women who wear the uniform across our country. I look forward to working with him in making sure the COPS program is funded once again.

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

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 83 printed in House Report 115-297.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 85 printed in House Report 115-297.

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 87 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mrs. TORRES. 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 258, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 258, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my amendment to this appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, since I have been in Congress, I have been working with manufacturers in my congressional district to ensure that we are doing all we can in Congress to support them in creating good-paying, high-skilled jobs right here at home.

Last month, I took a "Made in the 35th" tour and traveled across my district, meeting with manufacturers who are creating jobs here in the U.S. They told me about how they are competing with importers from Asia and an unfair playing field created by how our trading partners support their manufacturers.

I continued my tour to the Port of Los Angeles, where it became clearer where this unfair playing field has left us. Ships from Asia come in full and leave empty.

Mr. Chairman, the ships that leave Los Angeles should be full of American-made goods. This is the goal of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, or MEP: supporting American businesses through expanding markets and supporting innovation.

Two of the nine MEP success stories in California have happened in my congressional district. Insulfoam in Chino used the MEP to increase production by 20 percent, while reducing their energy costs by more than 5 percent.

Diamond Wipes, a very impressive company that I visited on my Made in the 35th tour, used the MEP to expand their wet wipes business to markets around the world.

A small investment in MEP meant real wins and expansions for these real American businesses.

□ 1430

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is common sense. For every dollar of MEP investment, we can generate nearly \$20 million in new sales growth and \$20 in new client investment. That is a \$100 million return on my amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment because that investment could end up in one of our communities.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the congresswoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to increase funding for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, the MEP program. This amendment would restore \$5 million to MEP, which has helped U.S. manufacturers create and retain good jobs in Connecticut and in every State in the country over nearly 30 years.

Connecticut's MEP, the Connecticut State Technical Extension Program, or CONNSTEP, works with facilities in Connecticut advising them on ways to grow their businesses. And thanks to partnerships with CONNSTEP, in my district alone, Metallon in Thomaston has increased new sales by nearly a half a million dollars, Metallurgical Processing in New Britain increased production by 20 percent, and RTR Technologies in Canaan increased sales by \$6 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' amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentlewoman'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 protection 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 91 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. MCKINLEY. 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 260, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000) (reduced by \$10,000,000)".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Environmental Security Computing Center within NOAA—the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—utilizes high-performance computing technology to quickly process information from weather satellites and to predict the path of a hurricane or the extent of damage a wildfire can create. As recent events have shown,

weather events can have a devastating impact on the lives of our fellow Americans.

In late July, northern West Virginia experienced unexpected flooding that placed eight counties under a state of emergency. Nearly 1,000 homes and businesses were damaged or destroyed, and, tragically, two individuals lost their lives. This was an unexpected flow of water.

Recently, Hurricanes Harvey and Irma have destroyed thousands of homes and communities, which will require a massive influx of Federal resources to rebuild. This Congress has the responsibility to ensure the accuracy and viability of the weather and climate monitoring work performed by the security center.

One of the most important systems NOAA uses to process this data is its high-performance computing assets, such as NOAA's Environmental Security Computer Center. My amendment provides funding to complete the build-out for that facility that NOAA has initiated. Completing the build-out will support the supercomputer systems that NOAA uses to process and report this important and critical weather model data.

What we are witnessing during this hurricane season, Mr. Chairman, demonstrates just how important passage of this amendment is to our Nation, and we are going to have reliable information provided to us. So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MS. ROSEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 94 printed in House Report 115-297.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 264, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$18,000,000)".

Page 314, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$18,000,000)".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to increase funding 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 science, and engineering. Through their NSF-supported work, our Nation's scientists have been able to develop innovative solutions to energy,

advanced manufacturing, national security, healthcare, and personal communications.

CISE also provides advanced cyber infrastructure for all areas of science and engineering, and it contributes to the education and training of computer engineers, ensuring our future generations 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 computers and constantly evolving technologies. As one of the few women in Congress to build her career in STEM, I know all too well the demand for talent in STEM is real, and we must make smart investments now.

Current CISE projects across the country include developing unmanned aerial systems technology to help reduce wildfires, creating new clinical modeling techniques to use electronic health records for personalized patient care, and strengthening our cyber infrastructure.

In my district, the University of Nevada, Las Vegas is using CISE funding for several groundbreaking initiatives. One of their projects focuses on increasing the 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 research 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 is the least we 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 and now Florida.

We have, in our Commerce, Justice, Science bill, protected America's investment and basic research through the National Science Foundation and its main grant account, the Research and Related Activities account.

We have funded the Research and Related Activities account at \$672 million this year. We recognize that America's leadership in the world is grounded, in large part, on the innovations and discoveries that are made by unrestrained scientific research.

I am a very strong supporter of the National Science Foundation's scientific research. And while we would like to see higher levels of funding for the National Science Foundation for NASA and for other science-related 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.

□ 1445

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 gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 101 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 320, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in support of our bipartisan amendment, which would increase Legal Services funding by \$10 million. I am willing to withdraw this amendment after my colleagues and I take a brief moment to speak about Legal Services. I know that the chair and the ranking member support Legal Services and may be able to help, but at some time in the future.

Our justice system is the envy of the world. Whenever we travel, people say what they really respect about America is the rule of law and our justice system, but it takes professional help by an attorney to navigate it. When they 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 detained.

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 disabled, 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 millions of 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 President Nixon, at that time, being the main supporter of it.

The bill only provides \$300 million for Legal Services, which is a cut of \$85 million from fiscal year 2017. This amendment provides a downpayment towards restoring these cuts, and I commend the authors for offering it.

We should not be cutting LSC funding at a time when more people than ever qualify for these services. Legal aid providers always must turn away more than half of eligible applicants. They already 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 the amendment. I want to express my support for the work the Legal Services Corporation does.

When we reach a budget agreement throughout the Congress for Legal Services, we will work with you in conference to help make sure they have the funds that they need to do their vital work to defend abused women, veterans, and members of the military who need assistance. They do important work. As soon as we find some extra room, I will work with you in conference to find them some extra support.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. CULBERSON for his help, and Mrs. BROOKS for her leadership.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 104 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 105 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 105 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 281, line 11, insert “(reduced by \$64,688,800)” after the dollar amount.

Page 347, line 16, insert “(increased by \$64,688,800)” after the dollar amount.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3354.

Since we last met, we began spending, I guess, a new \$15 billion on the

tragedies in Florida and Texas. I haven't had a chance to see how all of my colleagues are doing, but I sure hope that we are getting nothing but amendments designed to reduce spending to make up for the difference. I hope that is so.

I am looking at the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. I am on the Government Oversight Committee. We recently had another hearing on Fast and Furious. I don't think there has been enough contrition there at all. This was, I think, probably the biggest scandal in my lifetime, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives has to consider themselves to be a big part of that scandal.

Being from Wisconsin, I am also familiar with a local scandal we had there. If you google “ATF” and “Milwaukee,” you will find a situation in which they were selling guns which they shouldn't have been selling and buying guns which they shouldn't have been buying. So there is another reason why we should look at the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives.

Despite these scandals, their funding has gone nothing but up over the last few years. We are, in this budget, looking to borrow between 13 to 14 percent of this budget, and that is before we begin to have to spend money on the Florida and Texas hurricanes.

I am introducing a bill with a mild 5 percent across-the-board cut to ATF. President Trump had wanted a smaller increase. The Appropriations Committee went \$20 million over what President Trump wanted. I don't think that is right. I think they need a little bit of a slap-down here.

I am looking to reduce the amount of spending on this organization by \$64 million. I think that is very appropriate given the scandals that they have been involved in. It is very appropriate given that we are borrowing 14 percent of our money. In the sane world, we would almost take every agency down 14 percent. We don't have time for that, but this agency, based on their behavior, seems in favor of that.

I know some people are going to probably not want to cut anything here. We just heard in the last amendment that it appears like some people want to go up. I think this is a modest decrease, and I think they should have no problem finding this small amount of money.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, remembering that, first and foremost, the appropriations annual operating budget of the United States represents only 30 cents out of every dollar spent by the Federal Government.

I am keenly aware of how precious and hard-earned and scarce every dollar earned by our constituents is. We need to focus on the 70 percent: the automatic pilot programs, the looming insolvency of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. That is how we can really get our budget balanced.

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 Integrated Ballistic Information Network, which is so vital to help police officers identify the source of the bullet used in a crime.

This amendment would injure an agency that is doing good work today under the leadership of Attorney General Jeff Sessions to protect our Second Amendment rights. Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to oppose it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), my colleague, the ranking member on the Commerce-Justice-Science Subcommittee.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This reduction would have a significant impact on public safety. The ATF would be investigating fewer firearm traffickers and violent gangs. They would be unable to respond effectively to theft burglaries from Federal firearms licensees. These cuts would weaken the ATF's ability to do its primary responsibilities: combat violent crime and regulate the firearms and explosive industries.

Not surprisingly, a reduction of this magnitude would result in approximately 400 employees being laid off. According to the ATF, that means they would have to eliminate approximately 200 special agents, 65 industry operations investigators, and 135 professional technical positions. The elimination of these positions at ATF directly degrades the Department's capacity to combat violent firearm crimes and regulate the firearms and explosives industries.

I just think that this is not a proper amendment at this time or, for that matter, at any time, and I join the chairman in agreeing on this.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am going to disagree a little bit with one of 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 a larger cut in 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 processes 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 not going to kind of slap them on the wrist now, when will we?

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to oppose this amendment.

ATF is doing a good job of protecting our Second Amendment rights, and this amendment would injure them severely.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

□ 1500

AMENDMENT NO. 106 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 106 printed in 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 504, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, as mentioned, this amendment was actually drafted by Representative BUCK from Colorado. I understand this amendment passed on a voice vote last time.

I do have a nice speech that Representative BUCK's office has prepared for me, but I am not going to read a speech that is not my speech. I am sure it is a wonderful speech.

I hope the chairman allows this amendment in.

Mr. Chair, 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 Dahnert of Wisconsin was convicted of burglary. In 1986, he was granted relief and allowed to, once again, own firearms. Two months later, he was rearrested and charged with first degree sexual assault and four counts of second degree sexual assault, for which he received 5 years in prison.

In 1977, James Morgan was convicted of perjury to a grand jury. In 1988, he was granted relief and allowed to gain and own firearms. He was arrested that same year for first degree wanton endangerment and later 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 these applications would require significant ATF agent resources and would divert ATF away from its core law enforcement mission of fighting firearm offenses.

Since 1998, when the National Instant Criminal Background Check System was put in use, well over 1 million firearm transfers have been denied after background checks established that the individuals attempting to purchase the firearms were prohibited from processing firearms.

Even if only 20 percent of the denied individuals file an application with 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 not perfect, as evidenced by the examples I just gave.

The bottom line is that this amendment would give guns back to felons and, at the same time, sharply reduce ATF’s resources for pursuing violent crime investigations. Both of these outcomes would seriously harm public safety, and for these reasons, I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chair, I thank the Chairman for the opportunity to speak about my amendment to the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Division of H.R. 3354.

Mr. Chair, the right to bear arms is ingrained in our nation’s founding. These rights are given to us by God and guaranteed by the Constitution.

But for many Americans, this right has been forfeited. And their only option for recourse has been taken away.

When I was District Attorney in Northern Colorado I met a man who told me that when he was in college he bounced a check to his landlord. He pleaded guilty to a felony.

Since that day, he has been a model citizen. He finished college. He worked hard and raised a family.

This man made a mistake that is still haunting him nearly 40 years later. He wants to take his grandchildren hunting. But he can’t possess a firearm because he made a mistake in his youth.

The worst part of this situation is that the law allows the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives to consider petitions to restore this man’s right to possess a firearm.

However, for 25 years, the underlying bill has included a provision authored by then-Rep. 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 I mentioned earlier.

To be clear, my amendment would not act as a rubber stamp on every application. The ATF must weigh the merits of each individual case.

The burden is on the applicant to prove that he or she is nonviolent and does not pose a threat to the community.

Any American who can prove to ATF they do not pose a danger to society should be allowed to state their case. They should be allowed to advocate for their rights.

It is about time that we give these individuals that opportunity again.

Mr. Chair, my amendment is simple. It would give nonviolent individuals who made a

mistake in their past the opportunity for a second chance.

It would allow a grandfather the opportunity to take his grandchildren hunting and provide a way for a mother to protect her home.

To be clear, this amendment does not guarantee that an 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 “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 283, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$20,000,000)”.

Page 296, 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.

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 crimes.

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 retaliation 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 youths, 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 burden would strap the Bureau of Prisons, 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 institutions. 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; and in Philadelphia, reduction shooting rate was significantly larger than any reduction compared to non-program police districts.

Unlike incarceration cost of \$407.58 per person per day and \$148,767 per person per year, these alternative measures cost significantly less to serve a much larger population than what it cost to incarcerate one person, while reducing shootings and killings by 50%–70% in 15 of the most highly impacted large cities in the U.S. Hence, programs such as Cure Violence, Safe Streets and others show that alternative methods to incarceration are effective.

Both sides of the aisle agree that our juvenile justice system is in desperate need of repair. Incarceration at alarming numbers does not solve this problem.

Statistics show that incarceration does not serve as deterrence, nor does it keep our communities safe. Rather, it increases the likelihood for recidivism and thus, increases crime rates and mass incarceration.

For those who say juvenile justice is a state problem and not a federal problem because we don’t have many youths in federal custody, I say even if there is but one juvenile in our prison system, we have one too many.

I saw many young faces during the horrific tragedy in Houston’s vicious storm that claimed so many lives.

I do not ever want to see that look of despair and hopelessness again if we can do something to prevent that.

While some may say that juvenile justice is already funded, it is not enough. We need to 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 bill before us has zeroed out funding for the COPS Hiring Program.

This critical program provides Federal grants to local police departments 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 Congressional 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 their lesson, 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.

MAJOR COUNTY SHERIFFS’ ASSOCIATION,
Pontiac, MI, September 6, 2017.

Hon. BILL PASCRELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PASCRELL: On behalf of the Major County Sheriffs of America

(MCSA), I write in support of your amendment to the FY18 House Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies Appropriations bill which will provide critical funding to the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant (Byrne JAG) program. The MCSA is an association of elected Sheriffs representing the Nation's largest counties with populations of 500,000 people or more. Collectively, we represent more than 100 million Americans.

The MCSA was again dismayed at the CJS Appropriations Committee's decision to eliminate the COPS Hiring program—a program helping to ensuring state and local law enforcement have the personnel and resources necessary to protect and serve their communities. At a time when agencies are being asked to do more yet are still struggling to recruit and retain law enforcement professionals, we are seeing a pullback of federal support.

The MCSA applauds your understanding of the many challenges facing local law enforcement today and we appreciate your commitment to our profession.

Very Respectfully,

MICHAEL J. BOUCHARD,
Sheriff, Oakland County (MI).

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
POLICE ORGANIZATIONS, INC.,
Alexandria, VA, September 7, 2017.

Re Support for Amendment #109 to H.R. 3354 to Provide \$100 Million for COPS Hiring.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: On behalf of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), I am writing to advise you of our strong support for Amendment #109 to H.R. 3354, offered by Congressmen Pascrell and Reichert, that would provide \$100 million in funding for the Community Oriented 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 more than 100,000 citizens who share a common dedication to fair and effective crime control and law enforcement.

NAPO is very concerned that H.R. 3354 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; reducing and preventing 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 not 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.

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
ORDER OF POLICE,

Washington, DC, September 7, 2017.

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

Hon. KEVIN O. MCCARTHY,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY P. PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND REPRESENTATIVES MCCARTHY, PELOSI AND HOYER: I am writing on behalf of the 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, in the decade which followed, our nation experienced a significant drop in crime rates. A large part of this success was the nation's commitment to community oriented policing, particularly its hiring component which helped get more officers on the beat. Community oriented policing has been the cornerstone of our nation's policing strategy for nearly 25 years and the hiring program is the reason this strategy works.

However, today, we have less police on our streets and neighborhoods than we did even a decade ago, making the community policing strategy very difficult to pursue. It is no surprise to our profession that crime, particularly violent crime, is on the rise. There are less men and women policing our streets, keeping the peace and interacting positively with the communities they protect. If we are serious about stemming the rise in crime and if we remain committed to the community policing strategy, then we must continue to fund the COPS hiring program.

It is for these reasons we urge you and all Members of Congress to vote in support of the Reichert-Pascrell amendment providing resources to the COPS hiring program.

On behalf of the more than 330,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I appreciate you considering our views on this important issue. If you need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me or my Senior Advisor Jim Pasco in my Washington office

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,
National President.

Mr. PASCRELL. Hiding behind procedural shenanigans to dodge support for our Nation's law enforcement officers and then pontificating when you come to the floor, that doesn't settle right with me or a lot of other people.

□ 1515

You have done it year after year. You are not going to do it this year? I am sorry. You can't have your cake and eat it.

I want to say this in closing. I want all of my colleagues to reflect on how,

on the one hand, you can claim support for law enforcement while, at the same time, cutting the resources you need to hire brave men and women who keep the neighborhood safe. I do not know the answer to that question, but I do know that, during this year's National Police Week, a week where we 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 capabilities of its existing force. These funds are merit based, prioritizing hiring and equipment where they are most needed and for the best use of the taxpaying public. In these challenging times for law enforcement, it is critical that we 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. CULBERSON. 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. CULBERSON. Mr. Chair, I share my colleagues' support for law enforcement and have no objection to this amendment; and I will work with the gentlemen to ensure that the COPS program is funded when we get to conference, we have a budget agreement across the Congress, and additional funds are made available. The COPS program is an essential one that will be at the top of the list.

My support for law enforcement is reflected in the \$100 million increase seen in the Byrne JAG Program, which is a

very flexible grant program for local law enforcement to use for a variety of reasons, including hiring police officers, including forensic work, lab 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.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. 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 science research by one-half of 1 percent, or \$30.2 million, over the current funding within the \$6 billion National Science Foundation research account. Total spending is not increased, as NSF will adjust other areas of spending accordingly.

I ask the chairman and members to support the amendment and endorse this increase for the basic research that produces the scientific break-

throughs 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 Tsunami 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 as the designee of the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), and I have an amendment at the desk, No. 113.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 346, strike line 18 and all that follows through line 2 on page 347.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike language in the bill that would prohibit the EEOC from using its funds to implement pay data collection.

Mr. Chairman, we know that racial and gender pay gaps exist in America. The Obama administration, a few years ago, created the National Equal Pay Task Force, which recommended this new data collection, the EEO-1 form, which would, for the first time, require employers to provide not just data on who is hired by race, sex, and ethnicity, but also to include pay data.

The EEOC has collected employer data since 1966. There has been no problem with confidentiality. So for 50 years we have gotten information on

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 EEO-1 form.

