nothing ''smarter'' in this bill about dealing with that terrible problem.

Of course, President Trump has told us it is going to be ''beautiful,'' but every time you turn around, he is cozying up with some pharmaceutical lobbyists that are raising prices and putting some of their people in charge of his drug agenda.

All that this motion does is to take the very modest step of reducing the possibility that, through further mergers of drug companies, we will see the sick and dying extorted even more than they are today with skyrocketing prices that are made even worse when these mergers occur.

If this motion passes, it won't kill the bill or slow it down a moment.

What it will do is to give life to an effort to contain these mergers and see that prescription prices don't soar even further. Yes, it is not the principal issue on drug prices. Unfortunately, there is no wonder drug to stop prescription price gouging, but this is one of the only ways to get the issue to the floor of this House because our Republican colleagues in every committee are determined to remain silent and see no action whatsoever.

I continue to hear from my neighbors back in Texas who care about this a lot more than my Republican colleagues. They tell me they cannot afford their prescriptions or they are burdened with immense debt to do it.

I think of Elaine in San Antonio, who has suffered with glaucoma for a number of years. She is fighting to save her eyesight, but now her copays on three different necessary drops are costing $400, $227, $178 per month. She says she wants to finish her senior years in dignity but is burdened down by these outrageous prices.

The choice should not be blindness or rent for a senior who has worked and saved all their lifetime.

Even in the face of the opioid epidemic, where we are about to hear about a whole lot of bills on the floor that don't do a whole lot, but in the face of that crisis, a devastating national public health emergency, the price of naloxone, a lifesaving overdose reversal drug, has been spiked by almost 600 percent.

Even an effective drug is 100 percent ineffective when it is unaffordable.

Too many drugs are ineffective for too many people because drug prices have soared at a rate of ten times the rate of inflation. But where some see a crisis like that, others see a revenue opportunity.

Brand name pharmaceutical manufacturers rely upon government-approved monopolies to charge monopoly prices, whatever they can get out of the sick and dying. They utilize as many maneuvers as possible to perpetuate their monopolies as long as possible while pouring their money, not into research and development of new drugs, but into lobbying this Congress and the administration.

Drug manufacturers spent $171 million last year in Federal lobbying, more than insurance, oil and gas, electronics, or any other industries. They had more lobbyists than we had Members of Congress. In fact, they could have a two-on-one defense to assure that this Congress is quiet, it is inactive, it is unresponsive to people.

Let's pass this motion and ensure that when the pharmaceutical companies use the $80 billion tax windfall, that they were just rewarded by the Republicans to pay for more mergers, that consumers don't get caught in the middle and see their prices spike even further.

We need to commit ourselves to action by approving this motion to recommit, to commit ourselves to putting consumers first over Big Pharma.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, this motion is unnecessary because this bill does nothing to undermine substantive antitrust enforcement. It might even hold up mergers that the court already found procompetitive and could help lower drug prices.

This is simply a dilatory tactic used by my friends on the other side of the aisle to hold up this important legislation.

For decades, American antitrust laws have been a shining example of how to protect against anticompetitive activities in a consistent, predictable, and fair manner.

Other countries have looked to our laws as the template for the creation of their own competition laws. Let us continue to be a model of proper antitrust enforcement.

The SMARTER Act is a commonsense process reform that ensures fairness and parity in the narrow field of merger reviews. The bill was recommended to Congress by a bipartisan commission and is supported by former top antitrust enforcement officials and past and present FTC Commissioners of both political parties.

Mr. Speaker, accordingly, I urge my colleagues to do the smart thing by opposing this bill and supporting the underlying bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

CITIZENS' RIGHT TO KNOW ACT OF 2018

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 872, I call up the bill (H.R. 2152) to require States and units of local government receiving funds under grant programs operated by the Department of Justice, which use such funds for pretrial services programs, to submit to the Attorney General a report relating to such program, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 872, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, is considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2152

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 ''Citizens' Right to Know Act of 2018''.

SEC. 2. REPORTING REQUIREMENT FOR DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE GRANT RECIPIENTS USING FUNDS FOR PRETRIAL SERVICES PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year in which a State or unit of local government receives funds under any grant program operated by the Department of Justice, including the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance grant program under subpart I of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3750 et seq.), and which uses funds received under such program for a pretrial services program, the State or unit of local government shall submit to the Attorney General a report which contains the following:

(1) The name of each defendant participating in a pretrial release program administered by the pretrial services program, and whether, as applicable, each occasion on which such defendant failed to make an appearance.

(2) Information relating to any prior convictions of each defendant participating in the pretrial services program.

(3) The amount of money allocated for the pretrial services program.

(b) PUBLICATION REQUIREMENT.—Subject to any applicable confidentiality requirements, the Attorney General shall, on an annual basis, make publicly available the information received under subsection (a).

(c) REDUCTION IN FUNDING.—The Attorney General shall, for State or unit of local government which fails to comply with the requirement under subsection (a) for a fiscal year, reduce the amount that the State or local government would otherwise receive under each grant program described in subsection (a) in the following fiscal year by 100 percent.

(d) REALLOCATION.—Amounts not allocated to a State or unit of local government under subsection (c) shall be reallocated under each such grant program to States and units of local government that comply with the requirement under subsection (a).

