

of one who is loved to opioid addiction. A vital component of this effort is plugging the holes in our mail system and stopping illicit substances from entering the United States.

So far this year, Customs and Border Patrol, working with the U.S. Postal Service, has seized more than 790 pounds of fentanyl. That is enough fentanyl to kill 179 million people. To put that in perspective, that is more than half our population.

My friend Mr. HARRIS talked about the size of a grain of rice. How about 1 gram, Mr. Speaker, a Sweet'n Low packet, something that we use every day? It is enough to kill 500 people.

The STOP Act is a great companion to the bill I recently introduced with my friend TOM COTTON that provides the U.S. Postal Service with more resources to screen international mail to stop these insane amounts of drugs coming into our country.

I thank my friend from Michigan for his thoughtful work to implement this much-needed policy change. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

□ 1300

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

Mr. Speaker, I plead with you and my brothers and sisters on the other side of the aisle. I think we are making a big step today in this piece of legislation. I know there are other pieces.

I would recommend, Mr. Speaker, that we approach this deadly epidemic—and it is deadly—in the same way that we approached the epidemic at the end of the eighties and the early nineties, and that was the epidemic of the HIV virus. No one wanted to talk about it, Mr. Speaker, so people died when they could have been saved if we had had knowledge of prevention, if we had had knowledge of how we take care of those folks.

It took us until the beginning of the nineties, until we opened up local clinics, until people felt less involved in a stigma. Then they had to come out from the shadows to protect the rest of the population, including themselves. Then we came together, and the Federal Government passed the Ryan White legislation, which has been a big help on the HIV virus. Then we came together.

Unfortunately, maladies bring Americans together. Well, that is good that we do come together, though.

I ask and plead that we have the same vigor in approaching opiates and approaching fentanyl, which is coming in from other countries. If we do that, we will not only survive; we will help those—and we will prevent many from falling into the trap. You have heard some people talk about that trap today, starting with painkillers and moving on to even more dangerous drugs.

We are going to get through this. We are going to get through this. Yesterday we passed by voice vote legislation

to change the protocol on how we approach the patients, not only in the emergency rooms of America, but in many departments and hospitals across the United States. We need to find alternatives to the very opiates that are making fools of us. Those alternatives shall be part of the solution, part of the solution to getting to the promised land, as the gentleman says.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. BISHOP. I want to thank Mr. BRADY. I want to thank my good friend from Massachusetts, RICHIE NEAL, and all of those who worked on this legislation: DAVID REICHERT and many more. I congratulate our persistence in getting through a lot of hurdles.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking Mr. PASCRELL. I would like to thank the staff as well for all of their hard work in this process.

This is an epidemic. This is an issue that is not a Republican issue. This is not a Democrat issue. This is our issue. It is happening every day. Mr. Speaker, 115 Americans are dying each and every day due to opioid overdose. We are talking about mothers, fathers, children—too many children in our communities.

We know the current system is failing Americans. We are allowing these foreign criminals and drug dealers to exploit a very obvious loophole in the law. That is why this bill is so important. That is why it is important for Members of Congress to come together and get something done.

This bill sets hard deadlines that will require all packages coming into our country to have this actionable data that will enable the U.S. Customs and Border Protection to interdict and seize shipments of these dangerous packages and keep them off the streets, the American streets.

In closing, I just would like to say to all those here today: I know that we all have a story. I want to reiterate that we all have a story, and we have now a moral obligation to close this obvious loophole. I call upon my colleagues to support this important bill.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 934, 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. BISHOP of Michigan. 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.

# TRANSITIONAL HOUSING FOR RECOVERY IN VIABLE ENVIRONMENTS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials on the bill, H.R. 5735.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 934 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5735.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1309

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 5735) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a demonstration program to set aside section 8 housing vouchers for supportive and transitional housing for individuals recovering from opioid use disorders or other substance use disorders, and for other purposes, with Mr. SIMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, I received a letter not long ago from a constituent, Jim, from Dallas County. The first three words were: I need help.

In the letter, he talks about his grandson, Joshua, who is a good kid. Jim became his guardian at age 6, but Joshua took a bad turn at age 16. It was at age 16 he started using opioids. His life has never been the same.