Recently, the OMB, without warning or transparency, rescinded the EEOC's plan to collect the data, which was to begin in March. This amendment would make it clear that Congress should honor the purpose and spirit of title VII and permit the EEOC to carry out its statutory obligation to collect necessary data needed to enforce civil rights laws.

Mr. Chair, I would hope that we would adopt this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, everyone here appreciates concerns about the ways of discrimination. The question is how to collect the data in an efficient way, and the new EEOC-1 form is certainly not the way to collect that data.

What do I mean by that, Mr. Chairman?

You have to compare apples to apples and oranges to oranges. It is not like we don't collect data already. We have 140 different data points on the EEOC-1 form. This would increase the number of data points to 3,306 that an employer potentially would have to report.

Mr. Chairman, if we had better data, that is all right, but let's take a specific example: a large hospital. The new form groups all professionals together. A hospital would have to report what it pays its professionals in the same category, what it pays its female professionals and its male professionals. But, Mr. Chairman, it includes nurses and surgeons in the same category. They are all professionals. In fact, in the United States, for instance, among registered nurses, we have about 3 million—89 percent—are females.

Now, in the United States, we have an estimated number of physicians and surgeons of about 900,000; 65 percent are males, only 35 percent females. They are all grouped in the same category for the EEOC-1 form.

So what would the result be? If you were in a hospital and you had nurses and you had employee surgeons, it would look like you were discriminating against women because the nurses get paid less, and your average salary is going to be less for your women because you have grouped surgeons in with nurses. Only a Federal Government bureaucrat could come up with an idea like that in order to gauge whether wage discrimination occurs.

The fact of the matter is it is even worse, Mr. Chairman, because, based on the reporting of these results, EEOC can go on a fishing expedition against

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), the chairman of the subcommittee, and I want to thank the chairman for attaching this section to the bill. It is an important section for our employers.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS) in opposing this amendment because the EEOC, under the previous administration, has created this monstrosity of a burden on small businesses, and they did such a poor job of it that the Office of Management and Budget actually put the requirement under review and suspended it.

Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment. I join the gentleman in seeking to protect 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, and EEOC 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. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my, my, my. Here we go again. Another bill to protect the derrieres of big business, allowing them to hide crucial data from public scrutiny, information 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. Chairman, 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. Chairman, 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, conduct comprehensive statistical analysis, and evaluate the context of the discrimination allegations.

□ 1530

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 racial 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, I thank the gentleman from New York for his remarks. No one is naive enough to think that discrimination doesn't exist.

The question is: What tools should the Federal Government use?

And this certainly is not the tool that is helpful.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the form is not a complaint. We know that there are pay disparities. This would allow the EEOC to notice gruesome problems and disparities and address them where appropriate.

In that hospital situation, it is obvious the situation is not appropriate, but we do know that pay disparities exist, and this would be information that would allow the EEOC to address them.

I would hope that we would allow the EEOC to do its job.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chair, I agree with the gentleman. Pay disparities exist, but we need a precise tool. If we are going to give the Federal Government a tool with which to investigate and punish employers, it should be a surgical tool. This is not a surgical tool. This is an imprecise tool.

The EEOC, again, Mr. 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).

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 114 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 115 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Marine Fisheries Service to enforce Executive Order 13449 or section 697.7(b) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, in the Block Island Transit Zone (as that term is defined in section 697.7(b)(3) of such title).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3354 on behalf of the hardworking fishermen of Long Island and our entire region who are suffering more than ever under confusing and unfair regulations that are threatening to put them out of business.

This amendment is nearly identical to one I offered to the DHS division of this bill that unanimously passed by voice vote last week that related to the Coast Guard.

Today's amendment would bar the National Marine Fisheries Service from enforcing the ban on striped bass fishing in the Block Island Sound Transit Zone, a 15-mile stretch of water between Montauk Point, New York, and Block Island, Rhode Island.

No other species of fish are subject to an arbitrary ban in this section of Block Island Sound, famous for fishing and recreational boating.

The fact that the transit zone is considered a part of the EEZ means the ban on striped bass fishing extends into this local waterway. This means hardworking commercial fishermen, charter boat captains, and recreational anglers enjoying a day on the water with their family can suddenly go from fishing for striped bass legally to committing a Federal crime because they are drifted over the 3-mile line.

This ban was meant for the high seas, not a local waterway, arbitrarily declared to be part of the EEZ due to a boundary drawn on a map by a bureaucrat in Washington, D.C.

Every other species of fish popular in this area—scup; eel; squid; bluefish; even striped bass' cousin, black sea bass—are not subject to an unfair ban in this area. Just like they can legally with proper permits and allocations in adjacent State waters, local fishermen should be able to legally fish for striped bass in this area after State waters end and the transit zone begins.

Mr. Chairman, on the East End of Long Island, the coastal economy is our economy. So when unfair regulations impact fishermen, it also hurts the other local businesses like tackle shops, restaurants, gas stations, and hotels.

No one is more invested in protecting this important fishery to ensure it is there for the next season and the next generation than the hardworking men and women from my district who rely on fishing as a way of life.

This amendment does not create open season on stripers or lift the need for quota allocations or permits. In addition to a nearly identical amendment passing on a voice vote last week, last Congress, my standalone bill to address this issue, H.R. 3070, the EEZ Clarification Act, passed the House with another unanimous 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 is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, if the gentleman had brought some cooked fish, I probably wouldn't read this.

Mr. Chair, this is not an appropriate amendment for inclusion in an annual spending bill. Congress should not be in the business of micromanaging fish conservation in this manner.

The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission is an interstate compact that was established in 1942 as a mechanism to allow Atlantic coastal States to join forces in managing their shared fishery resources.

For over 75 years, this Commission has served as a body for the Atlantic coastal States, coordinating the conservation and management of 27 near-shore fish species. Each State is represented on the Commission by three commissioners who participate in deliberations and interstate fisheries management, fisheries science, habitat conservation, and law enforcement.

Through these activities, the States collectively ensure the sound conservation of management of their shared coastal fishery resources. We should allow the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission to do its job in managing fish stocks. We must not allow the House to be in the business of sec-

ond-guessing them and micromanaging fish regulations in particular locations.

There is a process currently in place for addressing these issues at the regional level, and we should allow that process to work. A stock assessment for striped bass is planned for next year. The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission can make a determination as to whether it intends to ask the Federal Government to open up the Block Island Transit Zone to striped bass fishing.

Currently, the consensus position of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission is that the fishing restrictions should remain in place. I believe that this is a bad precedent for Congress to interfere with this State-driven process.

For that reason, I oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. I understand his concern. I appreciate him bringing it to our attention. I understand similar language has already passed the House. I have no objection to him, and I urge Members to support it.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I wish to speak in favor of the amendment. How much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, my colleague on the other side speaking in opposition actually made a great argument for exactly why the amendment needs to be passed.

I completely agree, we should not be micromanaging the local fishery. And the best way to ensure that we are not micromanaging the local fishery is to pass this amendment.

The amendment is empowering the local regional council to be able to manage the 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 across an arbitrary 3-mile line.

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. _____. 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.

The 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. So the loss of 25 percent of 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 citizens. Charging subsistence fees is antithetical to these goals.

The Department of Justice itself has recommended eliminating this fee. A November 2016 DOJ memorandum recommended developing a plan to limit the use of “counterproductive ‘subsistence’ fees imposed on indigent residents.”

It further stated:

The Bureau of Prisons’ process for collecting these subsistence fees is costly and administratively burdensome on both halfway 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.

□ 1545

The BOP already eliminated subsistence fees for individuals on home confinement, but that is only by regulation. However it was a step in the right direction.

My amendment would continue this trend and eliminate the fees for those in halfway houses as well. My amendment provides a critical reform that would help improve reentry and reduce recidivism.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think it is entirely appropriate to make inmates help pay for some of the cost of their time in a halfway house. This program helps make inmate reentry into the community as seamless as possible. It has been a successful one. We want to reduce obstacles to make that transition without unnecessary burdens. However, this proposal would cut the Bureau of Prisons’ operations by about \$20 million. It would be forced to be absorbed by the Bureau of Prisons, that money that they are now receiving in reimbursement from transitioning inmates.

The Bureau of Prisons’ resources are already stretched very thin, Mr. Chairman, and this money would come out of other programs such as reentry services, antirecidivism, counseling, and inmate health and safety that are needed for inmate welfare and a successful transition into society.

While I appreciate the intent of the gentlewoman’s amendment, if the Bureau of Prisons were to have a cut of \$30 million, then prison safety and pris-

on services would be severely compromised, and that won’t help inmates or officers.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to join me in opposing this amendment. I urge a “no” vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, my friend suggests that the BOP actually collects this \$20 million. I would submit to him and challenge him to show me that the burden of trying to collect these fees does not outweigh any actual reimbursement. These people have no jobs. If they had jobs, they would almost surely be minimum wage jobs.

I want to ask my friend if he would rather the BOP be paid the de minimis cost to the government—which they 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 is low. It 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. 118 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 Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a commonsense amend-

ment 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 withdrawn the exemptions 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 is codifying 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 armor-piercing bullets capable of being fired from concealable semiautomatic handguns. This law passed the House of Representatives in 1985 by a vote of 400-21. Then it later passed the Senate by a vote of 97-1.

For far too long we have dealt with irresponsible riders on appropriations bills that put limits on our ability to keep our communities and our law enforcement officers safe. This is just one more example.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

I may say to my colleagues that this is one of the issues that baffles me the

most. I don't hunt, but I respect people who do. I don't target practice and target shoot, but I respect people who do. But it seems that more and more every day, as we have more and more violence, we want more and more stronger weapons because otherwise we are going to lose our rights if we don't do so.

Mr. Chairman, our rights are at the ballot box and many other places, not just in our holster. I think if we continue to do this, first of all, this is the wrong place to do it, and, secondly, it is the wrong thing to do.

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

Mr. LATTI. 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. LATTI is exactly right.

I met, at the time, with the Director of the ATF. I am grateful that the ATF withdrew 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. LATTI 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. LATTI. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, just very briefly, I usually don't get up a second time, but to my friend—and he is my friend—it is a confusion in this country. This is not about protecting the Second Amendment. We all do. Everybody does.

It is about common sense and asking: Where does it stop? How do we keep it from growing? How violent can we get? How many people can we shoot?

That is what this is about. It is not about the Second Amendment. The Second Amendment is well protected. Trust me.

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

Mr. LATTI. 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. LATTI).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 119 will not be offered.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 120 will not be offered.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 121 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 122 OFFERED BY MR. GAETZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 122 printed in House Report 115-297.

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:

SEC. _____. 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 Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of several of my colleagues from the Sunshine State who are still responding to the devastation from Hurricane Irma that made landfall earlier this week. The sponsor of this amendment, Congressman DEUTCH, and the cosponsors, Congressman CURBELO, Congresswoman ROSLEHTINEN, Congressman HASTINGS, and Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, all represent districts that received significant damage from Hurricane Irma. Due to the damage in their districts, these Members—with strong interest in this amendment—were unable to return to D.C. in time to debate this issue on the House floor, so I am here pinch-hitting for them.

Recently there have been reports that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Fisheries headquarters, located on Virginia Key in south Florida, may move to another location. This amendment would prohibit that move. Such a move would be devastating to the longstanding research relationships that the NOAA facility on Virginia Key has with local universities, the local business community, and the marine industries of south Florida.

The NOAA research facility on Virginia Key has maintained a partnership with the University of Miami and the south Florida community since 1943. Over the years, the NOAA facility and their research teams have worked closely and collaborated on critical re-

search projects and scientific breakthroughs with the University of Miami, Florida Atlantic University, NOVA Southeastern University, Florida International University, the Palm Beach County Business Development Board, the Greater Fort Lauderdale Alliance, the Beacon Council, the Marine Industries Association of South Florida, and other south Florida universities and business coalitions.

In fact, the University of Miami's Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science is located across the street from the NOAA facility on Virginia Key. These south Florida universities and business councils recently signed a formal memorandum of understanding that encourages collaboration among research, education, business, and economic development organizations.

Some research projects that the NOAA facility on Virginia Key has worked on with south Florida universities and business councils include the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary, creating a storm surge database for Haiti and the Dominican Republic, and something near and dear to my heart, Everglades restoration projects.

Moving the NOAA facility from Virginia Key would sever the bonds between the facility and the research universities in the south Florida community that create so much progress and so many jobs.

Again, I am grateful, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to introduce this amendment on behalf of my colleagues, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 123 OFFERED BY MR. SERRANO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 123 printed in House Report 115-297.

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:

SEC. _____. 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.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

□ 1600

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very straightforward. It would prohibit funds allocated in the bill from being used on the construction and operation of private, for-profit prisons.

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 is right. A country with less than 5 percent of the world's population accounts for a quarter of all the world's prisoners. In fact, our prison population has continued to increase over the past few decades, even as statistics have shown a decrease in crime.

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 respect 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, chose to act. The President issued a memorandum saying that we would phase out the use of private prisons, partially by seeking to reduce our prison population.

But in February, in keeping with this administration's policy of simply reversing everything President Obama did, Attorney General Jeff Sessions rescinded the order. He has since indicated that we won't continue to use private prisons.

We will use more of them, and we will lock up more people to fill them. What a disgrace. It is a waste of taxpayer dollars and a waste of countless American lives that could be turned around and made into successful citizens.

I am proud that in my home city of New York we have decided to divest our pension system from the for-profit prison industry. But now it is time for the Federal Government to divest itself as well.

We must continue to work on comprehensive criminal justice reform that

seeks to reform mandatory minimum sentences and curb the failed war on drugs and focus on reentry and reintegration so that those who serve time can become productive members of society, rather than lifelong inmates.

Tonight, we can start with this amendment and send a message to the Trump administration. Tonight, we can tell him not to reverse the progress made under President Obama and Attorney General Loretta Lynch. Tonight, we can say that making money off of incarcerating individuals is simply inconsistent with American values.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GRIFFITH). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I understand my colleague is offering this on behalf of another Member who could not be here today, but I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

Let me make sure that we read it so the people understand what we are talking about. None of the funds made available by this act may be used for the operation of a correctional facility by a private party or contractor, period.

This would shut down every privately operated prison and halfway house in the United States. Where are those 34,000 criminals going to go? Well, you would have to just turn them loose on the streets or pack them in like sardines in existing prison cells or spend billions of dollars over the next few years to house them.

This amendment is dangerous, irresponsible, and risks the safety of the public. By cutting off immediately all funding to private prisons, these 34,000 inmates would have to be released onto the streets of America. I can't imagine what kind of disaster that would result in.

Furthermore, I have always believed in the Yellow Pages test. If you can find a government service in the Yellow Pages, you ought to try to privatize it. As a general rule, the private sector is going to find a way to do it more efficiently, less expensively, and in a way that is going to save taxpayer money.

My experience with the private prisons that have operated in the State of Texas quite successfully throughout the Bureau of Prisons is that they are providing better security, better food, better healthcare, better transportation, better housing, better facilities for both the inmate and the staff. They have been very successful across the country. These 34,000 inmates will have nowhere else to go.

This amendment is extremely dangerous, destructive, and irresponsible. I urge Members to join me in opposing this amendment not only for 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, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

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

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my strong support of this amendment to end the proliferation of private prisons in our Federal justice system.

Following this administration's 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 individuals who have made mistakes and are serving their sentence. No one should profit from our prison system.

That is what I plan to reintroduce the End For-Profit Prisons Act—legislation that will require the Bureau of Prisons and U.S. Marshals Service to end its contracts with for-profit confinement facilities and make critical changes to the reentry process for individuals who have been released from Federal prisons.

Mr. Chairman, I call for the immediate passage of this amendment.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to join me in opposing this amendment to protect the public safety of the people of the United States, to ensure that our tax dollars are efficiently used, but, above all, to make sure these 34,000 inmates are not released onto the streets of America.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 124 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 124 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce Executive Order No. 13547 (75 Fed. Reg. 43023, relating to the stewardship of oceans, coasts, and the Great Lakes), including the National Ocean Policy developed under such Executive Order.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman

from Texas (Mr. FLORES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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, nor have any appropriations ever 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 congressionally authorized activities 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. 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 rise in opposition to the amendment.

This executive order was signed by President Obama in July 2010. The National Ocean Policy is designed to improve stewardship of our oceans, coasts, islands, and Great Lakes by directing government agencies with differing mandates to coordinate and work together. The National Ocean Policy creates no new authorities.

The result of increased coordination is better stewardship of our national heritage through improved government efficiency, better development and use of data and information, and a process of open and transparent stakeholder engagement that informs decision-making. This increased coordination between agencies needs to take place on a Federal level to reduce inefficiency, waste, and redundancy between agencies.

The National Ocean Council brings together State, local, and Tribal governments and all of the oceans uses, including recreational and commercial fishermen, boaters, industries, scientists, and the public, to better plan for, manage, harmonize, and sustain uses of ocean and coastal resources.

The bottom line is that the National Ocean Policy offers an avenue for thoughtful planning around issues affecting ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes areas. It is the best choice for stakeholders looking to be involved in the process.

For all of these reasons, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Before I reserve the balance of my time, on a personal note, it is amazing how much work we have done in the south Bronx with what little bodies of water and green space we have, how much we cherish it, and how much we feel that it has been a gift that we continue to work on. We no longer have earmarks, but when we did, it did a great job in restoring a lot of areas.

I see how, in other parts of the country and at the Federal level, we want to undo years and years of progress. I keep thinking of Republican leaders who took a different view. Teddy Roosevelt would be so upset at so much of what we are doing today because he saw the world in a different way. Thank God that he was our President for that period of time when we needed him for that particular issue.

Just on a personal note, I understand that a lot of people see the world differently than I do. Where I come from, tonight people know they now have places where they can row a boat, where they can eventually swim, where they can fish, and where a beaver named Jose has returned.

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, 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 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.

□ 1615

Under Article I of the Constitution, all legislative powers are returned to Congress—not some, all. That is the issue at stake here. The Obama administration's National Ocean Policy has overstepped constitutional statutory bounds.

Congress did pass a bill in the 106th Congress to create an Ocean Commission to review and make recommenda-

tions. 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. There have been no appropriations for these activities.

Additionally, 81 groups have signed a letter asking the Appropriations Committee to include this language to address this unconstitutional bureaucratic overreach in their annual appropriations bills.

Again, this is a simple amendment that stands up for the constitutional rights of this body to create the 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. Again, this amendment has been adopted with bipartisan support in this body eight times since 2010.

I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), for his work on this amendment, as well as to thank Chairman CULBERSON for his consideration. I urge my colleagues to support this straightforward amendment.

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

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. 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 ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CULBERSON. 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 Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 125 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 125 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act under the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program may be used in contravention of section 642 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 further 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 criminal aliens with at least one felony or two misdemeanor convictions.

However, in recent years, the number of jurisdictions receiving SCAAP funding that have adopted sanctuary policies, allowing violent criminal aliens to go free, has skyrocketed. My amendment would cut off SCAAP money for cities that violate the intent of these funds. These sanctuary cities must not continue using taxpayer money to flagrantly violate Federal immigration law and put American citizens at risk.