(e) DEFINITION.—The term ''failed to make an appearance'' means an action whereby any defendant has been charged with an offense before a court and who is participating in a pretrial release program for which funds received under a

grant program referred to in subsection (a) are used as a condition of pretrial release—

(1) does not appear for any court date regarding such charge;

(2) does not appear for any one appointment with the pretrial services program; or

(3) does not appear for any post-release appearance the court may require.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. 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 H.R. 2152.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1430

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

I rise in support of H.R. 2152, the Citizens' Right to Know Act of 2018, introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

A little over 50 years ago, there were three pretrial options for defendants accused of a crime: they were released on their own recognizance, granted commercial bail, or remanded to custody.

When considering the options on whether to grant ROR, set a bail amount, or remand, the judge considers a number of factors, including the severity of the crime charged, the suspect's criminal record, the danger posed to the public if the suspect is released, and the suspect's ties to community, family, and employment. Commercial bail ensures the appearance of the defendant in court at no cost to the taxpayer.

The situation for defendants began to change in the 1960s. The first U.S. pretrial services program, the Manhattan Bail Project, was established in 1961. The Manhattan Bail Project was intended to help defendants who were financially unable to post the surety bond conditions set in New York City.

The program interviewed defendants to gather information on community ties to determine a defendant's likelihood to appear in court. Based on these interviews, low-risk individuals were recommended for release on their own recognizance or the defendant's promise to appear without financial obligation.

Unfortunately, over the last four decades, pretrial release programs have expanded well beyond their original scope and purpose. Today, there are over 300 pretrial release programs nationwide, whose participants routinely include violent and repeat offenders, many of whom are able to post a commercial bond and have done so in the past. In many instances, the Federal Government has become a major source of funding for pretrial release programs.

Currently, these pretrial release programs funded by the taxpayers are not required to report any information about the defendants released through their programs into the communities. Basic information on defendants is neither collected nor reported in any systematic fashion.

H.R. 2152 requires jurisdictions that receive grant money from the Department of Justice to operate a pretrial release program to report certain information concerning the defendants to the Attorney General.

The bill requires the jurisdiction to submit the criminal histories of the defendants and the number of times the defendant has failed to appear as ordered by the court. It also requires the Attorney General to make public the information the Department of Justice receives. In my mind, that isn't a whole lot to ask these jurisdictions.

In fact, this bill is beneficial because citizens have the right to know what types of defendants are being released prior to their trial. If a defendant has a long history of criminal behavior or frequent failures to appear in court, the community should know that. Likewise, residents should be aware if their community is running a successful pretrial services program where defendants are regularly making it to their court appearances.

Simply put, no matter what side of the bail or no-bail debate you find yourself on, you should support this bill. Information like this, in the hands of the public, is never a bad thing. It will also be helpful to those of us who make policy on these matters.

I want to thank Mr. POE for introducing this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2152.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I thank the ranking member of the committee, Mr. NADLER, and the chairman of the committee, Mr. GOODLATTE, who is now managing the bill; and I certainly acknowledge my fellow Texan and know that he has all good intentions on important legislation dealing with the question of safety and security.

H.R. 2152, unfortunately, has been noted possibly to have requirements that would undermine the privacy of those who participate in the program, who are disproportionately poor Americans, and discourages the use of pretrial service programs in communities across the country because of the punitive measures in this bill. I rise to oppose H.R. 2152 because it is flawed and needs to address the disparate treatment of poor Americans.

I believe the consideration of the issues underlying the bill is timely but, unfortunately, not directed in the right way. The House should examine pretrial services and bail issues with the goal of reforming our Nation's bail system, not for the purpose of protecting the use of money bail which is unfair to the indigent, unproductive, and expensive for American taxpayers.

In fact, in Harris County, we have a money bail system, and a Federal judge, Judge Lee Rosenthal, indicated that it was disproportionately unfair to poor constituents in the State of Texas and, particularly, Harris County. We have been working to come together and have an agreement in our local community on recognizance bonds for individuals who work, and put a certain criteria in.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you, we are as concerned about the safety and security of our constituents, but it would be inappropriate for us to enhance the commercial bond industry, which I certainly appreciate—they create jobs and they are businesses—in contrast to individuals who simply cannot afford a money bond.

In this instance, this bill would penalize those entities, those communities that use Federal funds for pretrial release programs if they don't provide all of this data. Now, it might be important to provide this data for someone who is particularly dangerous, but, Mr. Speaker, you know just like I do, those individuals do not get a bond.

So, as I indicated, the Citizens' Right to Know Act would require a State or local government that uses Justice Department grant funding to pay for pretrial services, which are important programs, to report, annually, certain information to the Department of Justice about defendants who participate in the pretrial services program.

The very fact that you are in the program is an indication, in most jurisdictions, that you are not a violent felon. You would hope that you are not a person accused of sex crimes, sex trafficking, human trafficking. Those are matters that can be fixed.

Information that will be required to be reported includes the name of each defendant participating in the pretrial release program and each occasion that the person failed to make an appearance, the record of prior convictions of each participant, and the amount of money allocated for the pretrial services program.

If a unit of government fails to comply with the reporting requirement, it would lose its entire funding under the relevant program for the following fiscal year, penalizing smaller communities, innocent communities that didn't have the wherewithal to provide all that data. Certainly, it would be better spent on making sure that they use the pretrial program efficiently and safely and secure.