Jim writes that at first his grandson started out with pills and then, later, street drugs and ended up on heroin. No surprise here, Mr. Chairman: His usage escalated, and he ended up dropping out of school in the last semester of high school.

Along the way, he found a menial job here, a menial job there, but he

couldn't hold one down because of the drug usage. Jim tried to help him every way he could. He said that in the summer of 2014 his opioid usage brought him almost to death.

I won't say the story has a happy ending, but at least he is now trying to turn his life around. He is off of opioids, and he is on other medications: methadone, Xanax. He has actually gone back and gotten his high school diploma.

He has learned how to operate a forklift, but because of the damage that has been done, he can't hold down a job. His drug costs are expensive. He still needs help.

Mr. Chair, you know what is unusual about this story? Regrettably, nothing. Nothing is unusual about this story. Again, although it doesn't have a happy ending—and we don't know how this story is going to end—at least it doesn't have a tragic end, because far too many stories like it end in the tragedy of death.

And my guess is, Mr. Chair, that every single Member of this body could read a similar letter as I read from Jim from Dallas.

I have been in this House now for eight terms. Rarely—rarely—does a week go by that somebody doesn't use the term “crisis.” And most of the time I don't give it much thought. But Mr. Chair, when somebody says there is a crisis of opioid use in America, I could not agree more. How negligent this body would be if we didn't declare war on this crisis and do what is right and what is smart to address this crisis.

So today, out of the House Financial Services Committee, I am bringing up a bill by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), a member of our leadership team. I want to thank him for his leadership, because I know how heartfelt the pain he knows from his district is.

What the gentleman from Kentucky is bringing before us is that we have seen evidence that transitional housing can be a proven method to really help thousands and thousands of Americans like Joshua that I describe, to help them maintain their sobriety after completing rehab and as they are gaining skills and training and trying to get back into being independent, productive members of society.

So the gentleman from Kentucky says: It is time for a demonstration project, because we have some evidence. We have evidence already. And out of the 2.2 million Section 8 housing vouchers, the government's largest means-tested housing assistance program, let's take less than 1 percent of them—in fact, 0.5 percent of them—and on a temporary basis let's allocate some of these Section 8 housing vouchers to people who are literally dying of opioid addiction every day and need transitional housing options in a recovery evidence-based program.

□ 1315

I really think, Mr. Chairman, it is the least we can do today. I am sorry

that this is not on the House's suspension calendar. Demonstration programs are done every single day in the government.

Again, I would hope that this is something that we could join overwhelmingly on both sides of the aisle to do. Apparently, that is not the case, but I don't think this House will be deterred. I do not think this House will be deterred. I think, very soon, people like Joshua who are getting their life turned around can at least have transitional housing options to support their recovery. When they do, we will thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as I sat here and I listened to Congressman HENSARLING, the chair of the Financial Services Committee, where I serve as ranking member, I thought to myself he was absolutely correct on many of the issues that he surfaced when he held the letter up in the air and he said that there are many Members of Congress who could tell similar stories or maybe have gotten similar letters. He is absolutely correct.

Even more than that, there are many of us who have watched the devastation of communities that we represent because of drug addiction over the years for a long time. Unfortunately, many of these stories ended in tragedy, and I am pleased that we are focusing time and attention on opioid addiction and abuse.

I am so absolutely thrilled that we are paying attention, and we are recognizing that this is literally a disease and that we can help people, that we can do rehabilitation, that we can provide resources to keep people from dying and being imprisoned and treated in ways that will not help deal with the problem in any real ways. I am pleased about all of that, and I think the intentions of many of our Members are very good, that they really want to do something because many of them are seeing this for the first time.

But let me tell you how many years I have been seeing this. Let me tell you about how many deaths I know about. Let me tell you about the imprisonment of those who were both addicted and dealing drugs. Let me tell you about those who have died not only from heroin, that you are seeing now, but crack cocaine and other kinds of drugs and the mixtures that we don't even know about that have caused so many deaths, so much devastation.

So I want to do everything that I can to share my knowledge with you, to share my experiences with you, to help in every way that I possibly can move to credible, reasonable, sensible, rehabilitation and support and assistance for those who are addicted.

We are trying, as I can see in many of the bills that are being produced, to do

what we think is best, but much of it needs more consideration. It needs better understanding.