Look no further than my home State of Colorado in the case of Mr. Ever Valles. Back in October, Mr. Valles was picked up on charges, including possession of 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 OJP receives information indicating that an applicant violated the statute related to sanctuary policies, that the applicant will be investigated by the inspector general and could be subject to criminal and civil penalties.

A recent U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency report identified the top 10 jurisdictions with the highest volume of detainers issued that restrict cooperation with ICE. Not surprisingly, every one of those sanctuary cities received SCAAP awards in fiscal year 2016.

Mr. Chairman, sanctuary cities stand against the rule of law. These jurisdictions support illegal immigration and allow individuals who violate the law to remain free. We cannot allow these jurisdictions to continue these harmful policies on the American people's dime. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this unnecessary amendment. All this amendment does is prohibit use of funding to violate current law.

As we all know, Federal grant recipients of the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, or SCAAP, are not using Federal funds in contravention of Federal law.

The amendment is really about so-called sanctuary cities. This and other amendments like this seek to effectively overthrow community policing by diverting State and local police from their core mission of protecting public safety. Imposing this one-size-fits-all approach would degrade trust between immigrant communities and local police, thereby undermining public safety in all communities and for all residents.

We should not be attempting by word or deed to turn our local law enforcement into an arm of Federal immigration efforts. I live in a sanctuary city, and I can tell you with great certainty that amendments like this one will make my hometown less safe. People will be less likely to report crimes and cooperate with investigations simply because of the concern that they will be deported for interacting with local law enforcement.

What we need is broad and humane immigration reform which would place undocumented immigrants on a workable and earned path to citizenship, thereby allowing them to contribute even more to their families, communities, and our country.

Our immigration system is broken, but this amendment does nothing to fix it. I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

And I must say, the sanctuary cities, as they are called, have a lot of support from law enforcement throughout the Nation because they know that they need to speak to people in the community and get information on who the bad guys are or who the bad gals are, number one.

Number two, this is going to be a boom for the legal profession because just about every city and every State is going to sue if this ever became law. And we actually started holding monies back because they know how much help is brought to their community and how much they want to keep it in place.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have left.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman from Colorado's amendment.

When Kate Steinle was murdered, I was the new chairman of this sub-

committee, 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 grant policies are that a local law enforcement agency has to certify that they are cooperating 100 percent of the time with Federal immigration 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 (Mr. BUCK).

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. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for activities prohibited by the order issued by the Attorney General entitled "Prohibition on Certain Federal Adoptions of Seizures by State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies" (Order No. 3488-2015, 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 Ohio reformed civil asset forfeiture laws, local agencies have been able to bypass, just as the gentleman from Michigan described. DOJ allows this even when Federal officials play no role in the investigation or the arrest. Congressman AMASH's amendment would end this policy.

This program violates the independence of State's police powers and promotes an asset forfeiture scheme that undermines due process. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

□ 1630

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues strongly to adopt this amendment.

Attorney General Sessions' recent announcement to expand civil action forfeiture really allows local law enforcement to bypass State 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 big drug cartels, the reality is the median value of the adoptive forfeiture seizures has been around \$9,000—not exactly the sign of any major drug trafficking operation.

These adoptive forfeiture efforts tend to target poor neighborhoods. Between 2012 and 2017, the median value of assets seized by Cook County police was just over \$1,000. In Philadelphia, in 2015, the median value was \$192.

This policy does not discriminate between the innocent and the guilty.

With the responsibility on private citizens to prove their innocence, rather than law enforcement to prove guilt, innocent people without legal representation often never see their money or property again, and even those who are proven innocent have no promise that their property will be returned.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

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. In 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 gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. 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. It is now our obligation 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 agencies seize property, often with little or no evidence that a crime has been committed. The person whose property has been seized then has to hire an attorney and prove their innocence in order to try to get their property back.

Police departments have a strong incentive to abuse civil asset forfeiture because they get to keep these ill-gotten gains for their own use. Even when state legislatures have enacted important safeguards against abuse, the Justice Department has helped local police departments to circumvent such restrictions by "adopting" seizures that would be illegal under state law, and then sharing the proceeds with local law enforcement.

In January 2015, under the Obama Administration, the Justice Department issued two crucial orders to stop this circumvention of state, raw. Unfortunately, the current Justice Department has reversed those orders, and Congress must now take action.

This amendment will prohibit the Justice Department from using any money in this bill to engage in activities not allowed by the 2015 orders. I ask my colleagues to stop the assaults against law-abiding citizens by the people who are supposed to protect them. Vote for the Amash-Sanford-Labrador-Rohrabacher Amendment.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I stand here also to express my strong support for the Amash amendment.

Civil asset forfeiture without limits presents one of the strongest threats to our civil, 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 property rights.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 127 OFFERED BY MR. ROSKAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 127 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay a performance award to any officer or employee of the Money Laundering and Asset Recovery Section of the Department of Justice under section 5384 or 4505a 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 forfeiture cases pursuant to section 9.4 of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, for which the Internal Revenue Service has submitted a report of its investigation and its recommendation to the Department of Justice on or before June 26, 2017.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you a quick story. Andrew Clyde served three combat tours in Iraq, after which he returned home and opened a store in Georgia. Mr. Clyde had an insurance policy that only covered up to \$10,000 in off-premises losses. So like any reasonable person, he never brought more than \$10,000 in cash with him when he was making his nightly deposits.

Do you know what happened next?

The Internal Revenue Service noticed that he was depositing just under \$10,000 in cash regularly, so they took all of his cash. That is \$950,000.

If you are like most people, you are confused when you first hear about this. As it turns out, Mr. Clyde was in violation of a Federal law known as structuring, which is the intentional avoidance of Federal reporting requirements by staying below \$10,000 in cash deposits. This law was intended to catch large-scale criminal enterprises, mobsters, terrorists, and human traffickers, not veterans like Mr. Clyde.

When structuring is believed to have occurred, the IRS can use its civil asset forfeiture authority to seize funds in question and force the owner to prove that the money was earned legally.

Well, in this instance, Andrew Clyde earned the money legally and had a legitimate reason for depositing less than \$10,000. So you would assume that

Mr. Clyde would have ended this with the IRS talking to him and then saying: Oh, we made a mistake. Clearly you are not a mobster or a terrorist. Thank you for your service. Here is your life savings back.

But, no, that is not what happened, Mr. Chairman. That is not how the story ended.

Instead, the IRS threatened him with criminal structuring charges until he agreed to settle with the agency and give them \$50,000, after he had already spent \$100,000 in legal fees. He lost \$150,000 simply because he wanted to make sure that his cash deposits were low enough to be insured. If that sounds messed up to you, Mr. Chairman, that is because it is.

Now, here is the good news. The House recently passed, unanimously, H.R. 1843, the RESPECT Act. This bill prohibits the IRS from seizing funds from individuals, unless there is a probable cause that the money was earned illegally or connected to an illegal activity. But there is still the problem of those people who are already victims of this abuse by our government in civil asset forfeiture.

Now, since we began our bipartisan investigation of the IRS's civil asset forfeiture practices a couple of years ago, the IRS has apologized for past behavior, which is good; they worked quickly to reach out to possible victims, which is good; and they subsequently responded to the 454 petitions that they received. As of March 1, the IRS returned over \$6 million in seized funds. Good news. So far so good.

But the plot continues, and here is where we are right now. It turns out that a majority of the petitions were actually referred to the Department of Justice. The IRS referred the DOJ 255 cases, and has recommended that the DOJ return \$16 million to taxpayers whom they do not suspect of being conducted in any way to illegal activity. Unfortunately, the Department of Justice has not been nearly as interested in correcting these past wrongdoings.

As of July, the Department of Justice responded only to 73 of the outstanding 255 cases. This is completely unacceptable. The Federal Government took legally earned money from taxpayers, and the Department of Justice hasn't given the majority of these people a response, including Andrew Clyde.

The Roskam-Neal amendment, offered by myself and Mr. NEAL, the ranking member from Massachusetts on the Ways and Means Committee, is very simple. It simply says this: No one in the relevant section of the Department of Justice can get a performance bonus until they finish reviewing the backlog of cases that the IRS has sent them. We are not asking the Department of Justice to do anything extraordinary, Mr. Chairman. We are simply asking them to do their job. And until they do their job, the bare minimum that taxpayers can expect is that we at least don't reward these people with bonuses.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the amendment. I will work with Mr. ROSKAM as the CFO 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 great amendment 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 back the balance of my time.

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

I thank the chairman for his assurance and his hard work on this. I am confident that this will be resolved.

Mr. Chairman, I have got to tell you that the discussions that this House has made on a bipartisan basis with the Department of Justice have been obtuse and they have been ridiculous. I have been embarrassed by the interactions that I have had with senior staff members at the Department of Justice on this issue.

The Ways and Means Subcommittee has been scandalized by this, and we are going to do something about it. So here, today, we are rising on both sides of the aisle to bring remedy, rescue, and restoration to our citizens.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 128 printed in House Report 115-297.

AMENDMENT NO. 129 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 129 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out Order Number 3946-2017 of the Attorney General, issued July 19, 2017.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, in recent 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 system is ripe for abuse, and has undermined the constitutional rights of far too many Americans.

In response, 24 States and the District of Columbia have adopted reforms to their forfeiture laws.

However, through a practice known as adoptive seizures, Federal agencies, like the Department of Justice, can circumvent State and local laws to continue this practice.

In July, the Department of Justice announced a continuation and expansion of civil forfeiture, reversing a previous ban on adoptive seizures.

My bipartisan amendment, introduced with Representatives COHEN, MCCLINTOCK, and ELLISON, would prohibit funds for the DOJ to implement this expansion.

Our amendment is also supported by a broad and diverse coalition of organizations, including the American Conservative Union, the Institute for Justice, the NAACP, and the ACLU.

Today's vote takes an important step in halting the practice of adoptive seizures, protecting the rights of States and localities, and limiting some future abuses.

Ultimately, this amendment is a starting point, and we can't stop here. Congress must submit more comprehensive changes into law, changes like those included in the Fifth Amendment Integrity Restoration Act, my bipartisan bill, that calls for sweeping reforms to curb civil asset forfeiture abuse.

America was founded on the principles of due process and property rights, and these principles must be vigorously defended.

Mr. Chairman, 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 way it is today, the government can come in, and they don't even have to charge you with a crime, and they can take your car or your money or

whatever else they find. It is an un-American a thing as has ever existed.

Mr. WALBERG laid out some of the supporters: the ACLU, NAACP, and then it goes around to some conservative worlds. There are many times I have found that you get 360 degrees where the liberals and the conservatives come together and agree on libertarian principles that something needs to happen.

□ 1645

When you have got RAND PAUL, KEITH ELLISON, Mr. WALBERG, and myself all on the same thing, this needs to happen. So we need to pass it now.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. COHEN for yielding. I think that what he said is absolutely true. When you do a complete circle, you have come to a point of understanding that something is amiss, in good will we work together in a bipartisan fashion to fix it.

There can be useful issues relative to civil assets, but it needs to follow due process. Our civil liberties must be protected. We want to support law enforcement; it is a tough job. But, nonetheless, in our great country, liberty is still the most important ideal that we have, and the freedom that makes us different from other nations.

Mr. Chair, I thank my good friend for his support, and I would ask my colleagues to support it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 130 OFFERED BY MR. RASKIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 130 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement Order Number 3946-2017 of the Attorney General allowing Department of Justice components and agencies to forfeit assets seized by State or local law enforcement agencies.

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. SENBRENNER, 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 as it applies 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, indicting, arresting, 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, owner of a restaurant in Arnolds Park, Iowa, who deposited her cash earnings in the bank on a weekly basis, and it was always under \$10,000. She was suspected of illegally structuring her deposits, although they were perfectly innocent, and the IRS simply seized \$33,000 from her, causing huge problems for her business.

Another case that caught my eye was of a Chinese-American restaurateur who was traveling with a large sum of

money because he was about to buy a building for his new restaurant. He had been saving for decades to buy his own restaurant. He was stopped by the police and became understandably very anxious during the encounter. The police said that they found the large sum of cash money he had with him suspicious, and his nervous demeanor also telling, and they simply seized his money. They detained him for 2 hours. They let him go. They didn't charge him with anything, but they seized his money, his life savings that he had planned to use to purchase the building for his restaurant. He was a lucky one in that he was able, eventually years later, to get his money back, but he lost the business deal and his deposit in the process.

In 2014, the value of money and property seized under civil asset forfeitures by Federal law enforcement exceeded the total of losses in money and property from burglaries in our country. That means our people lost more money at the hands of the government through civil asset forfeiture than from being burglarized.

Because of the abuses revealed in 2015, the DOJ imposed restrictions to limit when the Federal Government could adopt forfeiture cases, and banned State and local police from using Federal law to seize cash and property without criminal charges or warrants, but the new policy lifts these restrictions and places the Federal Government back on the side of the trampling of people's constitutional rights.

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 burdens our citizens with onerous costs 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 \$906,000) (decreased by \$906,000)”.

Page 719, line 14, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$906,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 143 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI OF OREGON

Page 734, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$18,270,000) (increased by \$18,270,000)”.

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 3, 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 \$300,000)”.

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 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$400,000)”.

Page 741, line 16, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$400,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 151 OFFERED BY MR. DESAULNIER 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. 153 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO OF NEW YORK

Page 751, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,500,000) (increased by \$12,500,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 157 OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM OF CALIFORNIA

Page 763, line 3, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 154 OFFERED BY MS. MCSALLY OF ARIZONA

Page 767, line 24, insert “(increased by \$14,232,847)” after the dollar amount.

Page 805, line 25, insert “(reduced by \$14,232,847)” after the dollar amount.

AMENDMENT NO. 162 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. 163 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI OF OREGON

Page 795, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,150,000,000) (reduced by \$1,150,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 166 OFFERED BY MR. DESAULNIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 796, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 805, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(decreased by \$10,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 177 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

SEC. ____ For “Health Resources and Services Administration—Health Workforce” for establishing and carrying out the training demonstration grant program, as authorized by section 760 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 294k), there is hereby appropriated \$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. 181 OFFERED BY MS. SEWELL OF ALABAMA

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act to carry out the Child Care Development Block Grant Act of 1990 may be distributed to any child care provider if a localized list of providers (as mentioned in part 98 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, applicable to the Department of Health and Human Services, Administration of Children and Families, and in the final rule published in the Federal Register, Vol. 81, No. 190, on Sept. 30, 2016) indicates that a serious injury or death occurred at the provider due to a substantiated health or safety violation.

AMENDMENT NO. 185 OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH OF VIRGINIA

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

SEC. ____ For “Health Resources and Services Administration—Rural Health” to carry out section 427(a) of the Federal Coal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1969, there is hereby appropriated, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for “Health Resources and Services Administration—Program Management” is hereby reduced by \$2,734,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education approved this list of amendments last week, along with myself, and was looking forward to discussing them and others with all of us here today.

Unfortunately, the gentlewoman is not able to be here this week due to the death of her beloved mother, Luisa DeLauro, who passed away over the weekend at the age of 103.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut and I have something in common on this point: neither of us would likely be a Member of this body today were it not for the inspiration and role model of our mothers, both of whom were actively involved in local politics.

Like my own late mother, Helen Cole, who served in the Oklahoma House and Senate and as mayor of our home town of Moore, Oklahoma, Luisa DeLauro served 35 years as a member of the New Haven, Connecticut, Board of Aldermen, the longest tenure in the city's history. She served with six different mayors and dedicated her time to improving the lives of seniors and the working poor.

Her daughter has most certainly followed in her footsteps, bringing her passion, dedication, and tirelessness for these same causes to the Halls of Congress.

We are sorry the gentlewoman cannot be with us today. We know she is honoring her mother 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 New Haven, Connecticut.

Luisa DeLauro was an inspiration to her daughter, ROSA, to the city of New Haven, and to us all. Luisa was the longest serving member of the New Haven Board of Aldermen in the city's history, serving 35 years.

She set an example for women everywhere as she fought to ensure that women's voices were heard in the male-dominated arena of politics.

As ROSA has said, her mother understood that politics was an avenue for change, a way to help people who were struggling, and she dedicated her service to issues involving seniors, the working poor, and her beloved neighborhood of Wooster Square, which she helped to designate as New Haven's first historic district.

Luisa was a beloved local leader with an open-door policy, who developed friendships that lasted a lifetime, but she was also well known as a strong-willed fighter for issues she believed in, and it is clear that her dedication and fierce passion will live on in her daughter, our friend, ROSA.

Even though Luisa DeLauro passed away at 103, for ROSA and her family, it still feels like she was taken too soon. My thoughts are with 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. Schools across the country can use the Student Support grants to give all students access to a well-rounded education.

The grant program is also important because it was created to allocate funding by formula, which levels the playing field so small school districts can get their fair share of funding.

I am disappointed that this bill funds Student Support grants significantly lower than the original \$1.65 billion authorized in the Every Student Succeeds Act, and I hope there will be an opportunity in the Senate to increase funding for these critical Student Support grants.

I thank the chairman and ranking member for including my amendments in an en bloc package and for their hard work on this bill.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), my good friend.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bloc, which includes my amendment to prevent homeless youth and young mothers from seeing a lapse in service from their runaway youth programs and maternity group homes.

□ 1700

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 youth 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 Program 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 annual 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 wider 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 have experienced the most significant lead crisis. It is one that we are still working to overcome. Even though that crisis in Flint is no longer in the headlines, Flint and many other communities are still dealing with issues caused by exposure to lead.

There is no cure to lead exposure. We have to work on prevention and do everything we can to support those like the people in Flint and others 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 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO), my friend.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to 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 provide \$378 million in funding for State assessment grants, the amount authorized for these grants in the Every Student Succeeds Act but, notably, \$8.9 million more than that which was included in the legislation we are currently debating.

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.

Mrs. 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 provided in the appropriations bill being considered, will provide \$10 million in total funding for Fiscal Year 2018. I want to commend Representative GRIFFITH for his leadership on this issue.

The additional funding proposed by the amendment is fully offset by a reduction in program management, and the total amount of \$10 million is equal to the permanently authorized amount. That level, I would note, has remained the same since the Black Lung Clinics Program was first authorized in the 92nd Congress as part of the Black Lung Benefits Act of 1972.

Today, there are 28 black lung clinics located in 15 coal mining states which, with small grants provided by HRSA's Federal Office of Rural Health Policy, serve as a lifeline for disabled miners.

In many cases, these coal miners spent a lifetime working in our nation's mines, but now face black lung disease—a debilitating and frequently fatal lung disease that continues to erode lung function even after a miner leaves work in the mines. Since 1968, 76,000 miners have lost their lives to black lung disease.

The black lung clinics program is expected to serve 13,800 miners this year. The need for these clinics is rising due to an increase in the number of black lung cases, coupled with an increased number of miners who are now seeking assistance following the closure of mines.