The requirements in this bill largely mirror legislative initiatives being advanced by ALEC, the American Legislative Exchange Council, in the States, under the false guise of transparency.

Citizens have a right to know what their government is doing. I absolutely agree with that, and I support the reporting of information that will educate us as to what is taking place. As for H.R. 2152, however, I question whether the categories and information that must be reported under the bill are designed to do that or are adequate to tell us about the efficacy of these programs. In addition, the bill requires that this information be made publicly available by the Attorney General.

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the ACLU, NAACP, Human Rights Watch, and Color of Change have written to us opposing the bill and expressing concerns about this publication requirement and the harm to individuals resulting from a sharing of criminal records and personally identifying information. I share these concerns. The groups that I have named have been historic organizations that have dealt with the civil rights, civil liberties, privacy, and constitutional rights of Americans, no matter who they are.

Although the Judiciary Committee adopted an amendment to eliminate the reporting of arrest records of the participating defendants, I see no need to compile and make public information about prior convictions and the failures to appear in connection with identifier-specific defendants—maybe overall numbers, but this would be unnecessary and unproductive.

The main crux of what we should be about is that a pretrial program is a secure and safe program. The levels of a person who can participate should be utilized with guidelines, restrictions, and, certainly, local monitoring. But to penalize an organization, entity, a governmental entity trying to do its best and to be fair and balanced in the criminal justice system based on money bail is something that I would raise the question.

You can document, in Harris County, that we have had an enormously disproportionate impact on individuals with small offenses who have had to go no other route but either jail or money bail. They have no money bail. They are in jail. They could have a legitimate job. They could be a teacher.

We just had an incident with a mother who was placed in—she was, unfortunately, at least the allegations are, that she was driving, unfortunately, in a school zone and had a minute amount of marijuana. Whatever our positions are on that, she was sent to the Harris County jail, of course, lost her job. She was gainfully employed and is, obviously, distraught.

I hate to say it; her allegations are that she was raped in the Harris County jail, sad to say that. But the point is, just think if she could have been released on her own recognizance and/or a small amount in a pretrial release program. Not given that opportunity, she was taken in and, unfortunately, suffered these unfortunate consequences.

Members submitted amendments to the Rules Committee to address some of these concerns and also to encourage States to eliminate monetary bail, but none were made in order for consideration on the floor today. That is unusual, a closed rule on a Judiciary Committee bill that is the arm of decency as relates to decency, dignity, liberty, justice, and freedom.

Those are very important elements to the American people, and, certainly, the amendments should have been at least given consideration for the Representatives of the people of the United States in the people's House to debate these amendments. That was not the case, so we have a closed rule. I am baffled by that.

Instead of considering this bill, the House should be taking up legislation to encourage States to end the practice of requiring money bail, a practice that disparately impacts the poor and most vulnerable in our society.

For instance, I am a cosponsor of H.R. 1437, the No Money Bail Act of 2017, which would reduce Justice Department grant awards to States that do not eliminate money bail and would also eliminate bail at the Federal level. Instead of considering H.R. 2152, we should be advancing legislation such as H.R. 1437, or, minimally, both bills should on be on floor at the same time.

Again, this is no attempt to undermine how we secure our communities. I certainly take no backseat to the fact that our families, communities, police officers, and people in the criminal justice system should be protected, and those who have been given the benefit of a pretrial release should adhere to the rules that are there; but I can see no reason to be punitive to the local governmental entities as relates to not reporting names and all those details, including prior convictions, et cetera, et cetera.

What is the Federal Government going to do, say, if you have two prior convictions, you can't be in the pretrial release program? That is a local, State issue as opposed to a Federal issue, and what you are doing is connecting desperately needed criminal justice dollars from the Department of Justice to communities that may be trying to do their best.

With the version of H.R. 2152 that was reported out of the Judiciary Committee, we are not doing that, unfortunately. Therefore, I oppose the bill and hope that the House will soon take steps to do something about the real problem: our Nation's unjust money bail system.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for bringing this legislation to the floor.

I have several comments that I would like to make in response to my friend from Houston, Ms. JACKSON LEE, about this legislation and about what it is and, more importantly, what it is not.

I served 22 years on a criminal court in Houston, Texas, felony cases, saw about 25,000 people work their way through my court. Before that, I was a prosecutor for 8 years in State court. Mr. Speaker, I saw a lot of people charged with criminal conduct, and this legislation is necessary because of some problems that the system has created.

As the chairman pointed out, pretrial release is a relatively new concept in our justice system. When a person comes and is charged with a crime, generally speaking, in most jurisdictions, there are four ways in which that individual can be released until their day in court:

One way is to put up a cash bond, where they put up the cash to the sheriff's department sometimes, and after the case is over with, they get that cash back.

Another way is to go through a bonding agency where they pay a bonding agency a percentage and they, the bond company, are responsible for making sure the person appears in court. If they don't appear, the bonding company loses the entire bond money.

There is a personal recognizance bond, where an individual comes to court and tells the judge and promises: Judge, I will come back to court for my trial.

□ 1445

It is an agreement between the judge and the individual.

And then there is the pretrial release system.

The pretrial release system is similar to personal recognizance, except the person is supposed to be supervised by a government agency, usually called the pretrial release agency, that makes sure that that person abides by certain conditions, doesn't leave town, and that pretrial release agency is usually run by the local judiciary or the justice system like the county, four different ways.