Today, we hear talking about a piece of legislation that I think the author of the legislation is absolutely sincere in what he would like to do. He is seeing drug addicted persons who have abused not only prescription drugs but all the way to heroin on the streets without jobs, laying in the alleys without support, without housing, no place to go, and that is what he is attempting to do. He is attempting to do everything that he possibly can to get them safe and secure places to live with the other resources that must go along with it, supportive resources in order to help them become the persons that they can be.

But you cannot do this on the cheap. You cannot do this without understanding that rehabilitation costs money.

So, while I absolutely applaud the attempt, I want to share with you that taking 10,000 vouchers from those who have been waiting in line for years—I am talking about single-family parents with their children who simply are praying and hoping that they can get a voucher so that they can get a decent place to live.

I am not talking about drug addicted people, necessarily. I am talking about people, some of whom work every day on minimum wages who cannot afford the first and last month's rent to get into a place. I am talking about those who, even if they could find a place, they would be paying more than 30 percent of their income to have a safe and decent place. I am talking about those who have been living in rental units that really need more than just rehabilitation. They are dangerous places that people are living.

They are places that still are not protected from wind and rain and all of those things that people should not have to experience trying to live in a decent place to live. I am talking about people who are living in apartments that the ceilings are falling in who are looking for a decent place. I am talking about people who call every day to check to see if in fact they are going to be the next person who is going to be allowed a voucher. I am talking about people who have been waiting 2 and 3 years and on and on and on.

So I support the idea that the new population of opioid abusers can have a decent place to live and resources, but let's not deny the people who have been standing in line, who have been praying, who have been hoping for a decent place. Let's not take 10,000 vouchers in a so-called demonstration project.

Really, we don't need a demonstration project. I can tell you, many folks in this House can tell you what they know and what they have experienced so that we can put together good, credible, sensible legislation. But it will cost some money.

It is not about taking from one and giving to the other. The old people call

that robbing Peter to pay Paul. We don't want to do that. We don't want to say to Ms. Jones with 3 kids out there waiting in line for 4 years, 3 years, 2 years, what have you: Sorry, we have a new population that we are going to serve. No, we are not going to vote for more money, for more resources. We are going to take from your opportunity. Sorry you have been standing in line all this long.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to be helpful to all of the folks who need our help. I understand the shock that many are going through who are experiencing this for the first time, but I want you to know about the many nights that I have gone to bed when I have heard about another death of someone who is addicted, who has not had a place to live, who has been on somebody's doorstep, who has been in an alley. I want you to know what I know and what I understand about that mother who has begged me to help find a bed in a unit, a rehabilitative unit that could be used.

So this is not the way to do it, and this is not about creating new nonprofits with no experience, no background, to be able to implement this program. This is about understanding all the people who have struggled with these nonprofits, who begged for money, who begged for resources to deal with the populations who are basically dying from this addiction.

So whether it is about the fact that there is not enough money here, or we should not be developing new nonprofits to do this because we have experience with our public housing entities that know how to do this, this is about us saying: Yes, we have a problem, and we are going to spend the money. We are going to put the time in on it to develop the good, credible legislation. We are going to be serious about it. We don't want to just look like we are trying to do something. We are going to be positive. We are going to be committed. We are going to do what it takes in order to help these people who are waiting and looking for just another chance in life.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), the chairman of the Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee and author of the Transitional Housing for Recovery in Viable Environments Demonstration Program Act, or THRIVE Act.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my legislation, H.R. 5735, the Transitional Housing for Recovery in Viable Environments Act, or the THRIVE Act.

I thank Chairman HENSARLING, Chairman DUFFY, and my colleagues on the House Financial Services Committee for their support and feedback on this legislation. I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING for sharing that very compelling story about his con-

stituent, Joshua. Unfortunately, so many of us have constituents with similar stories, and that is what we are trying to address here today.

We all know the opioid epidemic is a major health crisis that has impacted every community in every congressional district; 116 Americans die every day from opioid overdoses. My home State of Kentucky has the third highest overdose mortality rate in the country.

This week, the House is considering several pieces of legislation to address this epidemic, and in order to achieve meaningful progress in the fight against opioids in our Nation, Congress can no longer simply focus on prevention, enforcement, and treatment. We must also begin to implement policies that focus on long-term recovery. Our Federal housing programs are an underutilized resource in these efforts.