The rate of black lung disease in coal miners fell steadily in the 30 years following the enactment of 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). NIOSH is also finding that miners are becoming totally disabled from black lung at much younger ages.

The increase in black lung disease has been due in part to longer mining shifts, more

powerful mining machinery, and mine operators cutting into more rock because the easiest reach coal has been mined out. Much of that rock is quartz bearing sandstone which, when mined, releases large amounts of silica containing mine dust that is far more toxic than coal dust.

The most severe form of black lung disease, known as progressive massive fibrosis or PMF, has spiked dramatically. Earlier this year, NIOSH reported that the Stone Mountain Resources clinic in southwest Virginia had identified the largest cluster of PMF ever found—over 400 cases. National Public Radio has reported on large clusters in Kentucky and other states.

PMF produces large masses of scar tissue in the lung, and often the only means for survival is undergoing a high-risk lung transplant.

While funding for the black lung clinics has been frozen at virtually the same level for the past 5 years, a number of clinics, including many of those in Appalachia, have faced substantial increase in demand from coal miners for screening, diagnosis and pulmonary rehabilitation.

Clinics provide benefits counseling, including assisting miners with federal black lung benefits and state compensation claims.

Some clinics are so underfunded that they are operating with obsolete and inefficient diagnostic equipment, which needs to be upgraded.

Mr. Chair, we owe it to coal miners to get them the care and benefits they need and deserve. I urge a yes vote.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills and agreed to a joint resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 102. An act to direct the Federal Communications Commission to commence proceedings related to the resiliency of critical communications networks during times of emergency, and for other purposes.

S. 327. An act to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to provide a safe harbor related to certain investment fund research reports, and for other purposes.

S. 416. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Incentive Act of 1980 to require an annual review by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the annual government-business forum on capital formation.

S. 444. An act to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to expand the investor limitation for qualifying venture capital funds under an exemption from the definition of an investment company.

S. 462. An act to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to refund or credit certain excess payments made to the Commission.

S. 494. An act to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to terminate an exemp-

tion for companies located in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and any other possession of the United States.

S. 488. An act to increase the threshold for disclosures required by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to compensatory benefit plans, and for other purposes.

S. 1311. An act to provide assistance in abolishing human trafficking in the United States.

S. 1312. An act to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States.

S.J. Res 49. Joint Resolution condemning the violence and domestic terrorist attack that took place during events between August 11 and August 12, 2017, in Charlottesville, Virginia, recognizing the first responders who lost their lives while 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

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

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 131 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GRIFFITH). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 131 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 693, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 693, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 694, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 718, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: “(decreased by \$10,000,000)”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment that would increase funding for youth employment initiatives by \$10 million.

Michigan's unemployment rate is 4.7 percent, but for youth aged 16 to 24, it is more than double that, over 11 percent. Young people face high unemployment, and the lack of opportunity to find meaning in the world of work has implications that go far beyond just those years that they might find meaningful employment.

Investing in those young Americans ensures that they all do better. Providing those important employment

opportunities builds a strong foundation around the concept of hard work, and I know many Members support this effort. We just need to make sure that we find every opportunity that we can to make sure that every young person looking for an opportunity to earn a few dollars learns and, especially, understands the connection between their focus on work and the benefits that they will realize from that not only in terms of their own well-being, but the contributions they can make to their community.

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, was \$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 \$832 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 offset to the Department of Labor's administration account will be too hard to absorb, including the administrative reductions already included in the bill.

I will commit to my friend that we will try to work with him through the process and see if there is some way that we can get these funds restored going forward.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my friend's comments. I understand the position he holds, and I do hope that we can work together, eventually, to make sure that this program is more fully funded.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, appreciate the chairman's comments, and I do hope, during this process, we will respond to this important request.

I rise in support of this amendment. The underlying bill cuts the Department of Labor's Youth Employment Program, which provides funding to all 50 States, by \$42 million, a shortsighted proposal that ignores the needs of millions of young people.

In the United States, there are roughly 5.5 million teenagers and young adults between 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 choice: 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 this. I think we all know of these individual cases where the life of a young person is changed permanently because of an experience that they had finding meaning in work.

Again, as I said at the outset, my view is we should try to find every way we can to support including as many young people in that experience as possible. This amendment would do that.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1715

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. 133 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 "(reduced by \$10,646,100)".

Page 706, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$17,560,000)".

Page 708, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$21,750,000)".

Page 708, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,112,900)".

Page 708, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$9,450,000)".

Page 708, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$11,437,700)".

Page 713, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$53,147,000)".

Page 715, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$35,997,500)".

Page 717, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$54,400,000)".

Page 718, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$27,253,900)".

Page 770, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$29,288,100)".

Page 805, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$43,100,000)".

Page 812, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$8,173,700)".

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 \$351,216,900)".

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.

Paying lip service 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 percent reduction of administrative expenses, which would save taxpayers \$351 million annually on Labor and HHS alone. Let me restate that: We can actually save \$351 million annually by just cutting administrative costs.

We, in fact, may well find the money to put the additional \$10 million into youth employment services if we cut our bureaucracy.

I come from a world of privacy business, so I understand that fiscal responsibility starts on a small scale and requires commitment to changing the trend. My amendment, when combined with similar measures across all appropriations, will yield big savings to taxpayers, and will do so without cutting projects or essential programs that we hold dear.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to seriously consider my amendment as we work to secure our fiscal future, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. 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 for the amendment, quite frankly. And while I understand and share many of the gentleman's concerns, most of the accounts that this amendment reduces have already been reduced in the bill. The allocations we are working on required us to find efficiencies and savings wherever possible.

I believe that cutting the administrative accounts in this amendment by

another 10 percent would unnecessarily increase the risk of significant disruption of services, and oversight responsibility of the agencies in this bill are charged with.

While I oppose the amendment for these reasons, I want to pledge to my friend that I will continue to work with him and others to identify specific areas where additional efficiencies and savings can be realized. And I know my friend also feels strongly about entitlement reform, where the real money is, and I look forward to working with him on that as well.

But in the meantime, Mr. Chairman, I must urge the rejection of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the efforts of the chairman, and, in fact, all of the appropriations efforts. In fact, this week we will pass a full set of appropriations bills out of the House to send to the Senate—something that has not happened 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 draw a line. We can't continue spending what we are spending, and I hope that we are going to be fiscally responsible down the road.

So I appreciate the chairman's comments. I worked very carefully with him, and, yes, I agree that entitlement reform is a huge issue and we have got to take it on. We need to amend the Budget Control Act. There are so many things we need to accomplish.

I am going to support our appropriations package and continue to try and work to tweak those so we actually save money, and we are efficient, and we save programs that we hold dear that are productive.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my good friend, the distinguished ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment would truly decimate the ability of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education to meet the needs of Americans by indiscriminately transferring \$351 million to the spending reduction account.

This does nothing to improve the bill, which is already underfunded. The majority has imposed more than a \$5 billion cut to the Labor-HHS bill below the 2017 omnibus level. Further cuts are completely unnecessary, and that is not all. The committee's allocation

was approximately \$5 billion below the nondefense level allowed under the Budget Control Act.

We have the resources available, yet the majority refuses to allocate them to the essential programs funded through this bill.

This amendment would not encourage the agencies to do more with less. Simply put, it would force the agencies and our constituents to do less with less.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), my good friend.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce funding by 10 percent for programs administered by all accounts in the Labor-HHS appropriations bill. By making it across the board, it makes it more difficult for the agencies to actually administer their programs, making it harder, if not impossible, for the government to protect its citizens by enforcing wage and protection laws, ensuring safe workplaces, ensuring education for students with disabilities, support for those with drug addictions.

The bill, as the gentlewoman has already indicated, is already underfunded, and this would just make matters worse.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope we defeat this amendment.

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 Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 134 OFFERED BY MR. POCAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 134 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 706, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,400,000)".

Page 708, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 708, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$9,976,000)".

Page 708, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,051,000)".

Page 713, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$21,317,000)".

Page 715, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$13,841,000)".

Page 718, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$59,625,000)" "(decreased by \$7,865,000)".

Page 740, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 770, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert "(decreased by \$51,901,000)".

Page 805, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(decreased by \$112,060,000)".

Page 817, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$25,224,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman

from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I am doing this on behalf of Ms. DELAURO. 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 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 140 investigators. That is 2,318 fewer workplace investigations. In addition, in the bill under consideration, safety training grants to reach workers in the highest risk jobs are eliminated, despite being a core OSHA program through every administration, Republican and Democrat, since 1978.

OSHA has only enough funding to inspect every workplace under its jurisdiction every 159 years. Why would this bill eliminate funding for Susan Harwood training grants that protect and educate workers in the most dangerous jobs?

This program costs less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the Department of Labor's budget. This cut is irresponsible and reckless. We cannot cut NIOSH occupational health research, the primary Federal agency that conducts research to prevent work-related illness and injury. This research is a critical defense against tragedy. We must fund MSHA to keep our Nation's mines safe. There is too much on the line to neglect this sector.

This amendment would restore funding to the Bureau of International Labor Affairs, which is tasked with enforcing labor provisions of free trade agreements that are intended to protect American workers.

Finally, this amendment would restore funding to the National Labor Relations Board, which protects the rights of workers under the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. Chair, 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 saying how much I regret—I know my friend regrets that our good friend wasn't here to offer her amendment here this evening, and I appreciate my good friend from Wisconsin stepping up and 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 only get around 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, I urge my 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. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 135 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 136 OFFERED BY MR. SABLAN
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 136 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. SABLAN. 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 713, line 4, after the dollar amount insert: "(increased by \$500,000) (decreased by \$500,000)".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. My amendment moves a small amount of money within the OSHA bureaucracy in order to put enforcement Federal boots on the ground in the Pacific region where my district, the Northern Mariana Islands, is.

□ 1730

Some of you may know that the Northern Mariana Islands are in a transition from overreliance on foreign workers to an economy that is predominantly U.S. workers. As part of that transition effort, last month the House passed and the President signed into law an increase in the fee that is used to train U.S. workers to replace foreign workers. At the end of this month, minimum wage goes up bringing us within 20 cents of the U.S. minimum wage, \$7.05 an hour. These changes are all part of the strategy to make the workplace more accessible and attractive to U.S. workers who are still on the sidelines unemployed.

There is one more small but important move we can make: assure these potential U.S. workers that job sites are safe. We are fortunate to have lots of investment in the resort industry in the Northern Mariana Islands right now. Hotels are going up, and waterlines are being laid. I imagine some Members have had a first job working construction, so they know there are inherent dangers on a construction site. Frankly, we have already had accidents.

Now every State has an OSHA office. There is an OSHA office in Honolulu, but that is 4,000 miles away from my district, and we have no Federal safety officer on duty in the Northern Mariana Islands. We need a real Federal presence—boots on the ground—that will assure U.S. workers that if they get a job working construction, the workplace is safe. As I say, this is one more element in the strategy to put U.S. workers into jobs.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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 to do 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 reserve 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 (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to rise in support of Mr. SABLAN's amendment which would improve enforcement of workplace safety standards in the territories. I would note that, adjusted for inflation, OSHA's enforcement budget has been cut by more than 20 percent since 2010, and OSHA's safety inspections declined by more than 20 percent during that time.

It is a sad commentary that we are placing less value on an American worker's safety at the workplace than we did a decade ago. We should be supporting workplace safety in the territories, and we should be supporting workplace safety in the 50 States as well.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support Mr. SABLAN's amendment.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers. I ask my friends and my colleagues to please support this lifesaving amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MITCHELL). The question is on the amendment offered by 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 Clerk 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' Prices and Cost of Living Division by the same amount.

This increase would restore the proposed cut the underlying bill would make to DOL's 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 staff within the Bureau as well 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. RODNEY 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 programs 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 \$8.5 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 to 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. Chairman, I want to reiterate the importance of the Department of Labor Women's Bureau. I believe that 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, paid family leave, and 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 (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. 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.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chairman, again, I urge support for this amendment. My amendment simply seeks to fund this program next year at the level it is currently funded at.

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. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG).

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 139 OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 139 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 717, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1)(decreased by \$1)”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment highlights the need to think about our future workforce and how it will change because of technology and to encourage the Bureau of Labor Statistics to accept a wider and more forward-looking range of inputs into its range of projections for its workforce of the future.

I co-chair the New Democrat Coalition Future of Work Task Force with my colleagues, Congressman SETH MOULTON and Congressman JARED POLIS. Congressman JIM HIMES, the chair of the New Dem Coalition, has been active in the task force work and joins me in cosponsoring this amendment today.

Over the course of several months, the task force has held a series of forums to hear from experts on various areas that will require this body’s attention in the coming years and decades. We have heard from historians, economists, and policy experts about how technological revolutions of the past have impacted social and political institutions and how lessons from those experiences and from current conditions can help us prepare for the future.

We have also heard from labor and business leaders who are pioneering the way they attract talent, retain their services, and develop skills for the increasingly rapidly change economy. It is nearly unanimous among our experts that the economy will change significantly and change faster, but it is less clear just how quickly the workforce will need to adapt.

For decades, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has been doing excellent and invaluable work to track our labor trends, and its projections have been proven very reliable and useful—to business and to our educators—in times of slower and relatively predictable technological development.

However, they are based on historical data and historical trends, and some of the anticipated changes in technology—such as robotics, self-driving vehicles, and artificial intelligence—could fundamentally change our economy in ways that haven’t been seen before. So, in its current form, the way the Bureau calculates and estimates future development of the workforce may not be able to capture the dramatic changes that our future holds.

One panel convened by the task force suggested that it would be impossible

to do projections in any single way to predict the workforce, but that, with additional resources, the Bureau of Labor Statistics could model for a variety of scenarios of different rates of technological change in different areas.

My amendment increases the BLS account by a dollar and decreases it by a dollar, and I intend it to mean that the BLS should submit to Congress an estimate of the resources it would need to make a range of forward-looking estimates, including consultation 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.

□ 1745

The results have not been uniform for all communities and all populations. Those transformations typically played out over generations, so our social and political institutions had ample time to respond. But today, development and deployment of technology is far more rapid, and Congress, business, and our educational system need the best possible data to evaluate policy proposals and to produce the workforce training needed for future employees and to develop educational curricula to ensure that our economy works for everyone.

Like in the industrial revolution, technological development presents the opportunity for a greatly improved standard of living, but it will also bring challenges to our workforce. 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 funding of the bill, so I do not oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FOSTER. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 141 OFFERED BY MS. MENG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 141 printed in House Report 115–297.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM), and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 734, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 770, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to encourage my colleagues to support my amendment, which simply increases funding for the Behavioral Health Workforce and Training program by \$5 million. This is a reasonable show of support for this important program, which saw its funding cut in half in this bill.

The Behavioral Health Workforce and Training program supports education and training for careers in behavioral health at institutions of higher education and through professional and paraprofessional training programs, with a focus on rural and medically underserved communities. This program was created as part of the 21st Century Cures Act in response to the significant nationwide shortage of behavioral health providers.

According to SAMHSA, 55 percent of U.S. counties do not have a practicing behavioral health provider, and 77 percent of counties reported unmet behavioral health needs. These statistics would be alarming at any time, but they are particularly concerning in the midst of a national opioid epidemic.

A 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.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York, representing the gentleman 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 that 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 gentleman as we work toward the fiscal year 2018 final bill. At this time, though, I must oppose the amendment and urge its rejection.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman 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 \$4,000,000)".

Page 770, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,000,000)".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, this amendment seeks to increase funding for HRSA's Geriatrics Workforce Enhancement Program by \$4 million, restoring program funding to the current enacted level.

I am thankful to the chairman for the funding amount already provided for in this bill, but I am hopeful that we can go one step further and fully fund this program again in the coming fiscal year.

The Geriatrics Workforce Enhancement Program improves healthcare for

older Americans by providing clinical training opportunities to students, medical faculty and providers, direct service workers, patients, families, and caregivers that integrate geriatric and primary care delivery systems.

In the 2015-2016 academic year, grantees provided training to 18,451 students and fellows participating in a variety of geriatrics-focused degree programs, field placements, and fellowships. Of these trainees, 11,824 graduated or completed their training during the most recent academic year, and grantees partnered with 365 hospitals, long-term care facilities, and academic institutions to provide clinical training experiences to trainees.

America's population is aging, and it is imperative that new generations of healthcare professionals and providers have the skills needed to care for older Americans. Every person in this Chamber at some point in their life will wish their healthcare provider had this training. I hope we will all recognize that fact today and do what is prudent.

I hope we will unanimously support this amendment, plan for the future healthcare of our Nation, and restore funding to the HRSA Geriatrics Workforce Enhancement Program account.

Mr. Chair, I urge support for this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, frankly, there is considerable merit to the amendment the gentleman is suggesting.

The amendment offered is for an increase to the workforce training program. Our committee understands the value of this program, which is why we did not accept the administration's budget request, which terminated the program. We were able to fund it, though, below last year's level. However, I will certainly commit to my friend that we will work with her as we go through the process toward the final bill, and hopefully we can find a way to increase this at a later time.

At this time, however, Mr. Chairman, I must oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, again, this amendment requires that the program be fully funded. I do look forward to working with the chairman, 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 New York (Ms. MENG). The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 145 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 145 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. KILDEE. 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 735, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$24,800,000)".

Page 770, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$24,800,000)".

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 hurdles. 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.

□ 1800

AMENDMENT NO. 149 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 744, line 7, insert "(increased by \$40,000,000)" after the dollar amount.

Page 746, line 12, insert "(increased by \$40,000,000)" after the dollar amount.

Page 756, line 21, insert "(decreased by \$120,000,000)" 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 3½ 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 modify 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 and laboratories at the time that inadvertently violated the statute were found to be draconian and at odds with the efficient delivery of healthcare.

At the time the TEST Act was considered in 2012, Congress determined that there were instances where a hospital or laboratory's violations were accidental, unintentional, and resulted in no patient harm.

At the time, CMS lacked the flexibility to align the severity of the sanctions for minor and inadvertent actions at the lab, resulting in needless punitive penalties, such as revoking lab certificates and banning principals from owning or operating certified laboratories.

The TEST Act was passed in 2012 to provide CMS with needed discretion to substitute reasonable alternative sanctions in the event of minor or inadvertent violations. In lieu of the previously mandatory sanctions, the TEST Act allowed more appropriate remedies like directed plans of action, onsite monitoring, and/or modest monetary penalties.

Yet, despite being given this mandate and this flexibility, CMS has written its regulations and interpreted the underlying statute in a way that are clearly at odds with Congress' intent in the TEST Act. There are serious impacts when CMS fails to use their congressionally mandated discretionary authority to issue appropriate sanctions.

Healthcare providers are forced to divert scarce resources to severe penalties, to oppressive settlements, and/

or to a costly appeals process. These would not be needed if CMS had properly implemented the TEST Act. This diverts scarce resources from patient care to dealing with an out-of-control CMS, and negatively impacts healthcare in our communities.