This legislation deals only with the pretrial release programs in our Nation, the 300 pretrial release programs.

The Citizens Right to Know Act is really not reforming pretrial release, it is an accountability portion of pretrial release to let people know how the Federal money is being used to operate.

Each year, millions of dollars in Federal grant money goes to State and local pretrial release agencies to operate those programs. These programs allow the accused individual to be released and await trial, usually to stay in the jurisdiction.

However, some jurisdictions overuse the programs and release many repeat and dangerous individuals with no

oversight by anybody. They are just released into the community.

Some of these released individuals disappear from the justice system indefinitely. We don't know how many do because there is no reporting of people under the pretrial release program to the Federal Government when they receive Federal funds.

In many cases, repeat, violent, and hardened criminals participate. As a result, in jurisdictions across the country, taxpayers are literally bailing out individuals with a long criminal record on a new criminal offense.

All across America, terrible crimes are being committed by individuals who are bailed out on a pretrial release program because there is no accountability of the program.

This bill is an accountability bill. Who is being released? What types of cases are being released? How many people repeat a crime while they are out on pretrial release?

We don't know because those records are never kept. So if the taxpayers are going to fund pretrial release programs, as they should in local jurisdictions, let the pretrial release program report back to the Federal Government the results of the program. Is it working? Is it not working? That is what we need to know, and we have no idea today.

It doesn't have anything to do with determining who is released on pretrial release, it just wants these organizations to report back to the Federal Government because the public has the right to know if the program is working.

Right now, that is neither collected or reported in any systematic fashion.

Why not? Why don't these pretrial release programs in the country say: Yes. It is working. Everybody comes back, or a great percentage comes back. Or: No. It is not working. People disappear. They commit crimes. We don't know, Mr. Speaker.

All this bill does is help pretrial release let us know and let them know and the public know, is the pretrial release program working in that jurisdiction?

You are using Federal money to operate the program, therefore, report back to the Federal Government on how that program is working or not working.

It doesn't change the pretrial release program, except it requires accountability. For too long, we have not allowed or required accountability of what takes place under the pretrial release program.

It does not collect data on each pretrial release defendant to determine if these agencies are effective in ensuring that defendants adhere to their pretrial requirements and whether the defendants actually show up for trial. It collects it on all defendants that the pretrial release program must report to the Federal Government.

Congress must be able to determine the effectiveness of these programs, and without basic information like this, Congress can't ensure that the programs are working around the country.

Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers need to know if their resources are being spent wisely, and that communities are being protected.

There have been numerous cases where individuals were released on pretrial release bonds, and they had a long criminal record, and they commit another offense.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter regarding pretrial release programs.

OCTOBER 27, 2017.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, House Judiciary Committee, Washington, DC.
Hon. CHARLES GRASSLEY,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, Washington, DC.

GENTLEMEN: We are writing to express our strong support for HR 2152, the Citizens Right to Know Act, sponsored by Rep. Ted Poe (R–TX). The legislation has been referred to the House Judiciary Committee.

This legislation is long overdue. It requires pre-trial release agencies receiving federal funds to report to the Department of Justice, who participates in their programs, including participant:

Criminal history, including previous charges filed

Previous failures to appear for trial

Previous and current non-compliance infractions

Currently these pre-trial release programs aren't required to report any information about the defendants released through their programs. Basic information on defendants is neither collected nor reported in any systematic fashion. The DOJ only collects data from pre-trial release agencies related to crime rates and trends in the aggregate. It does not collect data on specific participants and programs. Thus, there is no mechanism to determine if pre-trial release agencies are effective in ensuring that defendants adhere to their pre-trial release requirements or whether these defendants actually show up for trial.

Without this legislation, policymakers and taxpayers have no ability to determine the effectiveness of taxpayer-funded pre-trial release programs. And without such data, hundreds of federally funded pretrial release programs lack sufficient accountability to U.S. taxpayers. This lack of accountability has allowed many repeat and violent offenders to get out of jail on our tax dollars.

Until the 1960's, principal options for the accused were ROR (release on one's own recognizance) commercial bail or incarceration. Commercial bail ensured the appearance of the defendant in court at no cost to the taxpayer. Pre-trial release programs began in the 1960's for the purpose of securing release for indigent, non-violent offenders who couldn't afford monetary bail.

However, over the last four decades, pretrial release programs have expanded well beyond their original scope and purpose. Today there are over 300 pre-trial release programs nationwide whose participants routinely include violent and repeat offenders, many of whom are able post a commercial bond and have done so in the past. In many instances, the federal government has become a major source of funding for pre-trial release programs.

If Congress continues to fund pre-trial release programs, then Congress must be able to determine the effectiveness of such programs. Taxpayers deserve to know if their limited resources are being spent wisely and their communities are being protected.

We believe swift passage of H.R. 2152 will provide greater transparency for pre-trial programs, greater accountability for taxpayer funds, and increased public safety for our communities.