The THRIVE Act would make supportive housing more accessible to those most in need by allocating a limited number of Section 8 housing choice vouchers to nonprofits—nonprofits that have experience in housing. Not new nonprofits—nonprofits with a record of providing housing services, workforce development, job placement, financial literacy, and continued addiction recovery support for individuals who are transitioning out of rehab or a period of medication-assisted treatment and back into the workforce.

This legislation would only allocate either 10,000 or 0.5 percent of total housing choice vouchers, whichever is less, to evidence-based nonprofits serving people who are literally dying each and every day of opioid addiction and other substance abuse disorders. And the demonstration is limited to 5 years.

No one would have a voucher taken away from them, despite what my friend, the gentlewoman from California, is saying. No one would have a voucher taken away from them to create this demonstration program.

An estimated 198,000 Section 8 vouchers are turned over every year and returned to HUD, and it is from this amount that the demonstration would set aside only 10,000 to address a deadly national public health crisis.

Additionally, we made a commitment to working with our Democratic colleagues, including Congresswoman SINEMA, who has signed a joint letter with me to request additional funding from the Appropriations Committee to support this demonstration, because we understand the urgent need for greater Federal investment to save lives. So the ranking member's argument really doesn't apply.

The THRIVE Act has received endorsements from over 140 housing and recovery organizations across the country, including Addiction Policy Forum, the American Academy of Addiction Psychiatry, National Association of Social Workers, Faces & Voices of Recovery, the Association for Addic-

tion Professionals, and more than 100 others that are on the front lines of addiction recovery.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. YODER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, HUD Secretary Ben Carson visited several of these transitional nonprofits in my district in Kentucky earlier this year, and he witnessed firsthand the success of these evidence-based models of recovery.

I would like to especially recognize St. James Place, Revive LifeHouse, the Hope Center, Shepherd's House, and Chrysalis House, among others, for their critical work in the Sixth District of Kentucky that inspired this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the THRIVE Act would save American lives, as well as taxpayer funds in the long run, by helping more individuals rise above addiction and poverty.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should have a little clarity in what is being presented by my colleague about whether or not vouchers will be taken away from anybody. The fact of the matter is nobody thinks that vouchers will be taken away from anybody. They will never get the voucher.

□ 1330

They are standing in line waiting for years to get Section 8 vouchers to be able to have a decent place to live. That means that you take 10,000 vouchers away from the people, and the families, and the children, who have been waiting in line all of this time and you give it to a new population of people. That is what this is all about. That cannot be denied, and that is a fact.

I am sure that my colleague who is proposing this legislation will agree with me, the fact of the matter is, that person who has been waiting for so long will have to continue to wait, because the voucher that he or she could have gotten is going to go to someone else.

Let me just talk a little bit about Mr. BARR's letter that he sent to the appropriators. First of all, I want to thank him for offering to send the letter. And I want to thank him for coming to me and asking me if I would sign on to the letter. What Mr. BARR is doing is—if I may correctly describe this—is having second thoughts about the fact that you need some money, you need some resources in this program. So the gentleman from Kentucky's letter to the appropriators is basically meaningless, because his own bill directly contradicts it.

And I pointed this out to him as we had this discussion. The plain text of H.R. 5735 states, "No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the requirements of this act

and the amendments made by this act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated."

Mr. Chairman, you can't have it both ways. You can't support language that specifically prohibits appropriators from funding your demonstration and then turn around and ask the appropriators to provide funding. This just doesn't make good sense. That is why I had to say that I could not sign on with him on that letter, knowing what the language was in the legislation.

So, if the gentleman from Kentucky wants funding for this demonstration, he needs to be consistent in his advocacy for that funding, and that includes petitioning his own leadership for a waiver of their rules preventing bills that cost money from being considered.

I would be happy to join the gentleman from Kentucky in requesting funding for additional vouchers to support people with substance use disorders. But I cannot support this unworkable demonstration. And I cannot lend credibility to his efforts to distract us from the fact that his bill would take vouchers away from families in need, who have been standing in line begging, waiting, and praying for a decent, safe and secure place for them and their families to live.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), the chairman of the Housing and Insurance Subcommittee.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the full committee for his support of this fantastic bill that has been offered by Mr. BARR.