I have seen this firsthand in my district where a nonprofit faith-based community hospital committed an unintentional CLIA violation that resulted in no patient harm. The hospital then self-reported that violation, as we would expect any healthcare provider to do.

This hospital is my community's only level II trauma center and provides a significant amount of uncompensated care to the lower income population, including minority families. Yet, rather than working collaboratively with the hospital, CMS ignored the TEST Act and, instead, imposed crippling sanctions and forced the hospital to engage in a burdensome appeals process.

This action will cost this important community resource over \$100 million per year. This arbitrary unwarranted action by CMS forces the hospital to divert finite resources toward an unnecessary bureaucratic process instead of taking care of patients.

CMS needs to change its implementation of the TEST Act to follow the law. In the meantime, my amendment sends a message that this is not how we expect our Federal Government to act in a time when we are articulating a new vision for building a better American healthcare system.

This amendment does this by reducing CMS spending on bureaucracy by \$120 million and directing those funds toward true solutions for better healthcare by finding cures for pediatric cancer, Alzheimer's, and opioid abuse.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I have considerable sympathy with my friend's concerns. Frankly, I think he has certainly every right to be concerned about a hospital in his district. I certainly agree with an effort to put additional funding for the opioid epidemic, for pediatric cancer, and for Alzheimer's disease. These are all critical issues facing our country.

Nevertheless, I must oppose the amendment. The bill actually includes \$126 million within the CDC for surveillance and prevention of opioid misuse, which continues the large increase provided in fiscal year 2017. The bill also provides a \$1.1 billion increase for the National Institutes of Health, which includes a targeted increase of \$400 million for research on Alzheimer's disease, as well as increases for each institute center, including the National

Cancer Institute, to support vital research on disease such as pediatric cancer.

Furthermore, the bill also continues to provide funds authorized in the 21st Century Cures Act, including \$300 million for the Cancer Moonshot, and \$500 million for opioid abuse.

Finally, the reduction of funding at CMS proposed by my friend would weaken the agency's ability to properly manage and administer Medicare and Medicaid. So for that reason, I must oppose my friend's amendment.

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chair, the bottom line is that hardworking American families are tired of having unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats ignore congressional intent when implementing legislation such as the important TEST Act.

We must send a message to CMS today. Now is the time to right this wrong. In the meantime, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment to cut CMS by 3½ percent, \$120 million, and to increase research funding for pediatric cancer, for Alzheimer's, and for opioid treatment. This amendment is a win-win amendment for American healthcare.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to this amendment. I strongly support additional funding for the CDC, the National Cancer Institute, and the National Institute on Aging. I have spent my time in Congress fighting for those agencies.

In fact, over the past 2 years, Democrats on the Labor-HHS Subcommittee have worked closely with Chairman TOM COLE to increase the NIH 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. Keep in mind that the CMS Program Management account is already cut by a \$524 million in the underlying bill. That is a 13 percent cut. This amendment would increase that cut to more than 16 percent.

According to HHS, over 143 million Americans will rely on programs administered by CMS, including Medicare, Medicaid, CHIP, and the Federal health insurance exchanges.

Why would my colleagues in the majority support more than \$600 million in cuts to the Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP programs?

Slashing their administrative budgets by 16 percent is certain to harm services that impact Americans on a daily basis. These cuts will directly harm America's seniors, the blind, low- and middle-income families, children with 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. 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 "(reduced by \$14,000,000)".

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

Page 764, line 23, 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 common-sense pro-growth policies in Congress to reduce regulations and encourage innovation, programs like the Community Services Block Grant play a vitally important role in fulfilling 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 each of our districts 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 Home 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 State funding, 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 program.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman for working 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 \$715 million, but it clearly is an important program to many Members on both sides of the aisle, has a superb reputation, and we are going to do everything that we possibly can to build upon that and get back to at least the fiscal year 2017 level.

The gentlewoman's leadership in this is greatly appreciated, and we look forward to working with her as we go forward.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chairman, because of Chairman COLE's great willingness to work with and help the truly needy people in our communities, I am going to be withdrawing my amendment this evening. I look forward to working with Chairman COLE as we move forward in this process, and I just want to say thank you.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 152 OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 152 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 744, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,819,000)".

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, as 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.

Make no mistake, 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 is, as you all know, the most deadly of all the cancers.

□ 1815

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 through 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 gentlewoman 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 \$231,330,000)”.

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

Page 805, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$11,710,000)”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman 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 beau-

tiful 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.

The Healthy Transitions program 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. 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. 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 gentlewoman also knows, we have an allocation well below last year's level, and we had to make, again, a difficult decision.

Reduction of this magnitude of the Health and Human Services' 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 gentlewoman 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 gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OLSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LITTLE ROCK CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL NATIONAL HISTORIC 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 of the Little Rock Central High School 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]
YEAS—390

Abraham Carabajal Doyle, Michael
Adams Cárdenas F.
Aderholt Carson (IN) Duffy
Aguilar Carter (TX) Duncan (SC)
Allen Cartwright Duncan (TN)
Amash Castro (TX) Dunn
Amodel Chabot Ellison
Arrington Cheney Emmer
Babin Chu, Judy Engel
Bacon Cicilline Eshoo
Banks (IN) Clark (MA) Espallat
Barletta Clay Estes (KS)
Barr Cleaver Esty (CT)
Barragán Clyburn Evans
Barton Coffman Farenthold
Bass Cohen Faso
Beatty Cole Ferguson
Bera Collins (GA) Fitzpatrick
Bergman Collins (NY) Fleischmann
Beyer Comer Flores
Biggs Comstock Fortenberry
Bishop (GA) Conaway Foster
Bishop (MI) Connolly Foss
Bishop (UT) Conyers Frankel (FL)
Black Cooper Franks (AZ)
Blackburn Correa Frelinghuysen
Blum Costello (PA) Fudge
Blumenauer Courtney Gabbard
Blunt Rochester Cramer Gaetz
Bonamici Crawford Gallagher
Bost Cuellar Gallego
Boyle, Brendan Culberson Garamendi
F. Cummings Gianforte
Brady (PA) Davidson Gibbs
Brady (TX) Davis (CA) Gohmert
Brat Davis, Danny Gomez
Brooks (AL) Davis, Rodney Gonzalez (TX)
Brooks (IN) DeFazio Goodlatte
Brown (MD) DeGette Gosar
Brownley (CA) Delaney Gottheimer
Buck DelBene Gowdy
Bucshon Denham Granger
Budd Dent Graves (GA)
Burgess DeSaulnier Graves (LA)
Bustos DesJarlais Green, Al
Byrne Dingell Green, Gene
Calvert Doggett Griffith
Capuano Donovan Grothman

Guthrie Luján, Ben Ray
Gutiérrez Lynch
Hanabusa MacArthur
Handel Maloney, Sean
Harper Marchant
Harris Marshall
Hartzler Massie
Hastings Matsui
Heck McCarthy
Hensarling McCaul
Herrera Beutler McClintock
Hice, Jody B. McCollum
Higgins (LA) McEachin
Higgins (NY) McGovern
Hill McHenry
Himes McKinley
Holding McMorris
Hollingsworth Rodgers
Hoyer McNerney
Hudson McSally
Huffman Meadows
Huizenga Meehan
Hultgren Meeks
Hunter Meng
Hurd Mitchell
Issa Moolenaar
Jackson Lee Mooney (WV)
Jayapal Moore
Jeffries Moulton
Jenkins (KS) Mullin
Jenkins (WV) Murphy (FL)
Johnson (GA) Murphy (PA)
Johnson (LA) Nadler
Johnson (OH) Napolitano
Johnson, E. B. Neal
Johnson, Sam Newhouse
Jones Noem
Jordan Nolan
Joyce (OH) Norcross
Kaptur Norman
Katko Nunes
Keating O'Halleran
Kelly (IL) O'Rourke
Kelly (MS) Olson
Kelly (PA) Palazzo
Kennedy Pallone
Khanna Palmer
Kihuen Panetta
Kildee Pascrell
Kilmer Paulsen
Kind Payne
King (IA) Pearce
King (NY) Pelosi
Kinzinger Perlmutter
Knight Perry
Krishnamoorthi Peters
Kuster (NH) Peterson
Kustoff (TN) Pingree
LaHood Pittenger
LaMalfa Pocan
Lamborn Poliquin
Lance Polis
Langevin Price (NC)
Larsen (WA) Quigley
Larson (CT) Raskin
Latta Ratcliffe
Lawrence Reed
Lee Reichert
Levin Renacci
Lewis (GA) Rice (NY)
Lewis (MD) Rice (SC)
Lieu, Ted Richmond
Lipinski Roby
LoBiondo Roe (TN)
Loeb sack Rogers (AL)
Lofgren Rogers (KY)
Long Rohrabacher
Love Rokita
Lowenthal Rooney, Thomas
Lowey J.
Lucas Rosen
Luetkemeyer Roskam
Lujan Grisham, M. Rothfus
M. Rouzer

NOT VOTING—43

Demings Mast
DeSantis Messer
Deutch Poe (TX)
Diaz-Balart Posey
Garrett Rooney, Francis
Graves (MO) Ros-Lehtinen
Grijalva Ross
Labrador Rutherford
Lawson (FL) Ryan (OH)
Crist Loudermilk
Crowley Maloney,
Curbelo (FL) Carolyn B.
DeLauro Marino

Soto Tiberi Tsongas
Titus Titus Wasserman
Schultz

□ 1852

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes due to work in my Congressional District regarding hurricane relief. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 485.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL TO PRESENT CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO FILIPINO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 23, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 23

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY TO PRESENT THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE FILIPINO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on October 25, 2017 for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the Filipino Veterans of World War II in recognition of their dedicated military service.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING THE VIOLENCE AND DOMESTIC TERRORIST ATTACK THAT TOOK PLACE DURING EVENTS BETWEEN AUGUST 11 AND AUGUST 12, 2017, IN CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 49) condemning the violence and domestic terrorist attack that took place during events between August 11 and August 12, 2017, in Charlottesville, Virginia, recognizing the

first responders who lost their lives while monitoring the events, offering deepest condolences to the families and friends of those individuals who were killed and deepest sympathies and support to those individuals who were injured by the violence, expressing support for the Charlottesville community, rejecting White nationalists, White supremacists, the Ku Klux Klan, neo-Nazis, and other hate groups, and urging the President and the President's Cabinet to use all available resources to 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, Klansmen, and 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;

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

Whereas the extremist demonstration turned violent, culminating in the death of peaceful counter-demonstrator Heather Heyer and injuries to 19 other individuals after a neo-Nazi sympathizer allegedly drove a vehicle into a crowd, an act that resulted in a charge of second degree murder, 3 counts of malicious wounding, and 1 count of hit and run;

Whereas 2 Virginia State Police officers, Lieutenant H. Jay Cullen and Trooper Pilot Berke M.M. Bates, died in a helicopter crash as they patrolled the events occurring below them;

Whereas the Charlottesville community is 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 by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress—

(1) condemns the racist violence and domestic terrorist attack that took place between August 11 and August 12, 2017, in Charlottesville, Virginia;

(2) recognizes—

(A) Heather Heyer, who was killed, and 19 other individuals who were injured in the reported domestic terrorist attack; and

(B) several other individuals who were injured in separate attacks while standing up to hate and intolerance;

(3) recognizes the public service and heroism of Virginia State Police officers Lieutenant H. Jay Cullen and Trooper Pilot Berke M.M. Bates, who lost their lives while responding to the events from the air;

(4) offers—

(A) condolences to the families and friends of Heather Heyer, Lieutenant H. Jay Cullen, and Trooper Pilot Berke M.M. Bates; and

(B) sympathy and support to those individuals who are recovering from injuries sustained during the attacks;

(5) expresses support for the Charlottesville community 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 domestic terrorism by 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.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). Pursuant to House Resolution 504 and rule 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 Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1856

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, with Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 154 printed in House Report 115-297 offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 155 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY
OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 155 printed in House Report 115-297.

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:

Page 752, line 19, strike "\$15,000,000" and insert "\$20,000,000".

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. Chair, I want to speak on this amendment, which provides some additional funding for assisted outpatient treatment.

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 SAMHSA. This is not new 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 442-2, this level of funding was authorized in the bill. It is already authorized there. 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.

A few years ago, when New York passed Kendra's Law, when a young woman was killed by a mentally ill person, they realized that had he been in treatment, it likely never would have happened.

□ 1900

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 patient can be stabilized by remaining on their medication, by having their counseling, perhaps supportive housing, supportive education, supportive employment, their life can turn around.

So what happens is, a court, a judge, protecting this person's own rights, civil rights on every level, will say to this person: I am not going to involuntarily commit you to a hospital. Your crime doesn't rise to the level—it is not a felony or something like that—it doesn't rise to the level of prison, but what they say is: We are going to require, however, that you stay in treatment, require that you take your medication, that you stay in counseling, and you do other things as prescribed by the court.

Now, most States allow this, but here is the problem: in many counties in America, they don't have the ability to pay the administrative costs to handle this. So this amendment provides a mechanism whereby people can do this.

So understand, the assisted outpatient treatment is a civil-legal procedure whereby a judge can order an individual with a serious mental illness to follow a court 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 the people said that AOT made them 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 competent in their case manager's ability to help them; 87 percent had fewer incarcerations; 83 percent had fewer experienced arrests—and the point is, they had an increased number of arrests prior to being in AOT, and then afterwards it declined precipitously.

Eighty-one percent said AOT helped them get and to stay well; 77 percent fewer experienced psychiatric hospitalizations; 75 percent reported that AOT helped them gain control of their life; 74 percent fewer experienced homelessness; 55 percent fewer experienced suicide attempts or physical harm to themselves; 49 percent fewer abused alcohol; 48 percent fewer abused drugs; 47 percent fewer physically harmed others; 46 percent fewer damaged and destroyed property; and costs were cut in half.

This small amount of money—and believe me, it would cost perhaps 10 or 20 times more to really do this thoroughly—is there to help people in mental health crisis. We could either continue to throw people in jail, continue to see crimes happen—and by the way, when a mentally ill person is in prison, 80 percent of them get no treatment. We put them back on the streets and the problems occur again.

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 something about this. And I do ask that the House pass this small amendment out of an existing budget, no new spending, to provide an additional \$5 million for assisted outpatient treatment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman and want to begin by acknowledging 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 is with great reluctance that I opposed this particular amendment, earlier, when we actually accepted.

But the amendment increases funding for programs currently funded at \$15 million, the same as last year. As my friend knows, our committee actually received an allocation that was lower than last year, and we had limited 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 different 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 oppose the 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 discuss 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 tonight we can really think about Congresswoman DELAURO, her family, and her mother, and offer our sincere condolences 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 programs. In the bill under consideration today, SAMHSA's mental health programs, they are already cut by \$231 million. That is a 20 percent cut.

Unfortunately, this amendment would further reduce funding for crit-

ical SAMHSA programs such as Mental Health First Aid, Suicide Prevention, and the National Child Traumatic Stress Network. We need to be increasing support for mental health services, not robbing Peter to pay Paul by shifting funds from one program to another.

Now, by profession, I am a psychiatric social worker, and I founded a community mental health center. Believe me, I personally know the impact and the need, the unmet need, for additional funding for mental health services.

As my colleagues and I have noted, the allocations approved by the committee 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 programs 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 increase; \$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 outpatient treatment.

As a former chief psychiatric nurse at the VA hospital in Dallas, Texas, I have witnessed the unintended consequences of the deinstitutionalization process. Many of my own patients, diagnosed with severe mental illnesses, were discharged with 30 days of prescription medicines and did not have stable housing.

Once they ran out of their prescriptions, their condition worsened, they suffered psychotic breaks, and they became homeless or incarcerated. Individuals with untreated psychiatric illness now make up one-third of the Nation's estimated homeless population. That totals 600,000.

In Texas, there are 35,000 incarcerated individuals with a severe mental illness, but only 4,500 psychiatric beds are available in all of the Texas hospitals combined.

This amendment increases court-ordered 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 pilot is extremely important. It saves money. It saves lives. And for Members to reflect back on this, I hope they would rather say: I helped fund a program known to save lives. SAMHSA has been reported many times by the GAO to waste a lot of money. This saves lives, and I urge people to vote for this amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 156 OFFERED BY MR. KELLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 156 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 763, line 3, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000) (increased by \$5,000,000)".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment No. 156.

Over the past 25 years, infant adoptions have decreased, and only about 1 percent of pregnant women choose adoption. While there are approximately 2 million couples waiting to adopt in the United States, there were only 18,329 domestic infant adoptions in 2014.

Unfortunately, too many women who have encountered unplanned pregnancies report not receiving adequate information about adoption. Everyone facing an unplanned pregnancy should have access to timely, accurate, and noncoercive information about adoption that helps them make their own fully informed decision.

In 2000, Congress authorized the Infant Adoption Awareness Training Program. This program awards grants to adoption organizations to train healthcare workers who offer health services to expectant mothers and are trained to provide adoption information and referral.

In the year 2000, the program annually delivered training to an estimated 10,000 healthcare workers nationwide. This program was phased out in 2010.

This bill funds adoption awareness programs at \$39.1 million. My amendment designates \$5 million of that funding to restart the Infant Adoption Awareness Training Program with the goal of ensuring that expectant mothers have access to timely, accurate information about adoptions.

I also support the administration's effort to fund activities to improve hospital-based adoption support services for our expectant mothers. I urge them to continue this hospital-based program to ensure that mothers who wish to make an adoption have access to comprehensive support throughout the entire adoption process.

Adoption is a bipartisan issue, and it is vital that individuals who are providing health services to expectant mothers are trained to properly provide adoption information and referral.

Madam Chair, I urge adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Chair, I don't rise to oppose. I just wanted 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.

□ 1915

Ms. LEE. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman 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 did not receive funding in fiscal year '17.

Women should have access to all options when considering the impacts of an unintended pregnancy, of which one is adoption. But we should not ignore the irreplaceable role of preventing unintended pregnancy by providing education and health services.

The underlying bill limits women's access to care by prohibiting funding to the Title X Family Planning program, a program specifically created to ensure women have access to high-quality family planning services to prevent unintended pregnancies and access reproductive care services. By denying women access to comprehensive family planning and preventative health services, the bill would have a devastating impact on women and families, especially low-income women and women in rural communities.

In 2014, Title X Family Planning centers helped women avert 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 33 percent higher, and the teen pregnancy rate would have been 30 percent higher.

In addition, Title X providers are required to offer pregnant women the opportunity to provide information and counseling regarding all of their options—all of their options—in a neutral, nondirective, and factual manner, including adoption. For some women, adoption services and counseling may be the best option. But we must ensure that every woman has access to all options and is allowed to make the choice that is best for her and her family.

Unfortunately, this bill represents yet another missed opportunity to get serious about reproductive health and preventing unintended pregnancy in this country. This amendment uses funding from other programs in the Children and Families Services account that are critical to the well-being of children, women, and families as an offset for this new program. Funding for Head Start, the Domestic Violence Hotline, programs that help serve and protect runaway and homeless youth, among others, are at risk.