Sincerely,

Patricia Wenskunas, Crime Survivors; Mark Klaas, Father of Polly Klaas, Klaas Kids Foundation; Ronald Lampard, Criminal Justice Reform, Reform Task Force, American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC); Jim Backlin, Christian Coalition; Colin Hanna, Let Freedom Ring; Kay Daily, Coalition for a Fair Judiciary; Susan Carleson, American Civil Rights Union; Harriett Salerno, Crime Victims United; Beverly Warnock, Parents of Murdered Children; Gary Bauer, American Values; Jim Gilmore, Free Congress/American Opportunity Foundation; Beth Chapman, Professional Bail Agents Association; Larry Cirignano, Children First Foundation.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Citizens Right to Know Act simply states that if a State or local jurisdiction is going to use Federal money for a pretrial release program, they must report to the Federal Government information on who participates in the program, the criminal records of those individuals, the appearance rate at trial, and the previous failure to appear of those programs.

I also want to be clear that any State or local jurisdiction that does not report this information will lose the portion of Federal funds which they use for pretrial release programs only. Other Federal funds will not be affected that go to, for example, Byrne grants. I just want to clear that up because my friend, Ms. JACKSON LEE, mentioned that they are going to lose all Federal funds. No. They just lose the funds that apply to Federal pretrial release programs if they don't report those statistics.

There is some question about the privacy of individuals. If States have a law to protect the privacy of certain persons on pretrial release, this bill does not change that. This bill says that if the State has those privacy laws for individuals, which some do, that is fine. That will not be affected or overruled by this Federal law.

I think that this legislation is necessary to see if these programs are working. If they are working, maybe we ought to expand them. If they are not working, maybe Congress needs to reform the pretrial release program.

This legislation enjoys widespread support. One of those supporters is the National Association of Police Organizations. I include in the RECORD a letter indicating their support.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POLICE ORGANIZATION, INC.,
Alexandria, VA, May 9, 2017.

Hon. TED POE,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POE: On behalf of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), I am writing to you to express our support for the Citizens' Right to Know Act of 2017, H.R. 2152.

NAPO is a coalition of police unions 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.

Each year, millions of dollars in federal grant monies go towards state and local pretrial release programs, which allow accused criminals to await their trial at home, rather than in jail These programs, which in many cases serve repeat, dangerous criminals, often operate with little oversight, putting public safety at risk. Increased oversight of these programs would decrease the possibility of the accused committing crimes while on pretrial release or simply disappearing to avoid facing justice.

The Citizens' Right to Know Act addresses the lack of oversight of these programs by mandating that federally-funded pre-trial service agencies publicly report on program participants, including if they have a history of criminal behavior, whether they appear for their trail, and whether they have ever previously failed to appear for trial. As federal dollars are going towards bailing out criminals, this Act helps ensure that the accused face justice and our communities are protected.

We look forward to working with you to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. JOHNSON,
Executive Director.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this so we can know exactly what is taking place with Federal funds that are being used to keep people and let people, as Ms. JACKSON LEE pointed out, out of jail without having to use some other type of system. And if it is working, let's expand it. If it is not working, maybe Congress needs to be involved to make sure that people do show up for trial, because that is the whole key of a bond, is to release the person under some type of bond, like a pretrial release bond, but we want them to appear in court.

I had cases in my court where people were released on pretrial release bonds; they would show up for trial. I had cases in my court where they were released on pretrial release bonds, and they are still running loose years later.

We don't know the statistics of who is released and who comes back and who is released who never comes back.

This legislation just wants a report to Congress so we can decide on reforms if necessary in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas. He is a dear friend. As we debate this question, I think it is a very important moment as we look at comprehensive criminal justice reform.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that this body oppose H.R. 2152, which is a classic piece of legislation which poses itself as a solution, but it is in search of a problem. The solution has very ominous consequences for minorities and poor people, and infringes on the constitutional rights of citizens, that they should be presumed to be innocent until proven guilty when they participate in these pretrial release services.

When I was a magistrate court judge in DeKalb County, Georgia, over a period of 12 years, starting in 1989 to a time about 5 years before I came to Congress, it was my duty to commit people to pretrial services.

Everybody knows how it works, everybody knows who is eligible, and everybody knows that it is a roaring success. There are no problems with pretrial services, which help poor people and basically minorities, who tend to be disproportionately caught up in the criminal justice system.

It helps people who can't afford to make a money bail to be able to get out of jail with some minimal supervision as they await disposition of the charges against them.

It is a simple program administered by State and local authorities around the country. It works. There is no question about it. There is no need for any Federal supervision or oversight of these programs.

What H.R. 2152 would do would be to require local governments who receive DOJ funding for pretrial services to send a report to the DOJ, the Jeff Sessions DOJ, detailing the personally identifiable information on those defendants participating in alternative bail/pretrial release programs, which are typically utilized by those who can't afford money bail.

Sending this information to the DOJ will create a permanent record of the defendants who are awaiting trial, and that data will remain in a Federal database, even if the charges against the accused are dropped or the accused is found innocent.

Pretrial service programs are critical in protecting those who are unable to post bond during their pretrial stages, and this legislation would disproportionately impact minorities and poor people.

The presumption of innocence is one of the most sacred elements of our criminal justice system and a pillar of many modern-day criminal justice operations in modern society throughout the world.

H.R. 2152 threatens this right to a presumption of innocence. Pretrial service programs are critical, and poor people and minorities should not be penalized by being permanently marked in a Federal database, and for that reason I ask my colleagues to not approve this solution in desperate search for a problem with ominous implications for poor and minority people.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2152, the Citizens Right to Know Act.

As a cosponsor of this bill, and a law enforcement for over a decade, I believe this bill is common sense and a needed piece of legislation.