This is pretty simple stuff. There are 2.2 million vouchers. 2.2 million vouchers. And we are talking about a demonstration project of 10,000: 2.2 million total; 10,000 in a demonstration project. We are talking about a small sliver of vouchers that can go to help people who are addicted to opioids, or even other drugs to, say, use the vouchers to move people into transitional housing that are nonprofit. People are making money off this. It is community transitional housing.

Help them maintain sobriety. Teach them valuable job-training skills. Help them get employment. This is just simple common sense. And for people to say, I can't support it because I am taking vouchers away from others, that is bogus. There is 7 to 9 percent turnover in the voucher program of the 2.2 million, and we are talking about a small sliver to help people. This shouldn't be partisan. This is common sense.

So I would ask—and I know that Mr. BARR has worked with the ranking member, and she has been wonderful to work with on a lot of issues and I appreciate her bipartisanship. This is one that I would ask her to take a second look at, Mr. Chairman. If she did, I

think she would say it is a small number.

If it works, we can expand it, we can grow it, and we can help more people get off of devastating drugs.

I just want to make one side comment on these drugs. In my communities, it is not just individuals, it is crushing families. We have little kids who are being taken out of homes in out-of-home placement, crushing the budgets of our counties.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DUFFY. Let's get this done. If we are going to address this crisis, it is the kind of thought process that Mr. BARR has put into this bill of creative thinking, using resources that we have available to us, to help people who are getting crushed by these devastating drugs.

I know the ranking member cares about those people deeply. And I know she has fought for those folks who have been inflicted with drug abuse. I just would ask her, in this one, to join us and say: Let's do a small demonstration project, just 10,000. Let's work together.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, yes, Mr. DUFFY is absolutely correct, I care about this issue very deeply, and I want to do the right thing. I want him to know that while he was talking about the 2.8 million vouchers, does he know that there are 5 million people who are in need of these vouchers?

You cannot make the argument that there is more than enough to go around with all of these people standing in line. When they opened up the waiting list recently, just in Los Angeles alone, 600,000 people attempted to get access to these vouchers.

This is about whether or not you are willing to put your money where your mouth is. Either you are willing to pay for your demonstration project, or you want to take away the opportunities of those who have been standing in line, and we are talking about families with children. You don't tell me what is going to happen to them because you won't increase the number of vouchers, and you don't want to put any money into it, so you have to show how you care.

It is one thing for us to get up on this floor and talk and debate and explain what we would like to see happen, but it is another thing when we say that we are willing to put the resources that are needed to deal with the problem.

I will just say that of the 2.8 million people waiting, 5 million people are in need, and the average waiting time is almost 2 years. So what are you going to do? You don't need a demonstration. We have enough information, we have enough research, and we have enough stories about what has happened for so

many years and how so many people have died because they have not had resources available to them to deal with the problem.

And, again, I am willing to spend as many hours as it takes to help you know and understand the history of this problem. It didn't just start with opioid abuse. It didn't just start with communities who never experienced this before. This has been going on for years and years and years.

I join with Members in wanting to do something about it. But I say to Mr. BARR, it is going to cost some money, and we should not rob Peter to pay Paul. We should not take from those in need. We should not tell the people standing in line, Too bad, stand in line a little bit longer because we have a new episode that we have to deal with.

Let's take care of everybody who wants to change their lives, everybody who wants to put behind them this addiction, everybody who is begging for just a second chance.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), chairman of the Capital Markets, Securities, and Investment Subcommittee.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding. I congratulate my friend and colleague from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) for tackling this difficult and very important issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this much-needed legislation that would expand housing options for individuals who are transitioning out of addiction treatment and require continued support. These are typically people who have exhausted all of their resources already.

Why? Because they are addicted. That is why they are in this, that is why they qualify for these housing assistance vouchers, and this is right on target for helping them.

The THRIVE Act is an important piece of legislation with strong, bipartisan support that came out of our committee that would create a pilot program to allocate Section 8 housing choice vouchers to transitional housing nonprofits with evidence-based models of recovery and life skills training. It is important to note that this is 10,000 total vouchers out of the 2.2 million that are available, or one-half of 1 percent of all of those vouchers, whichever is less, so we are talking about a small portion of all of the total vouchers that are available.