Madam Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman. I do share her concern. That is why we are asking for \$5 million of the \$39.1 million be used to give expectant mothers the opportunity to learn fully and make a decision based on what they want to do. It is about education. It is about making them fully aware.

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 from this bill and from this process, and that is an opportunity to vote on the amendment to fund Title X Family Planning. We must restore funding for family planning services; invest in a comprehensive approach that prioritizes health promotion, education, services, and care; and an approach that includes sex education programs, better access to birth control, and reproductive health services.

I am extremely concerned about the cut that this amendment imposes on the Children and Families account at HHS. I oppose this amendment. This is cutting funds from Head Start, Runaway and Homeless Youth grants, and the Community Services Block Grant, among other critical programs.

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments. What this is really about is 2 million couples willing to adopt children 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. DELAURO 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 do now rise.

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 Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3354) making appro-

priations 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. 3697, 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 House Resolution 504 and rule 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 Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1922

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, with Mr. MITCHELL (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 156 printed in House Report 155-297, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 158 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 158 printed in House Report 115-297.

Ms. BONAMICI. 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 767, line 24, insert "(increased by \$51,000,000)" after the dollar amount.

Page 770, line 18, insert "(reduced by \$64,000,000)" after the 1st dollar amount.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentlewoman

from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to increase funding for senior nutrition programs under title III of the Older Americans Act. My amendment funds these programs at levels authorized by the House just last year.

We are in the middle of an unprecedented demographic shift as this country ages. The population of older adults is growing faster than at any point in history. As we grow older, we all want people across the country to be able to age with dignity, health, and independence in their own homes and communities for as long as possible.

For more than 50 years, the Older Americans Act has supported community-based providers that reach more than 11 million seniors and caregivers annually in each and every one of our districts providing person-centered assistance to help people age in place. These critical OAA services include home-delivered and congregate meals to make sure that older adults are getting the nutrition needed to keep them healthy and engaged, which reduces the risk of falls, depression, and other negative outcomes.

Just a few weeks ago, I had the pleasure of joining dedicated volunteers to deliver Meals on Wheels to seniors in northwest Oregon. I highly recommend this to my colleagues. You can see firsthand the value of these programs and how important these meals and visits are to our constituents who rely on them.

The Older Americans Act also covers transportation to get older adults to the doctor, the grocery store, or even to a local senior center to engage with friends and avoid isolation. The OAA funds critical disaster assistance response efforts for seniors and communities like those just devastated by Hurricanes Harvey and Irma.

Unfortunately, funding for the Older Americans Act has drastically lagged behind the growth in the older adult population, the increasing need for services, and the rising cost of delivering these supports. This stagnant and, in some areas, eroding Federal investment in OAA programs costs us more in the long term. When seniors can't stay healthy at home, they end up in hospitals paid for by Medicare or in institutional long-term care, often funded by Medicaid. Both are far more expensive than adequate investments in the Older Americans Act to keep seniors healthy at home for as long as possible.

Support for the Older American Act is strongly bipartisan. Last year, Congress voted without opposition to reauthorize the Older Americans Act, a bill that included modest increases in authorized funding levels.

Unfortunately, annual appropriations still fall woefully short of these

amounts we clearly and firmly approved. This amendment will increase funding for core OAA programs delivered through title III—which include critical nutrition, home- and community-based support, and caregiver services—to the amounts that were just so broadly supported last year.

These investments in OAA are necessary if we are to provide the person-centered, cost-effective in-home services and supports needed to keep our expanding older population healthy and independent in their homes and communities. This amendment is an essential first step toward rectifying the recent depletion of these important funds for these vital programs.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's concern for programs that support vulnerable seniors. Frankly, 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, for offering the amendment and for her leadership on issues affecting older Americans.

The Older Americans Act was first passed 50 years ago as part of Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty. It helps older Americans live with dignity and stay connected with their communities. I am proud that last year we were able to pass a 3-year bipartisan reauthorization that increased funding for the programs. But had our investments in these programs actually kept up with inflation and growing populations, the authorization levels would have been even much more. But, thankfully, the reauthorization moved us in the right direction.

This amendment would bring funding for supportive services, nutrition pro-

grams, and caregiver supports in line with the authorized level. Even though these are not fully adequate to address the total need, it is another step in the right direction. So I support the amendment and our commitment to older Americans. We can maintain that commitment by adopting this amendment, so I thank the gentlewoman for offering it.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, may I please inquire as to the remaining time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Oregon has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who serves on the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, first, I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon for introducing this amendment. I rise in support of it.

We have to really let our seniors know that we care about them. My mother passed away a couple of years ago. She was 90 years old. I recognized personally the importance of comprehensive services to ensure that our seniors have a quality of life that they so deserve in their senior years. This also helps taxpayers and families avoid paying for more expensive healthcare and long-term care services.

So I thank the gentlewoman again on behalf of our constituents. This will strengthen our communities, and I ask for an "aye" vote.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important amendment that is a good investment to save in the long term and take care of our seniors.

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

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

□ 1930

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI). The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 160 OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY
LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 160 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. 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 770, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000) (increased by \$2,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, my amendment provides \$2 million in dedicated funding for peer

support and paraprofessionals as part of the Behavioral Health Workforce Education and Training program.

Ensuring all Americans have access to affordable and high-quality mental health services should not be a partisan issue. It is simply the right thing to do.

The purpose of the Behavioral Health Workforce Education and Training program, which this amendment funds, is to add additional training to serve populations especially in rural and medically underserved areas.

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 populations across their lifespan, 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 support-related strategies can be used as more engaging and successful solutions than current hospital and emergency room care-related options. Peer support programs provide individualized, managed care to those who need it the most.

Many studies have shown the vast benefits to patients who utilize peer support. For example, a 3-year pilot project called the Peer Health Navigation Intervention, or "The Bridge," showed that peer support, in addition to a variety of other positive outcomes, shifted the focus of healthcare from urgent care and emergency room visits to outpatient primary care.

Furthermore, many 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.

This modest amount of funding for a community-based partnership program will make an enormous difference for millions of Americans who deserve access to behavioral health services, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. COLE. 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 to know 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, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of Mr. LUJÁN's amendment, and I want to thank him for this.

I shared earlier that I, by profession, am a psychiatric social worker. I actually founded a community mental health center. It was called Change, Incorporated.

As part of this community mental health center, we had a program. That program was to train individuals in peer support. This was in the day. I can tell you what Mr. LUJÁN has said about the goals and the successes of peer support services. It can't be overstated. This amendment would close this shortage in services for individuals who need them.

As chair of the Social Work Caucus, again, psychologists, psychiatric social workers, and clinical social workers agree that peer support for individuals who may or may not have earned an advanced degree is extremely important because they can understand and they know what the needs of their clients are. Studies have shown that peer support services help to reduce emergency room visits by individuals suffering from depression.

I urge my colleagues to support this 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 really 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 Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), 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 first dollar amount insert "(increased by \$100,000,000)".

Page 794, line 15, after the second dollar amount insert "(increased by \$100,000,000)".

Page 794, line 19, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$100,000,000)".

Page 805, line 25, after the dollar amount insert "(decreased by \$100,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, nearly 1.7 million children, including 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 gentleman 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 gentlewoman's frustration with finding a large enough offset to accommodate the increase she proposes. However, her amendment would actually reduce resources for the Department of Education by nearly a quarter. I think this would jeopardize the Department's ability to administer the very program she seeks to increase.

So I will reluctantly oppose the amendment at this time. I believe the offset within the Department of Education administrative account is just simply too much.

Again, I want to reiterate to my friend that I look forward to working with her as we go forward and perhaps receiving a different allocation under a House-Senate agreement in the future.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's kind and thoughtful words about afterschool programs.

There are over 18 million children whose parents want to take advantage of afterschool programs, but they lack access in the area where they live. That is why we work to fund our national network of afterschool programs through the 21st Century Community Learning Centers initiative.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I just want to say to the distinguished chair that I appreciate his positive comments about this program. I look forward to a better allocation as the process moves forward, and I look forward to having him and 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, I grew up in the Bronx, New York. I was fortunate to have my mother not working at the time. She was able to supervise me. I had many wonderful play dates.

I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman, in my community where this program is so essential, many of these people are working two, three jobs. The mother is working two or three jobs; the father is working two or three jobs. For some of these families, there is only one parent.

Perhaps you can come visit my district. I would like you to come to Port Chester, New York. This was one of the first afterschool programs I was fortunate to be able to support with this account. I would love you to come and visit and see what these programs do, which is 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. 164 OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 164 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 796, line 5, insert after the dollar amount ““(reduced by \$1,184,000) (increased by \$1,184,000)””.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and

a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, this, I think, is a very modest amendment, which just simply seeks 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. Again, unfortunately, 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 change in our allocation in conference, I will gladly take another look at the magnet school 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 the offset 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 remain starkly 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, now, 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 was disappointed to see that the majority took a step back from the progress that we had made and imposed a cut to this program in the underlying bill.

Why in the world would the majority not want to see school segregation ended? This amendment certainly leads us in that direction, and I strongly support it, and I hope you would reconsider your opposition because many of us remember those days.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may 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, magnet 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 totally 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 it 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 believe strongly 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. 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 any more than I accept the idea that, by funding charter schools, we are involved in promoting racial segregation. That is not what we are trying to do here. We have a genuine debate over the best vehicles to go forward.

I happen to think both these vehicles are good vehicles. I have seen what the charter school movement, frankly, has meant in New Orleans, what it has meant in this city, the opportunities that it has opened to thousands and thousands of students of all racial backgrounds.

And the administration, as my friend knows, has put a particular emphasis

here. And while we increase funding, we are not anywhere close to what the administration wanted to do. So I want to reiterate to my friend from Connecticut that we intend to work with him if we have an allocation change where we can find some additional resources, because I think he makes a very good point, and I very much value the contributions that magnet schools also have made to try to improve educational outcomes across the spectrum for our students.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 165 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 167 OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF MINNESOTA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 167 printed in House Report 115-297.

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 "(increased by \$70,246,000)".

Page 802, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced 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 high 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 the while saving their families money.

The key is that CTE students often don't need an extensive 4-year edu-

cation, 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 some of my colleagues are still pushing—that a 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 CTE State grants by \$70 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 pay for his amendment. In my opinion, it is totally misguided.

Since the TRIO program began, it has produced over 5 million college graduates, and those college graduates were almost exclusively from families where no one had ever had the opportunity to go.

This is a proven successful program. It has helped literally millions of first generations of college students, so I strongly support TRIO and will not support cuts in this program; so I, therefore, oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to increase funding for current technical education programs. For some people, pursuing their desired career means securing a college degree.

In my 30-year career in workforce education, I have seen firsthand this

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 creators unable to find qualified workers for in-demand jobs.

□ 2000

Democrats and Republicans agree that the skills gap is a serious problem challenging our workforce. More importantly, my constituents, schools, and employers throughout my district recognize this is a crisis that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of the amendment.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (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 amendment proposes to slash \$70 million in funding.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have 30 seconds, so I will give any listeners a suggestion.

I suggest you spend some time at your local tech school or your local trade school and ask the people who teach there how many of their students are former 4-year students who cannot find a job in the field in which they thought.

These people can have a family-supporting job 8 or 9 years earlier if they are directed to a technical education or a trade school. They will be supporting their families and be able to do that when they are 21 or 22 rather than 31 or 32.

You will learn a lot if you talk to your local tech school or trade school.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would take money from important college access programs, GEAR UP and TRIO, and use it to increase important 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 meant to 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 for them.

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 move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MITCHELL). The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, as the co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional TRIO Caucus, I find this amendment, which would cut \$60 million in funding from TRIO educational services that assist veterans and low-income and first-generation college students, deeply disturbing and misaligned with our national economic interests.

It sends the misguided message that only university education is unnecessary for low-income students. You know, just get a little job training and go straight to work.

I might make the observation that I don't see anybody over there who has less than a bachelor's degree, and I know my good friend has a law degree.

While career and technical education is very, very important, low-income students and our country's economic viability deserve the option of educating some of our students at a 4-year-degree level.

For us to maintain hegemony in the world, we need people like Steve Jobs, who was not a trust fund baby, who was not a legacy kid, but someone who had the talent and ability. We need to provide opportunity to the larger pool of talent in our country in order to be able to create the next iPhone.

I will give you a really good example, Mr. Chairman. There is a student who happens to live in southeastern Minnesota. As a matter of fact, he lives in the Second Congressional District. He was once 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 start-up 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 just 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 opposed to TRIO.

This is not an effort to diminish access to baccalaureate degrees, but to give priority to programs that are helping Americans learn the skills they need for good, high-paying jobs.

Research has shown that graduates with a technical or applied sciences associate's degree outearn baccalaureate degree holders by between \$2,000 and \$11,000.

Earlier this year, the House passed the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act. That bill and this amendment are important steps to make sure all Americans have access to an education that helps them develop the skills they need to have a successful life.

I am proud to support this amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate to see some of my colleagues claim that career and technical education is somehow the separate or lesser pathway to a 4-year college degree. These claims are neither factual nor are they very genuine. CTE promotes college access, with 91 percent of high school graduates who earn a 2- 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 career and 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 are not serving anywhere close to the population eligible for TRIO. Somewhere less than 10 percent of the eligible students actually take advantage of the program.

Again, my State invests very heavily, probably more heavily than most other States that I would suggest do the same thing Ohio and Oklahoma have done. And these programs which my friend rightly champions, I have seen people actually raise their own taxes so they could have a career or technical institute.

So I think there is merit to both of these approaches. But I do also think 5 million college graduates from people who did not have the chance to go is something this country ought to think about. The statistics tell us each of those graduates in a lifetime earn \$1 million more than they would have. I promise you, the Federal Government will get its share of that million dollars.

This is a program that has paid for itself over and over again. Perhaps as we go forward, we can find other ways to help both of these programs capitalize on their potential.

So while I agree with the objective my friend is trying to achieve, I don't agree in achieving it at the expense of TRIO or GEAR UP.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes 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 pro-

ceedings 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 "(decreased by \$33,954,220)".

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 \$43,759,340)".

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 many people there.

So I think a small reduction of 2 percent is something that we should all be supportive of, make a little bit of a dent on that deficit and a little bit of a dent on that huge sea of money we voted for—including myself—working its way towards Florida and Texas.

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

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

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin is a good friend. We serve on the Budget Committee together, and, frankly, I know how sincere his concern about the issues that he lays out is. I know how hard he fought on that committee, and oftentimes we were unlikely allies in a number of places.

□ 2015

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 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.

Mr. Chairman, one of the agencies affected by this amendment is the Department of Education's Office of Inspector General that is responsible for conducting independent and objective audits and investigations. It is through this agency that we can review offices like the Federal Student Aid office, and Congress can learn about policies 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. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman 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 funded through this bill. The Department will simply have to do less with less. That is not good for the American people, and it is not good for our constituents.

A Department with fewer resources to oversee the Student Aid portfolio, and as Mr. SCOTT pointed out, the Office of Inspector General's ability to promote efficiencies within the Department and investigate fraud, will be hampered.

Mr. Chair, for these reasons, I oppose the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 169 printed in House Report 115-297.

AMENDMENT NO. 170 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 170 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 817, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$99,000,000)".

Page 856, line 11, 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 support of my amendment, which will reduce funding for the National Labor Relations Board by \$99 million in fiscal year 2018. Since its inception, the NLRB has served as a partisan board that flips in ideology from one administration to the next, often cutting businesses off at the knees and stifling economic growth.

In just the last 8 years of the Obama administration, the NLRB managed to overturn a total of 4,105 collective years of precedent in 90 cases. In cases such as the ambush election rule and the joint employer rule, the board significantly overstepped their bounds and dipped their hands into the day-to-day business operations of hardworking Americans.

Now, let me be clear: I am not here to attack the unions. I wish more people would join unions under the amendment that we just dealt with. I believe that employees should have the right to join a union if they think that joining a union is best for them and their family. But the fact remains, since 1990, the NLRB has received 65 percent fewer election petitions and 40 percent fewer unfair labor practice charges. Meanwhile, while private sector labor representation has decreased in the last 25 years, the NLRB's budget has increased in inflation-adjusted dollars by close to \$50 million.

My amendment would implement a necessary reduction to the NLRB, which will bring their funding in line with their expected workload for the upcoming fiscal year. Specifically, my amendment saves taxpayers close to \$100 million in the upcoming fiscal year and provides private industry with relief that the NLRB will have to focus on the most pressing cases that arise rather than engaging in partisan witch hunts.

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. 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 practices.

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 out of 20 charges filed are resolved without litigation.

For charges at the regional level, 90 percent of the cases with probable merit are settled, which means they are resolved without needing to be heard before the NLRB's five-member board.

For cases 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 reinstated 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. Chairman, 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 thought of. So people have to consider for themselves, I guess, whether the average State would even need 30 employees. Here we are just

cutting 30. We are still leaving the bulk of the agency in existence.

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an insult to the millions of American workers who deserve to be treated fairly and in a timely manner under the law.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 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. 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:

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 504, 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 FRELINGHUYSEN, 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 attack, 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.

□ 2030

This actually goes about rightsizing MSHA, which is the mine safety and health group that will inspect the mines. What we found is we have fewer mines to actually inspect. My amendment is real straightforward. It is saying: let's rightsize that particular group. Let's cut 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 gentlewoman 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 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 this 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 requirement for mandatory inspections. You cannot underfund 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 the Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment irresponsibly cuts funding for coal mine safety and health by 10 percent, cuts 96 positions in the Mine Safety and Health Administration, or MSHA. The Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 established MSHA and requires MSHA to conduct four wall-to-wall inspections every year on underground mines and two wall-to-wall inspections for every surface mine. These are mandatory and required for safety in the mines.

MSHA is required to conduct spot inspections every 5 days at those coal mines that release large amounts of combustible methane since those mines have the highest risk of fires and explosions.

In addition to the mandatory and spot inspections, MSHA responds to hazard complaints from miners, investigates discrimination complaints, and provides compliance assistance with standards such as the new rule to prevent the scourge of black lung disease.

If this amendment is enacted, 96 positions will be cut and MSHA will have to choose between the mandatory inspections or meeting its obligation to implement these other essential 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 . . . concern of all in the coal"—or other—"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,
Triangle, VA, September 7, 2017.
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.

At a time when mining fatalities are 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 do to ensure they come home to their loved ones at the end of their shift. This amendment is a step backward in safety, putting 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 35 percent less coal mines 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 gentlewoman 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 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:

SEC. _____. 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. Before this 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 hearing process.

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 a 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 5 minutes.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment which would block the NLRB's election rule, an attempt to undermine collective bargaining rights. The NLRB enacted this rule to modernize and streamline the process for voting on union representation.

To be clear, the NLRB undertook a very deliberative rulemaking process. It was transparent, and it included input from stakeholders and the public.