May I share respectfully with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who may be in doubt of this bill, if you are in support of pretrial diversion programs, then you should support this bill.

The existence of pretrial diversion courts is manifested in our Nation due to a righteous need for proper adjudication at all levels of the economic strata and all portions of our culture and society.

But the pretrial diversion program comes after arrest. Arrest is made by the police officer investigating the incident. Innocence is presumed until adjudicated guilty or otherwise, and within 48 hours of arrest, probable cause has to be presented in the form of an affidavit to a magistrate court, and that judge will determine if that American has been righteously incarcerated, his freedom taken from him, our most precious right as Americans.

We stand in the body which gave birth to the concept of a man and a woman's right to be free, and I support that.

The diversion programs across America, however, through their rather brief history within our judicial system, have failed to provide sufficient data to the jurisdictional authorities that gave birth to them, and that data has not been shared at the Federal level which supports them financially through the harvesting of treasure from the American people that we serve.

I respectfully submit to my colleague that I am a compassionate American man that believes in innocence until proven guilty, and I would like for diversion court programs to continue and grow across our country to better serve the needs of we the people, to recognize the fact that all of us, in some way, are failed and fallen, and we should, of course, with compassion, move forward through the judicial system.

The pretrial diversion programs that exist across our country depend upon a cornerstone of confidence among the jurisdictional authorities that they operate within and the Federal Government that funds them, that they are operating within parameters that are accepted across the country as abiding by laws local, State, and Federal.

□ 1500

To not share data that is readily available by these courts with the Federal Government that funds them is an angle that could be used to defeat these courts that we support. So the compilation of data righteously collected and disseminated is something that we should support if we further support these very court systems.

So this legislation before us today would give Federal and State law enforcement agencies vital data on criminal offenders, repeat or otherwise, who

are placed within the diversion court systems. This information is crucial to both promoting public safety and giving policymakers better insight into the effectiveness of pretrial programs, which I support.

I would like to thank Congressman POE for his leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues very respectfully, on both sides of the aisle, to support this legislation.

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

Let me indicate and reemphasize points that I made and, as well, points that Mr. JOHNSON made.

This will have a disparate impact, and what strikes me of great concern is that this amendment was, in essence, a closed rule.

I submitted an amendment that would basically gather data—which, I think, is what the proponent of this legislation wants—to ensure that pretrial release is working, to show that people who would be a threat to the community are not running without restraint, and to show the number of people who would appear for their appearance, if you will, in court who were beneficiaries of the pretrial release program. Those are all good elements, but it concerns me, again, that we don't have any clear parameters of whom this will hurt.

And also, small communities are dependent upon Federal grants. Their structure may not be the best, and so, if you are now asking them for reporting of individual names and past offenses, I beg the question of the value of that information.

What we really should have is aggregate numbers of who, under the pretrial program, is able to or is, in essence, not meeting the criteria and is breaking the agreement and commitment they have to either appear or to stay in a certain area. That is important information, and I think the DOJ could utilize that in an aggregate form.

Why are we giving names that will remain in the DOJ database for someone who may ultimately go back to work, as this mother may go back to her family and her life would hopefully—even though she experienced a tragedy in the jail and lost her job, let's hope that she has a future.

But if she were caught in this bill, would her name now be in the database? I have not researched her case. It seems that this might have been her first offense, but it certainly was a minor offense with a small amount of marijuana. As the facts evidence, it was the jurisdictional, the geographic area that she was in that caused the greatest trouble.

So the other side of it is that money bail is another issue that we should have looked at. We should have put both bills on the floor of the House because there is a movement across the Nation to begin to address, again, disparate treatment of money bail—not on the issue of race, but on the issue of economics.

So the person working in the fast-food place is in jail and, most likely, loses their job. We know that people who work in fast-food are mothers, fathers, grandmothers, and grandfathers taking care of families, and being in jail does not help them take care of their family. You can be assured—unlike maybe other positions where you can say I was on vacation or that you didn't even stay in jail because you had the money to get out of jail—you cannot say you are on vacation for a couple of days or that you were nothing because you are right out back at work. You are fired.

A very evident case is the gentleman who was wealthy in Texas—a very renowned case—found in a hotel room in Galveston. He had decapitated his roommate's head and disposed of it—is my recollection. I stand to be corrected if my recollection is not correct—in the Galveston Bay, and because he could post a $100,000-plus bond, Mr. Speaker, he was released. Put that on any poor person, and we would be aghast at even how this person got bond set. But he did. Ultimately, he was acquitted in that case. I still shake in my boots.

So the issue is there is more to this than giving names and putting it in a database in the DOJ for persons who may never commit another offense in life. Money bail contributes, again, to the unnecessary detention of many low-risk pretrial defendants, inappropriate release of high-risk defendants who have financial means—as I just indicated, a person who decapitated a person's head—unwarranted financial burdens on low-income communities, and the gamble of placing public safety in the hands of a bail bonding industry that will always profit before the public good, a real point to the unfairness of the money bail.

Yet you would deny funds to small towns that are doing pretrial release, or even big counties and cities that are trying to do their best, but they need these Federal funds. Find another way for us to be able to assess what is going on.

Wealth-based detention has disastrous consequences: overcrowding of local jails, lost jobs, lost housing, poor sanitation and medical care, broken families, and it drains local budgets.