But here is what we do know, Mr. Chairman. Our country, our States, and our communities are in crisis right now. Over the last decade, there has been this dramatic rise in opioid abuse, whether it is the nonmedical use of prescription drugs, as well as illicitly manufactured heroin. We need engagement at every level.

In light of this medical emergency, there is an extremely pressing need for additional transitional housing for

opioid recovery. These housing programs must follow a proven evidence-based approach that has helped thousands of Americans to maintain sobriety after completing rehab, gain valuable job skills, and eventually transition back into society to lead independent lives.

Time and time again, individuals who have just completed inpatient rehab programs are forced to live in housing situations where they are surrounded by people who are using the same illegal substances that sent them into rehab. We have to change that.

While the evidence suggests that effective treatment and recovery plans should cover a span of 3 to 5 years for an individual, based on their needs and severity, we have a long way to go to properly prioritize and fund the recovery support programs and resources that individuals need in their communities. Twenty-three million Americans are in recovery today—let me repeat that—23 million people are in recovery today for substance abuse.

A sober, safe, and healthy living environment that promotes recovery from substance abuse is essential in providing recovery support. These are people who qualify, as I said before, for these Section 8 vouchers. Because they have exhausted their resources, let's throw them a lifeline. Let's throw them some help. Let's allow them to have an opportunity to go and succeed.

That is why I support the THRIVE Act, which also has the support of the Michigan Heroin and Opiate Prevention and Education program, which is known as Mi-HOPE, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I am so pleased that Members on the opposite side of the aisle are just being introduced to this crisis. I am so pleased that they are just learning about addiction. I am so pleased that they are willing to talk about it. But I am not so pleased that they are not willing to spend any resources on it. I don't know if they understand that the average cost of a voucher annually is \$9,500.

Why can't they support that amount of money to deal with credible, decent housing for the very individuals that they say they are trying to give some support to. I don't know how much they know about addiction. And I don't know how much they know about the history of the war on drugs.

Have any of them ever visited a drug rehabilitation project? Let me commend them to one that they need to know about. It is right here in Washington, D.C. It is known as N Street Village. Please go. I want them to learn about what they do, or what the costs are, and how they struggle for more and more resources to help more and more people. They cannot legislate. They cannot come up with programs without having an understanding of, and an appreciation of,

what has happened in this country and the many people who have died, and the families who have suffered.

It didn't just start now. The gentleman who just spoke talked about it is now a crisis. No, it has been a crisis for a long time.

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

□ 1345

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), vice chairman of our Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments Subcommittee.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman HENSARLING for his leadership and for moving this important legislation forward.

Mr. Chair, the United States has an opioid epidemic, one that is claiming more than 115 lives every single day. The faces and the stories of the opioid crisis and those family members, friends, students, and loved ones who have been affected by it demand some solutions from us.

Over 4 years ago, in March 2014, I launched our community action plan on opioids in the 14th Congressional District of Illinois. Since then, I have worked with community leaders in my district to update our action plan with local, State, and Federal policy recommendations.

One of our key objectives is increasing access to sober living facilities for individuals who have undergone inpatient treatment and need support as they navigate their recovery. An immediate step we can take is to allow individuals in recovery to have access to Federal housing programs, especially transitional housing.

Transitional housing is an important, evidence-based piece of recovery that empowers these men and women to maintain sobriety, acquire job training and employment, and find a community.

I have met individuals whose lives have been changed by transitional housing. Chris Reed from McHenry, Illinois, has been sober since 2009. He was a founding member of New Directions Addiction Recovery Services, which opened a sober living house for men in Crystal Lake, Illinois, in October of 2016. The organization opened a home for women in December 2017 and a third home in McHenry County this year.

According to Chris, he said: "Sober living and recovery housing provides structure, support, and accountability that greatly increases the chances a person with a substance use disorder (SUD) will achieve long-term sobriety. By providing housing stability along with appropriate resources—such as job placement, peer recovery support, social activities, and services to others—people with SUD begin to disconnect from drugs and alcohol and reconnect with a supportive community."

I am proud to support the THRIVE Act, which will expand access to these life-changing transitional recovery

homes through existing Federal housing programs. This is something Congress can do right now to prevent opioid overdoses.