□ 2045

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. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the distinguished ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. WALBERG that

would block the National Labor Relations Board election 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 preelection process previously had been open to manipulation, delay, and drawn-out preelection 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, as opposed to the previous requirement that the employer only provide home addresses. Under the new rule, employers must provide this electronically within 2 days of ordering an election.

By ensuring that there is a timely transfer of more complete voter contact information, the rule removed another obstacle that had denied workers the opportunity to be more fully informed prior to voting on whether or not to form a union. The employer, of course, already has unfettered and unlimited access to communicate with employees, even on work time.

I also want to point out that the NLRB's election procedures are now settled law. Every court where this rule has been challenged has upheld the rule. The fifth circuit, for example, said that the Board "acted rationally and in furtherance of its congressional mandate in adopting the rule."

The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia held that "the Board engaged in comprehensive analysis of a multitude of issues relating to the need for and the propriety of the final rule."

Mr. Chairman, history has shown when workers' rights are respected, the economy benefits. Protecting workers' rights to make their voices heard helped build a strong middle class. Research shows that the 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 background information to find out how, indeed, they even represent themselves and communicate with their employees in relationship to a union that is well-versed in what they will do with their challenge in the lawyered-up situation that they have.

It discourages any comprehensive study by the employee—let me state that again—by the employee of what they are looking at with union representation or without.

Seven days for a businessperson 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 truly want our 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—the opportunity to make their case to workers fairly and expeditiously.

Prior to this case, in every case, employers would have access with ways to pester and bug employees at home, through their personal email, through their phone numbers. There was simply no way that there was any equality given to the case for union organizers to make. In fact, union organizers often had to try to find ways that they could reach to simply make the case to workers so that they can make a fair choice.

In addition, I find it ridiculous that this is called, by those on the other side, an ambush when, in fact, the only ambush is when they ambush the right of workers to organize by drawing out the election process to months and years, often beyond when many of the employees involved are even at the same employer because of the adverse working conditions that could have led them to organize in the first place.

This rule was done through a multi-stakeholder process. There was a lot input from all sides, and it was a very

thoughtful rule that gave a level playing field to ensure that workers, should they desire to organize, had a reasonable calendar for doing so and a reasonable way of reaching other workers to tell them the benefits of organizing, just as the company was telling them the downside.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to reject this amendment which throws out a very thoughtful rule that levels the playing field in labor relations.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ARRINGTON). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 174 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 174 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. Each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the 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 marker this week.

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. We 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. 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. 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 dangers we face in terms of 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 want 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 them. So far, 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 do 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 yield 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.

□ 2100

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 \$20 trillion in debt. We are staring that in the face.

How do you look at your children and grandchildren and say, "That is okay. That is okay. Paying for \$20 trillion worth of debt is easy"?

The answer is you don't, because it is not.

What it takes to address it is will. It takes resolve. It takes cutting back more than you have cut back before and examining 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 under-

lying 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 biomedical research grants, and cuts to public health emergency response. The list goes on and on.

Investment is what we need to help build and strengthen our middle class, and this amendment threatens that.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge Members to oppose this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 175 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY
OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 175 printed in House Report 115-297.

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 "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. 280h-6) there is hereby appropriated, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Health Resources and Services Administration—Program Management" 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, 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 Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis 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 suffers from 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 for a few.

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 among children, suicide rates are climbing. In fact, over the last 20 years, suicide rates have climbed overall in this country. But, tragically and alarmingly, they have grown a great deal among children.

How do we tell families of children who have completed a suicide or attempted a suicide that we couldn't come up with the money for this, and, instead, we thought other programs were more important?

This money comes from the existing programming budget. It does not take away from vital programs. But I want you to know that there has been a 54 percent increase of suicides among children under age 12. Thirty-seven percent of those child suicides are Black children. The rate among African-American children ages 5 to 11 has doubled over the last decade.

This provides critically important services for children. It appears that schools are the most important place where treatment can take place. Only 23 percent of prekindergarten programs have onsite or scheduled visits from psychiatrists and psychologists, according to the Child Mind Institute.

The current workforce consists of approximately 7,500 child and adolescent psychiatrists. We need 32,000. Eighty-five percent of all psychotropic medications for children are written by primary care practitioners, not psychiatrists, so we end up with serious problems here as suicides grow and as mental health problems grow. This small amount of money is taken from existing funds, not from any other programs, to make sure we are providing services for these children.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to, again, thank my good friend for, as he always does, raising important issues, and I appreciate his bringing attention to the mental health of children.

The amendment offered—and this is an important point I think many Members in this body don't think about—is actually for a newly authorized program that has not received funding in the past, and our committee actually has a smaller allocation than it had last year. I think most of the public 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 comes 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 penny of that has moved in. They found a way to fund it. But we can end up in a situation where you just simply pile on authorizations and send us less money and think we will somehow work it out. Sometimes we do. 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 we have been able to do that, but we can't do it everywhere.

I want to tell my friend that, while I oppose the amendment, I am certainly going to work with him. Actually, I asked him not too long ago to give me the one thing that is the most important thing, and he mentioned the lack of trained and qualified personnel, that we could have a lot of programs, but until we had a bigger pool of people capable of rendering the services, then we simply are going to be moving from program to program. I think that was a very good point, and it is why I accepted my friend's amendment for \$10 million to begin to do that. That is another area. I think we have to pick a few pressure points here.

I agree with what my friend is offering here in terms of the need for emphasis. We just simply have to work harder either getting the funds or finding other places to take the funds from.

So while I oppose the amendment, I want to be very clear that I intend to work with my friend going forward.

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, let me add to this. Yes, there was money in the Cures bill for opioid abuse for 59,000 people who had died from drug overdoses, but 350,000 people will die this year related to mental health problems.

I want to make sure that Congress is not, once again, in a situation where

we are having another moment of silence for some suicide, for some child or young adult that got violent and shot someone or ran their car into a crowd, or something else. We have got to start putting money into these programs. Five million dollars barely scratches the surface, but it is like that old adage of the man who came across a child throwing a starfish back in the ocean. The person said: "You can never take care of all of them." But the child said: "It will make a difference for this one."

This will make a difference to a few children.

How do we explain this to a parent whose child is suffering, who can't get services, that what we have is we couldn't transfer money within an existing account, it doesn't add any more, and it doesn't eradicate any programs, but it is something there especially at a time when this is so life threatening?

You can't explain that to a mom or a dad.

During all the time in the course of working this bill, we heard from thousands of people telling their horrific and sad stories. I spent the last 42 years of my life working as a psychologist. I have seen the faces of those who have gone to the funerals and seen those wasting away in prisons. I do ask that this amendment be adopted.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the 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 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 are here tonight and why this \$5 million for mental health programs is not included in this Labor-HHS bill under consideration.

The reason is because this bill is being cut by \$5 billion from FY17 levels. This is the end result that we get when the majority's efforts to slash nondefense spending come to fruition. We are forced to choose between life-saving programs, such as mental health and substance abuse programs, and programs that invest in our future, like early childhood education or job training.

We ought to be negotiating a bipartisan budget deal to lift the sequestration caps on both defense and non-defense programs. Then we could begin working on a bipartisan base that will allow us to adequately fund mental health and substance abuse prevention.

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

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. 176 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 176 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ For "Health Resources and Services Administration—Maternal and Child Health" for carrying out the Pediatric Mental Health Care Access grant program, as authorized by section 330M of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-19), there is hereby appropriated, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Health Resources and Services Administration—Program Management" is hereby reduced by, \$9,000,000.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this amendment increases access to pediatric mental healthcare by providing \$9 million in grants to improve access to behavioral integration and pediatric primary care.

I thank the chairman of the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee for his agreement to our other amendment to boost the 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.

□ 2115

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 24, this is the critical period in the life of someone who is developing serious mental illness to have care. We can no longer just say that we are going to let pediatricians be the primary providers for mental illness treatment when that is something that they do not have the specialty and training.

The number of psychiatrists there to treat children is declining relative to the needs. The problems among children, as I mentioned previously, continue to go up.

I might also add here that this does not reduce any spending among the critical funded and authorized programs within SAMHSA.

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 using it for evidence-based 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 inner 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's lives?

It makes no sense to me.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, once again, I agree with my friend on the basic point, but this, too, is a program that was authorized with no funding.

The things we got funding for in the 21st Century Cures Act, we funded to the penny. Frankly, things 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 just mentioned are from programs that were authorized by non-appropriations committees. We don't create the programs.

That is where my friends, frankly, on the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Ways and Means Committee need to spend some time. They need to spend some time deauthorizing certain programs that continue.

Again, I will work with my friend if our allocation changes or we can find 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 we 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.

My friend'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 that care.

What we can do and what my colleague from Oklahoma said is we need to cut some things. One of them is stop the ridiculous wasteful spending at SAMHSA. If they can fund \$400,000 websites and 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. 178 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 178 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 establishing and operating the National Mental Health and Substance Use Policy Laboratory, as authorized by section 501A of the Public Health Service Act (42

U.S.C. 290aa-0), 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 want to restate the problems that exist at SAMHSA.

The General Accounting Office, during the multiyear investigation of the subcommittee which I chair, the Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, came back and said that 80 percent of the grants for SAMHSA are not evidence-based. There is a serious problem in that agency.

Instead, they funded absurd programs, such as making fruit smoothies; and a \$400,000 website for toddlers to sing-along songs, which they told us was about prevention.

We asked: What are you preventing?

They said: We will get back to you on that.

They also had workshops on getting in touch with your inner animal, making masks and collages; interpretive dancing; a website and crisis line for people in the New England area when they had heavy a snowfall so they could call in.

They have workshops on how to tell people to get off their medications. They had a \$25,000 oil painting for their office, which graces their hall, of people sitting on a rock, which gives them mental health awareness. I might add, the only thing I am aware of is a total waste of money. And, of course, an alternative conference, which continues this year as well, spending, I think, \$150,000 or so to hold their conference at the luxurious Boston Park Plaza Hotel.

I don't want to hear from that agency that they don't have money. This particular program redirects them so they get reset in terms of evidence-based care. It forms a panel of people with expertise in medical psychiatric areas, including consumers.

It is there to provide direction and guidance for an agency that has been without direction and guidance. It is there to make sure that we redirect the way SAMHSA is going so that it gets in the area of really treating mental illness.

Let me say this—let me use the words of Dr. Elinore McCance-Katz, the current Assistant Secretary of Mental Health and, therefore, the de facto head of SAMHSA.

She said: ". . . SAMHSA does not address the treatment needs of the most vulnerable in our society. Rather, the unit within SAMHSA charged with addressing these disorders, the Center for Mental Health Services, chooses to focus on its own definition of 'recovery,' which generally ignores the treatment of mental disorders, and, as a

major initiative under 'recovery' services, focuses on the development of a 'peer workforce.'

"There is a perceptible hostility toward psychiatric medicine: a resistance to addressing the treatment needs of those with serious mental illness and a questioning by some at SAMHSA as to whether mental disorders even exist."

For example, they state that psychosis is just a different way of thinking for some experiencing stress. They also focus on activities that don't directly assist those who have serious mental illness.

She adds that: "Significant dollars are spent on hotlines for callers who may be experiencing suicidal thinking. . . ."

But I might add that during this whole time, while death rates decline for heart disease, lung disease, AIDS, and accidental deaths, et cetera, they went way up for suicide. They increased steadily for substance abuse.

It is a failed agency, along those lines.

She says that there are pressing needs, but nowhere in SAMHSA's strategic initiatives do they even address psychiatric treatment of mental illness as a priority.

I know we have to change this. I would like to ask of my dear friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, is there a way we can talk more about this and address this in the future to see that this is addressed adequately?

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding and for his excellent work in this area.

Yes, we would look forward to that. Frankly, we have pretty regular exchanges with a lot of the committees under our jurisdiction where they have done the hard work of authorizing an investigation. That can be used to guide appropriations.

So I look forward to working with my friend to make sure we can eliminate the type of abuses that he is talking about and redirect funds where they need to go for the care of patients.

I thank my friend for his work and his kind words, and I certainly pledge that I will work with him going forward, as I have in the past.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Reclaiming my time, knowing that when my friend says something, I consider that a bond.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 179 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 179 printed 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 520F of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb-37), 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, \$10,000,000.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is the last of my amendments on this. Although this House overwhelmingly passed the authorization for these, as did the Senate, money was not allocated towards it.

While I understand there is a priority to treat substance abuse, but even with that, many times there is nowhere for someone to go.

Back in the 1950s, we had over half a million psychiatric hospital beds in this country. I think at the time the population of the United State 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.

□ 2130

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 for a psychiatric bed and nothing opens up.

I thought when Dorothea Dix said let's close down the jail concept, that

was prevalent in our country back then, let's have nice hospitals for them. Historically, they said that was a good move, but what happened is these psych beds closed down starting widely in the 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 have not kept that 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 to find a bed for someone, which may be an hour or two drive away, there is no place for them.

Surely, we understand the idea: Do we continue to put these folks in hospitals and jail cells? Do we dump them back in the street and let them be the forgotten homeless whom we walk over? Do we send them back home and risk further harm to them? Do we have them tied to a gurney and given a chemical sedation, a chemical straight-jacket to wait until something opens up?

What this amendment does is it is \$10 million in grants to develop and maintain or enhance the database of inpatient psychiatric facilities and crisis stabilization units so we can begin to address this bed shortage. Rather than lead people away from care, this is a way of helping hospitals get that care and instill States to put together programs to speed this up.

We still have to work with CMS to create more beds and stop some of the ridiculous rules that they have in there, but what do we continue to tell the mentally ill? "We will get around to it"? "We couldn't do it this time"? "Good luck"? "I am sorry your son died"?

When does this end? Will we hear more excuses that we can't do anything about it because we had a \$5 billion cut? What do we do with Americans who are dying from this over and over?

Thomas Jefferson once said: "I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, that His justice cannot

sleep forever." We have a chance to make a difference in the justice for the mentally ill, or will we once again turn a blind eye and say we can do nothing?

Mr. Chairman, I ask that Members vote for this amendment to try and save some lives.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in the order to consider amendment No. 180 printed in House Report 115-297.

AMENDMENT NO. 182 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 182 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ For "Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration—Substance Abuse Treatment" for the Controlled Substance Monitoring Program, as authorized by section 3990 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-3), there is hereby appropriated, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Office of the Secretary—General Departmental Management" is hereby reduced by, \$10,000,000.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chair, tonight I am proud to introduce an amendment that will fully fund the National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reporting program, colloquially known as NASPER. NASPER has long provided us with an opportunity to help prevent the spread of opioids across the country; however, until now, we have not funded it.

NASPER funding supports the development and maintenance of a State-run prescription drug monitoring program. These prescription drug monitoring programs allow for doctors and pharmacists to electronically interconnect with one when prescribing opioids, allowing for the providers to confer and ensure that the patient is not receiving a duplicate opioid prescription that the patient may then divert or sell.

Prescription drug monitoring programs work because they engage providers and they successfully prevent individuals from exploiting weaknesses in the healthcare system.

During any epidemic, it is important to first help those in need and provide support to individuals and first responders who were impacted 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 epidemic, we must commit resources to programs that will promote prevention and encourage safer prescribing of prescription drugs.

As the subcommittee chairman for the authorizing committee that has been tasked with the public health response to a crisis that claimed more than 60,000 American lives last year, I am committed to further working to oversee the implementation of our initial response efforts and to develop any supplemental responses that may be needed to prevent future unnecessary deaths.

I encourage my colleagues to take this opportunity to support the work of the Subcommittee on Health on the Energy and Commerce Committee in authorizing this and allow Congress to approve funding for NASPER.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 183 printed in House report 115–297.

AMENDMENT NO. 184 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 184 printed in House Report 115–297.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The 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. _____. No funds made available by this Act may be used to undertake any activities to prepare for or facilitate the transfer of responsibilities or functions from the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs of the Department of Labor to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, this amendment would prohibit the use of funds in this act to prepare for or facilitate the transfer of the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs into the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

The amendment would ensure that these two important agencies charged with distinct missions to enforce workplace discrimination laws are not unduly burdened by the administration's plan to transfer responsibilities of Contract Compliance into the EEOC.

Although both agencies enforce discrimination laws, they differ in their authorities, their scope, and their responsibilities. For example, Contract Compliance only addresses discrimination by Federal contractors, unlike the EEOC, which enforces the laws as they relate to virtually all employees.

Contract Compliance is responsible for ensuring that the Federal contractors and subcontractors take affirmative action to ensure that all individuals have equal opportunity for employment. EEOC was created by title VII of the Civil Rights Act, and its support for affirmative action is voluntary.

Contract Compliance, the focus is on contract compliance, and the ultimate sanction is disbarment of a Federal contractor. It gets its authority through an executive order and accomplishes much of its enforcement through the administrative process. By contrast, EEOC is established by statute and makes and enforces Federal statutes through lawsuits in Federal courts. Other distinctions:

The ultimate client for Contract Compliance is the Federal Government, while EEOC's clients are private employees;

EEOC is complaint driven, unlike the Office of Federal Contract Compliance; Contract Compliance can audit contractors, EEOC cannot;

EEOC has subpoena power, Contract Compliance does not;

Contract Compliance does not have the authority to file lawsuits and get punitive damages, EEOC can seek punitive damages and lawsuits;

Contract Compliance enforces the Vietnam Era Veterans' Readjustment Act, the EEOC does not;

EEOC protects employees from genetic discrimination, Contract Compliance does not.

The proposal to transfer the Office of Federal Contract Compliance into the EEOC came about by some ideological groups that want to shrink the Federal Government, but it is unwise because it is opposed by civil rights groups and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

To underscore the collective voice and opposition to this transfer, the Senate Committee on Appropriations adopted language last Thursday that says that the committee rejects the budget's proposal to begin plans to merge the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs with the EEOC.

Mr. Chair, the realignment of responsibilities would ask the EEOC to do considerably more with a lot less in terms of expertise, personnel, and funding. Further, this combination would derail the EEOC's efforts to reduce its backlog of charges while simultaneously trying to collect vital data rel-

evant to the enforcement of civil rights laws.

The enforcement of civil rights laws would be best served if we in Congress would fully fund both the EEOC and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance so that they both can do the vital work of securing the right to work in a place free of harassment, retaliation, and other forms of discrimination.

For these reasons, I ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 186 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 186 printed in House Report 115–297.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. 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 "Fair Labor Standards Act" and such disposition is listed as "willful" or "repeated".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

□ 2145

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. If you have a contract doing business with the Federal Government, if in your disclosures you have been found designated to have violations of the Federal Labor Relations Act, and those violations are considered to be willful, intentional, and repeated, then you will not be able to take advantage of this particular appropriation.

This kind of amendment is designed to say that the Federal Government believes that a penny earned and a penny worked should be received by the worker. It is as simple as that.