In many cases, an arrestee may be held longer in jail while awaiting trial than any sentence she or he would likely receive if convicted. Right now, in my own county and other big counties around the Nation that have not corrected that, they are doing that right now: causing innocent people to plead guilty to offenses that they did not commit in order to shorten the lengthy pretrial detention. Individuals who are detained are not able to assist their attorneys in the investigation of charges against them, resulting in many wrongful convictions and longer sentences.

So I only offer this thought so that we can have a viable discussion on the money bail issue and the disparate treatment that this legislation—though, not intended—would bring about when you ask communities to give the names and prior convictions of persons who may have had one or two marijuana or DUI—which all of us abhor—convictions. But the privacy issues are a concern, and the lack of debate on the impact of money bail and its unfairness are not being discussed, and the lack of a rule that allows amendments, I think, concerns me.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the American Civil Liberties Union, NAACP, Human Rights Watch, and Color of Change, who expressed their opposition to this legislation.

MAY 8, 2018.

VOTE ''NO'' ON THE ''CITIZENS' RIGHT TO KNOW ACT OF 2017'' (H.R. 2152)

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), the NAACP, Human Rights Watch, and Color of Change, we urge you to vote ''No'' on H.R. 2152, the ''Citizens' Right to Know Act of 2017,'' as the House considers this bill. This legislation raises serious privacy concerns for the civil and human rights community given the personally identifiable data that is to be collected and publicly reported by the federal government. The bill also undermines efforts to eliminate or reduce jurisdictions' reliance on money bail systems. We urge the members to instead consider H.R. 1437, the ''No Money Bail Act of 2017,'' and other bipartisan efforts to encourage the elimination of money bail systems.

THE CITIZENS' RIGHT TO KNOW ACT RAISES PRIVACY CONCERNS

The Citizens' Right to Know Act requires jurisdictions receiving funds from the Department of Justice (DOJ) to report to the Attorney General the names, arrest records, and appearance failures for those participating in DOJ funded pretrial services programs. The legislation allows the Attorney General to make public the names, arrest records, and failure appearances that jurisdictions report. Except for a clause that subjects the data ''to any applicable confidentiality requirements,'' the bill does not provide any explicit privacy protections for those whose personally identifiable information has been collected by the federal government and is subject to public release. The bill requires that the Attorney General penalize noncompliant jurisdictions by denying them 100 percent of the DOJ grant program funds that are used to support pretrial services programs.

While we appreciate the need for the federal government to collect and report data, personal privacy interests must be balanced with public interests. When personally identifiable information is being collected and publicly reported, we believe that such information should be obtained and disseminated only with individuals' informed consent. We also believe that the potential to harm individual reputations should be considered when arrest records are publicly shared. We are troubled that the Citizens' Right to Know Act would collect and publicly report personally identifiable information of individuals participating in pretrial services programs—individuals who have not been convicted of a crime given their pretrial status.

THE CITIZENS' RIGHT TO KNOW ACT UNDERMINES BAIL REFORM EFFORTS

The Citizens' Right to Know Act is inconsistent with efforts to reform money bail systems, like the No Money Bail Act, which many of our organizations support. By collecting and reporting only certain data about pretrial services programs and those participating in them, the Citizens' Right to Know Act will depict a one-sided picture of pretrial services programs and participants. For example, the legislation's focus on when an individual has failed to appear promises a negative narrative around the pretrial stage. If this bill were serious about measuring the true impact of pretrial services programs, it would collect a more robust data set and not that which is of interest only to the bail bonds industry.

We support bail reform that corrects the injustice of basing a defendant's release on how much money the person has. Instead of considering the Citizens' Right to Know Act, Congress should take up the No Money Bail Act of 2017. This legislation would incentive jurisdictions to reform their money bail systems using federal resources. The No Money Bail Act would build safer communities, stronger families, and a fairer criminal justice system by ensuring that people who are innocent in the eyes of the law are not deprived of their freedom because they cannot afford money bail.

For the above described reasons, we urge members of the House to vote ''No'' on the Citizens' Right to Know Act. Instead, we encourage the House of Representatives to give serious consideration to bail reform bills through legislative and oversight hearings on the issue.

Sincerely,

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, American Civil Liberties Union, NAACP, Human Rights Watch, Color of Change.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana). The gentleman from Virginia has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Texas has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when a person is arrested and charges are filed, usually, now, in our country, they don't sit in jail waiting to see a judge for weeks or months. They see a judge within 24 hours. They appear in court. The judge sets bail. This is all public record, including the name and what the person is accused of. It is already public record. So it is not something that is new.

The judge sets bail and determines if the person can afford a lawyer or not and appoints a lawyer right then, within 24 hours. I think that is marvelous in our country. I remember the old days when that did not happen.

This idea that we are denying a person's right of privacy, it is public already, people who are charged with crimes.

My friend from Georgia said pretrial release works. It is a proven thing to work. Well, how does he know that? Because he says so? We don't know if it works or not.

Mr. Speaker, in April of 2017, 26-year-old Christian Rogers was walking along the street in New Jersey and he was shot 22 times. His assailant, Jules Black, a 30-year-old from Vineland, New Jersey, had just been arrested 4 days earlier by the State police and charged with possession of a handgun. He was released on pretrial release and had a long criminal record.