People who do not support this amendment are saying that Federal contractors can engage in wage theft and it is okay with us. And we are simply saying that the hardworking people in the United States expect that the Federal penny that workers earn will be given to them, and that is not too much to ask.

Hardworking people living in America should never worry that an employer will steal their wages, especially if that employer is paid by 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 profiteer off of their employees by letting them keep their government contracts.

If passed, my amendment will ensure that a business that willfully and repeatedly violates the Fair Labor Standards Act cannot apply for a Federal Government contract until they clean up their act. To be clear, my amendment would not punish a single accidental violation.

If my colleagues across the aisle won't make corporations pay their fair share of their taxes, I hope that they will at least join me in going after employers who refuse to pay taxpayer money to line their pockets by cheating employees repeatedly, and on purpose. This is not a small thing. This is real money out of real people's pockets.

The Economic Policy Institute found that low-wage workers in just the ten most popular States—California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, and others—lose \$8 billion in wages due to wage theft each year.

For example, the corporation General Dynamics Information Technology owns a number of call centers that serve Federal contracts. In the last 10 years, they have agreed to pay \$412,000 in back wages to 921 employees for Fair Labor Standards Act violations. Immigrants and residents of low-income communities are often at the greatest risk for abuse at the hands of employers who do wage theft.

The government should be doing everything it can to protect workers from intimidation and stolen wages. If this amendment passes, companies like General Dynamics Information Technology won't be able to continue to do what they have been doing. They will have to be fair to people, at least after they clean up their act.

We have to demand higher standards, Mr. Chairman. Respecting a fair day's pay for a fair day's work is an American value.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I 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 withdrawn.

There are existing requirements for reporting and addressing violations of labor laws by Federal contractors. In-

deed, hundreds of companies every year are barred from doing business with the Federal Government.

While bad actors certainly should face consequences, I believe blanket prohibitions circumvent proper administrative review under the existing procedures. Agencies already have many requirements related to the award of Federal contracts, and imposing a new across-the-board requirement, in my view, is not the right approach to address this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and I urge its rejection.

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, we know that there are a lot of contractors who have significant wage violations. It should be a privilege to contract with the Federal Government. Taxpayers should not be asked to subsidize companies that engage in willful and repeated wage theft.

This amendment only applies to contractors with repeated willful violations, not technical violations that could result from good faith difference in interpretation of rules and regulations—willful and repeated.

Awarding contracts to those kind of contractors is not only unfair to workers, it is unfair to law-abiding contractors who play by the rules but are forced to compete on an unlevel playing field with those who cut corners.

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

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
Washington, DC, September 7, 2017.

VOTE YES ON AMENDMENTS NO. 113, NO. 184, AND NO. 186 TO H.R. 3354, THE MAKE AMERICA 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 Employer Information Report (EEO-1). Amendment No. 113, offered by Representatives DeLauro, Frankel, and Scott to the FY18 CJS appropriations bill, would preserve funding for that critical equal pay initiative.

The data collection at issue, through the EEO-1 that employers already must use to document the demographics of their workforces, is a critical tool to lift the cloak of secrecy that shrouds pay decisions in this country. Without such transparency, the

pernicious gender and race wage gaps, and the discrimination that causes them, will continue to flourish. The new EEO-1 revision was adopted after extensive public comment and would have deterred intentional pay disparities, facilitated employers' good faith efforts to comply with equal pay laws, and identified appropriate targets for federal enforcement of nondiscrimination law.

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 ordered a review and requested that the EEOC undertake a new effort, the Harris amendment could unnecessarily tie the agency's hands. Members should vote in favor of the DeLauro-Frankel-Scott amendment in order to preserve the ability of the EEOC to continue to make meaningful progress on equal pay. A vote against this amendment is a vote against equal pay.

2. AMENDMENT NO. 184 (NO FUNDING TO ELIMINATE OFCCP AND TRANSFER DUTIES TO EEOC)

The Trump administration's FY2018 budget submission to Congress recommended the elimination of the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) and the transfer of its functions to the EEOC. This amendment, offered by Representatives Conyers and Scott 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 remedy complaints of discrimination in employment. The OFCCP more broadly oversees the employment practices of federal contractors who are required to proactively monitor workplace diversity and pay equity, make meaningful efforts to recruit qualified applicants from under-represented groups, and eliminate barriers to equal opportunity for various disadvantaged groups, including veterans and individuals with disabilities. The administration's proposal would jeopardize the uniquely important missions of each agency and weakens our government's ability to effectively enforce our nation's civil rights laws. It would also place an extraordinary burden on the EEOC which already has an excessive workload and a well-known backlog. Finally, numerous organizations that work with these agencies—from civil rights, women's rights, and workers' rights groups along with business groups such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—oppose the administration's proposal.

For these reasons, we urge members of the House to support Amendment No. 184 that would prevent the elimination of OFCCP.

3. AMENDMENT NO. 186 (NO FUNDING TO FEDERAL CONTRACTORS WHO REPEATEDLY AND WILLFULLY VIOLATE FLSA)

This amendment, offered by Representatives Ellison, Grijalva and Pocan to the FY18 Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill, would ensure that no federal contracts 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.

Should you have any questions, please contact Vania Leveille.

Sincerely,

FAIZ SHAKIR,
Director, Washington
Legislative Office.
VANIA LEVEILLE,
Senior Legislative
Counsel.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment, and I urge its adoption.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 187 OFFERED BY MR. GIBBS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 187 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the final regulations on "Improve Tracking of Workplace Injuries and Illnesses" published by the Department of Labor in the Federal Register on May 12, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 29624 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 personally identifiable information for those injured on the job.

Additionally, a provision in the final rule declaring automatic postaccident drug testing is now considered an unreasonable procedure, a provision that conflicts with multiple 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 gentleman 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 longstanding requirements that certain employers in high-risk industries submit summary injury and illness data to OSHA, which now must be done electronically. And, third, it requires large employers in high-risk injuries to submit more detailed injury and illness data to OSHA.

These are critical protections for workers. They should not be overturned.

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, employers will still be required to keep this information on record. Any OSHA inspector can come in and inspect those records. So the idea that there is no documentation of any workplace injuries or illnesses is still there.

The problem here is that it is put on a website, that could have issues with FOIA requests, also publicly available. Businesses will be forced to sensitive

information and confidential information that will be public information that risks the identity of many employees out there.

OSHA has historically recognized the sensitive nature of this data and sought to protect this 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 reduce 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 and work injuries.

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), my friend, the distinguished ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, which blocks OSHA's ability to improve tracking of injuries and illnesses in workplaces across the country.

One of the problems we have is that Federal OSHA and State OSHA plans have less than 2,000 inspectors to cover 8 million workplaces nationally. If you do the arithmetic, each Federal OSHA inspector can inspect a workplace about once every 159 years. State OSHA might be able to do it once a century. So the fact that you have something on site that is there for them to see if they ever get there, the problem is they never get there.

We need to make sure they have the information to know which ones to go to, which ones are the dangerous sites. The scarce resources that OSHA needs to precisely target those resources is a result of these reports. For large employers, and each illness with summary information from smaller employers, that is how they figure out where to visit.

This rule also protects workers against discrimination if they report injuries. GAO has found that workers fear reporting injuries, especially where employers impose sanctions or reduce bonuses for work-related injuries.

This amendment would upend this important rule which allows OSHA to target their resources to inspect those that really need inspecting. This amendment would upend the rule and compromise its transparency and worker protections.

The information is not individually identifiable. People are protected. But

the courts have said that this information is not confidential.

This amendment would rig the system against worker safety by depriving OSHA of the information they need to target the workplaces, so I request a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask support of my amendment to make sure that we protect the private health records of our employees at the work site and any illnesses that they might have. I don't think we should risk that.

As I said earlier, I think OSHA inspectors have the ability to come in and inspect those records on the workplace site. Putting it out on the internet doesn't make a lot of sense.

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

□ 2200

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.

SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS PROGRAM

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to highlight the impor-

tance 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 that rely on that 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 common-sense forest management for a myriad of reasons: again, forest health, school funding, jobs, all the things that make sense for the West. We need to pass Secure Rural Schools funding.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CURBELO of Florida (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of assisting his family and constituents in recovery efforts from Hurricane Irma.

Mr. MARINO (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of personal reasons.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1311. An act to provide assistance in abolishing human trafficking in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary; in addition, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and to the Committee on Homeland Security 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.

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 truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

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

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on September 11, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 13, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2461. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service; Livestock, Poultry, and Seed Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rules of Practice Governing Formal Adjudicatory Proceedings Instituted by the Secretary Under Various Statutes [Docket No.: AMS-LPS-16-0051] (RIN: 0581-AD58) received August 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2462. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Hass Avocados From Colombia [Docket No.: APHIS-2016-0022] (RIN: 0579-AE29) received August 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2463. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department of Defense Chemical Demilitarization Program Semi-Annual Report to Congress for September 2017, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1521(j); Public Law 99-145, Sec. 1412 (as amended by Public Law 112-239, Sec. 1421(a)); (126 Stat. 204); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2464. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Division of Regulatory Services, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Teacher Preparation Issues [Docket ID: ED-2014-OPE-0057] (RIN: 1840-

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 Education and the Workforce.

2465. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2016 Annual Progress Report to Congress on the C.W. Bill Young Cell Transplantation Program and National Cord Blood Inventory Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 274k(a)(6); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title III, Sec. 379 (as amended by Public Law 109-129, Sec. 3(a)); (119 Stat. 2554); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2466. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2016 Report on the Preventive Medicine and Public Health Training Grant Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 295c(d); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title VII, Sec. 768(d) (as amended by Public Law 111-148, Sec. 10501(m)); (124 Stat. 1002); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2467. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the NURSE Corps Loan Repayment and Scholarship Programs Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2016, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 297n(h); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title VIII, Sec. 846(h) (as amended by Public Law 107-205, Sec. 103(d)); (116 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2468. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "Pre-market Approval of Pediatric Uses of Devices — FY 2016", pursuant to Sec. 302 of the Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act of September 27, 2007; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2469. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a mandate from the Accountability Review Board concerning the May 31, 2017 attack in Kabul, Afghanistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2470. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-45, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2471. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting five (5) notifications of a federal vacancy, designation of acting officer, nomination, or action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2472. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting three notifications of an action on a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2473. A letter from the Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Waiver of Passport and Visa Requirements Due to an Unforeseen Emergency [USCBP-2016-0006] (RIN: 1651-AA97) received August 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2474. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Depart-

ment's report to Congress entitled, "Assistance Provided to Foreign Aviation Authorities for FY 2016", pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 40113(e)(4); Public Law 103-272, Sec. 1(e) (as amended by Public Law 112-95, Sec. 207); (126 Stat. 39); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2475. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; SOCAT Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0417; Directorate Identifier 2017-CE-008-AD; Amendment 39-18975; AD 2017-15-15] (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.

2476. 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-NM-076-AD; Amendment 39-18970; AD 2017-15-10] (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.

2477. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0330; Directorate Identifier 2017-NM-016-AD; Amendment 39-18972; AD 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.

2478. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (Embraer) [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0250; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-158-AD; Amendment 39-18976; AD 2017-15-16] (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.

2479. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0640; Directorate Identifier 2017-CE-020-AD; Amendment 39-18969; AD 2017-15-09] (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.

2480. 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-2017-0331; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-213-AD; Amendment 39-18971; AD 2017-15-11] (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.

2481. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., (Type Certificate Previously Held by Canadair Limited) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0333; Directorate Identifier 2017-NM-005-AD; Amendment 39-18974; AD 2017-15-14] (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.

2482. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9055; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-071-AD; Amendment 39-18977; AD 2017-15-17] (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.

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-2017-0142; Product Identifier 2016-SW-013-AD; Amendment 39-18979; AD 2017-16-02] (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; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0664; Directorate Identifier 2016-SW-073-AD; Amendment 39-18947; AD 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.

2485. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0395; Directorate Identifier 2017-CE-011-AD; Amendment 39-18966; AD 2017-15-06] (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.

2486. 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-2016-9304; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-028-AD; Amendment 39-18959; AD 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.

2487. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Lycoming Engines Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0788; Product Identifier 2017-NE-27-AD; Amendment 39-18988; AD 2017-16-11] (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-CE-023-AD; Amendment 39-18980; AD 2017-16-03] (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.

2489. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31143; Amdt. No.: 3755] received August 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2490. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31144; 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 [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0355; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-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.

2492. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Texas Towns; Pampa, TX and Seminole, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0185; Airspace Doc. No.: 17-ASW-6] received August 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2493. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, and Amendment of Class E Airspace; St. George, UT [Docket No.: FAA-2016-8162; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-12] received August 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2494. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0699; Directorate Identifier 2017-NM-004-AD; Amendment 39-18968; AD 2017-15-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2495. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9052; Product Identifier 2016-NM-080-AD; Amendment 39-18983; AD 2017-16-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2496. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0335; Product Identifier 2017-NM-025-AD; Amendment 39-18994; AD 2017-17-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2497. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of correct liability (Rev. Proc. 2017-44) received August 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2498. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — General Arbitrage Rebate Rules (Rev. Proc. 2017-50) 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.

2499. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — National Average Bronze Plan Premium (Rev. Proc. 2017-48) (RP 128677-16) 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 305 Treatments of Elective Dividends by Publicly Offered REITs and RICs (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 Information Sharing Act of 2015" for Fiscal Year 2016, pursuant to 6 U.S.C. 1506(a)(1); Public Law 114-113, Sec. 107(a)(1); (29 Stat. 2951); 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. 2582. A bill to authorize the State of Utah to select certain lands that are available for disposal under the Pony Express Resource Management Plan to be used for the support and benefit of State institutions, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1624. A bill to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to treat certain municipal obligations as level 2A liquid assets, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 115-306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 513. Resolution 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 (Rept. 115-307). Referred to the House Calendar.

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]

H.R. 3017. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than October 13, 2017.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 3737. A bill to provide for a study on the use of social media in security clearance investigations; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 3738. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to remove certain limitations with respect to commodity assistance for school breakfast programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia:

H.R. 3739. A bill to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the "Former Presidents Act of 1958", with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 3740. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the financial aid process for homeless children and youths and foster care children and youth; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By 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. 3741. A bill to codify the Minority Bank Deposit Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 3742. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide formula grants to States to improve higher education opportunities for foster youth and homeless youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ:

H.R. 3743. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations to ensure airfare fairness in the wake of a disaster or emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 3744. A bill to provide that an Indian group may receive Federal acknowledgment as an Indian tribe only by an Act of Congress; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 3745. A bill to amend the Fair Housing Act to establish that certain conduct, in or around a dwelling, shall be considered to be severe or pervasive for purposes of determining whether a certain type of sexual harassment has occurred under that Act, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself and Ms. MOORE):

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. GOTTHEIMER (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. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. KIHUEN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. HECK):

H.R. 3748. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an option for individuals who are ages 50 to 64 to buy into Medicare, to provide for health 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. MEEKS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. LEE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JEFFRIES, 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. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico):

H.R. 3750. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to facilitate the commer-

cialization 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 Committee 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. LANGEVIN):

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 for Federal office, to make 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 Secretary of Veterans Affairs 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 an Open Society with Security; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. MEEKS (for himself, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LEE, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. EVANS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VELA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. MOULTON):

H. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution denouncing and opposing the violence, xenophobia, and bigotry that are promoted by White nationalists and neo-Nazis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution 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 President . . . "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 Departments."), Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 ("The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposes, and Excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States. . . ."), and 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 foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.").

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 3738.

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. 3739.

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 foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in this Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, United States Constitution

By Mr. MEEKS:

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 subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 3743.

Congress has the power to enact this 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 Officer 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).

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 3747.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York:

H.R. 3748.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 allows Congress to make all laws “which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution” any “other” powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States.

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 3749.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3750.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, located at section 8, clause 18.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 3751.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 4

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 3752.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Clause 8

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3753.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 1 of article I, and clause 18, section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 36: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.

H.R. 38: Mr. DAVIDSON and Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 232: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 284: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 299: Mr. ESTES of Kansas.
H.R. 365: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 463: Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 489: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 490: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 535: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 539: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 548: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 604: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 632: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 644: Mr. DAVIDSON and Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 662: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 681: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 696: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 721: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 741: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 747: Mr. McEACHIN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Ms. BARRAGAN.
H.R. 750: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 754: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 758: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 785: Mr. BERGMAN and Mr. BUCK.

H.R. 807: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 812: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 815: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 820: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 822: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 874: Mr. MOULTON and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 895: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 936: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LANCE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 986: Mr. GIANFORTE.

H.R. 1002: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 1017: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. AGULLAR, Ms. MENG, Mr. COLE, Mr. BOST, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1057: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. ESTES of Kansas.

H.R. 1098: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1136: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 1144: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1148: Mr. REED and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1155: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1164: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. JONES, and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 1261: Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 1300: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1368: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1384: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 1406: Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 1409: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1456: Ms. SANCHEZ and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 1468: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 1477: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1539: Mr. POCAN, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1542: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 1589: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1606: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 1661: Mr. KIND, Mr. COOK, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1676: Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. BASS, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1730: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1802: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 1861: Ms. NORTON and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1864: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1898: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 1899: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 1987: Ms. MOORE and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 2092: Mr. BACON, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2130: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2142: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 2152: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 2198: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 2285: Mr. TONKO and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2290: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2306: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2309: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 2319: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 2327: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 2342: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2344: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 2358: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2405: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 2408: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2434: Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 2450: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 2452: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2465: Mr. EMMER, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 2482: Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 2519: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BROWN of

Maryland, Mr. STEWART, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. YOHO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 2545: Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 2589: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 2591: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 2663: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 2666: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2687: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 2690: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 2701: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2713: Mr. BARR and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 2723: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. YOHO, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 2733: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 2740: Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2790: Mr. VISLOSKEY.

H.R. 2797: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. KIHUEN.

H.R. 2801: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2809: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2832: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 2871: Mr. JONES, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 2890: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2902: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 2909: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. COLE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 2926: Mr. FASO, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 2942: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 2953: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MESSER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 2955: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 3053: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 3071: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 3117: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 3127: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 3128: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 3134: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 3148: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 3153: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 3170: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 3179: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 3263: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 3274: Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TURNER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 3275: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 3282: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 3304: Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BASS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 3311: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 3329: Mr. GARRETT and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 3361: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3380: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 3394: Ms. PINGREE and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 3395: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 3403: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3409: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HUIZENGA, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 3441: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. PALMER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 3497: Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. YOHO, Mr. JONES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 3513: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 3549: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 3570: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 3591: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3640: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 3666: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 3673: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 3674: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 3688: Mr. BACON and Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 3697: Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 3699: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 3710: Mr. SERRANO and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3731: Mr. KING of New York.

H.J. Res. 48: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H. Res. 31: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H. Res. 161: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. LOESACK.

H. Res. 220: Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 443: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. POCAN.

H. Res. 466: Ms. TITUS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. LANCE.

H. Res. 467: Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 495: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr.

HASTINGS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 505: Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. POE of Texas.

H. Res. 507: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 3697 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.