Christian Rogers is just one example of a victim who was killed because of the pretrial release program. So I would disagree with my friend from Georgia that it is working. We don't know the statistics.

I told you this earlier when I spoke. I was a judge in Harris County for 22 years. People were released on pretrial release. The very people who are released on pretrial release are the people that my friend from Texas is talking about: people who can't afford a surety bond, people who can't afford any kind of bond.

So pretrial release serves its purpose and it serves it to a specific part of the community, but we need to know if it is working, if these people come back for their day in court or they don't come back for their day in court or if they commit a crime while they are on pretrial release. We don't know the statistics.

All this legislation says is let's audit pretrial release across the country and see if it is working, see if it is not working, see if we can make improvements. That is all it is. It is an audit. It is not denying anybody any rights under the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I think the legislation is a good idea. We need to know if taxpayer money is working. I appreciate the extra time the chairman has given me.

Mr. Speaker, that is just the way it is.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am clear and I think my colleague Mr. JOHNSON is clear on the pretrial release versus the money bail, but in many instances, pretrial release may have a negative impact on a poor, alleged actor of criminal activity as the money bail system. But this will add additional pain and lack of promise.

As I said, my amendment was to have the aggregate number of those who did not appear. That is viable and important information. You could have it by counties, small towns, villages, and cities to indicate what the impact is of pretrial release.

What strikes me as a concern is to have names and prior convictions, because it becomes part of a DOJ database and these persons may never commit another crime. They might have been in the hospital, maybe they get back and say why—I don't know what it means if you didn't make the first one and they got information that Mr. Smith was in the hospital, didn't have a lawyer, is coming back, but his name has already been sent out. And then you are going to penalize the local jurisdiction for the Federal funds that they are so desperately in need of.

By the way, I am grateful that in the omnibus that we recently passed, we plussed up all of those numbers. And I can assure you, our communities are jumping for joy in the work that they have to do in criminal justice reform or to secure or to make safe their communities, particularly, our police officers for whom I have championed the COPS on the Beat, and I just wish we could really plus that program up because it is a very viable program that we had from the 1990s.

So taking money away is going to be, in this instance, when there could be a positive alternative to giving the information, something that I would be concerned about.

□ 1515

I have already mentioned the issue that wealth-based detention has disastrous consequences: overloading the local jails, the lost jobs, the lost housing, poor sanitation, medical care, broken families, and draining local budgets. So let us have a moment on the floor that we can discuss the reform of money bails, as was done in the Federal court in the Southern District of Texas.

In closing, I would like to reiterate that this bill is, as they say, an effort at finding a problem. It is important that we promote transparency and accountability in government, but this bill does not move in that direction. I am willing to extend my hand of friendship to my friend from Texas. We will see where this bill goes.

But we know what it may really do. The bill was written for the purpose of burdening pretrial services programs, publicizing the sensitive information of defendants who are charged with but not convicted of a crime—and I think that is an important element; you really do deserve privacy if you are just an accused and not yet convicted—and in order to undermine the efforts to reform the money bail system.

That is why civil rights organizations have written to oppose this bill. I would like to think that they would be willing as well to work with us and come halfway to address the question of the money bail disparate treatment, discriminatory impact. By the way, it is not just a racial disparate treatment; it is a poor people's disparate treatment; it is a working people's treatment, when they don't have money.

We have heard the stories. They put up grandmother's house, their house, and it becomes a real tall mountain to climb. The money bail has been harmful and, in some instances, shameful in what it has done to poor, working families. And instead of considering the

bill that would help us reform that, we should be considering—rather, this bill with the ask of private information. I would like to see if we have to have this bill to do it in aggregate. No names on it would be very helpful. And we should be advancing legislation to eliminate the placing of financial conditions on someone's release from jail pending trial, which is taking money away from the local jurisdiction.

The bill today does that, and I think that we can work to do better. And I am not pleased to be opposing, but I would ask my colleagues to consider all that I have said about bail reform and disparate treatment and how we can best handle the needs of finding out who leaves pretrial release and who doesn't. Let's just get the numbers.

Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against this bill. I ask my colleagues to join me, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am baffled by those who oppose this very simple and straightforward legislation. Not a single Member in this Chamber should be opposed to the Citizens' Right to Know Act.

When has more data in the hands of this body ever been a bad thing? We have a number of obligations we owe our constituents. Two of those obligations are to make sure our communities are safe and that tax dollars are spent wisely. This bill accomplishes both. Without the Citizens' Right To Know Act, we and our constituents lack the ability to determine the effectiveness of taxpayer-funded pretrial release programs. Without the required data, hundreds of Federally funded pretrial release programs lack sufficient accountability to U.S. taxpayers. This lack of accountability has the potential to allow many repeat and violent offenders to get out of jail on our tax dollars. We and our constituents deserve to know if resources are being spent wisely and our communities are being protected.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) on this very important legislation. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2152, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 872, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1545

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.R. 2152;

The motion to recommit with respect to H.R. 5645; and

Passage of H.R. 5645, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

CITIZENS' RIGHT TO KNOW ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 2152) to require States and units of local government receiving funds under grant programs operated by the Department of Justice, which use such funds for pretrial services programs, to submit to the Attorney General a report relating to such program, 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 passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 197, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 175]

YEAS—221

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lesko
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—197

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brat
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cummings
Curtis
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.