Let's make a statement about the importance of support in recovery and offer resources to individuals for whom a transitional home could be life-saving.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member of the Small Business Committee and a senior member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chair, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the ranking member for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5735, the THRIVE Act.

H.R. 5735 has a worthy goal. Helping individuals struggling with addiction to access treatment and recovery services is certainly important, but despite these intentions, H.R. 5735 has significant flaws which, in the end, make the bill unworkable.

My primary concern is that H.R. 5735 carves out 10,000 existing Section 8 vouchers for use in this pilot program without authorizing new funding for any additional vouchers. This essentially decreases the number of Section 8 vouchers in circulation and increases wait times for millions of other households already seeking a voucher. Those forced to wait will include low-income families, seniors, people with disabilities, veterans, and those experiencing homelessness.

You cannot just change words in the law. You need to open your checking account or your checkbook.

Currently, only one in four households who are eligible for Federal affordable housing assistance receive it. In New York City, we have more than 150,000 people waiting for a voucher.

While I fully support helping all people with substance abuse disorders and recognize the important role affordable housing plays in an individual's recovery process, providing affordable housing for individuals with substance use disorders should not come at the expense of others in need.

HUD's Affordable Housing and Section 8 programs are woefully underfunded. Instead of providing Section 8 vouchers to just those with substance use disorders, we should be providing significantly more resources and expanding the Section 8 program to help all those in need.

Additionally, this bill places arbitrary time limits on the individuals participating in the demonstration program. This is counterproductive and out of step with other existing supportive housing programs.

Finally, while H.R. 5735 seeks to help individuals suffering from substance use disorders, it does nothing to address the fact that many people with these disorders lose their housing because of the harsh eviction policies in Federal housing assistance programs.

I support the ranking member in her continued effort to ensure those individuals with substance use disorders face fairer eviction procedures and ban one strike policies that cause tenants to lose their assistance for a single incident of drug use.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chair, again, H.R. 5735 has a worthy goal. However, this bill is plagued with a number of problems, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it unless you provide the resources to make this legislation work.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), a valued member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Chairman, when we talk about the opiate crisis, we talk often of its victims, but there is an important group that we are leaving out: survivors.

Individuals who complete inpatient rehabilitation and other treatment programs have been forgotten and left behind without a way to begin a new life. In particular, finding a suitable place to call home can be especially challenging.

Research has proven the connection between substance use and homelessness. It is time that Congress take a closer look.

Today, nearly 110,000 Americans are homeless, with approximately half suffering chronic addictions to drugs, alcohol, or both. Approximately 70 percent of homeless veterans are estimated to suffer from substance use disorder.

We continue to focus on treatment and prevention, but unless we simultaneously look toward assisting those who need support after treatment, this terrible crisis will continue. That is why I rise today in support of H.R. 5735 introduced by my colleague, ANDY BARR, whose home State of Kentucky is no stranger to the opiate crisis.

Called the THRIVE Act, or the Transitional Housing for Recovery in Viable Environments Demonstration Program Act, this program will kick off a 5-year demonstration program to support transitional housing. Specifically, 10,000 Section 8 housing vouchers will be set aside specifically for people with an opiate use disorder.

Transitional housing takes a wrap-around approach by providing its residents with a stable, supportive environment to address their addiction, mental health, and/or homelessness. Required participation in recovery classes, life skills education classes, mandatory savings plans, and full-time or part-time employment work together to support residents as they continue to improve their lives.

Homelessness and addiction create a vicious cycle, and these Americans need help to break it. With this bill,

Congress can step in and provide some assistance for their next step of recovery.

Mr. Chair, I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 5735.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, it is interesting that my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle can come into this Chamber and talk about homelessness and talk about rehabilitation and talk about the need for housing.

I am the ranking member on the Financial Services Committee with every wish and every hope to be able to have this committee take up a bill on homelessness. I have not been able to get that done. We have taken up over 100 bills on the Financial Services Committee, but not once have we dealt with the issue of homelessness.

The gentleman from Minnesota who talked about homelessness and the fact that veterans are homeless is absolutely correct, but what are you going to do about it?

Are you going to come to the floor to try and convince the Members of this House that somehow a demonstration project where you take 10,000 vouchers from the existing vouchers that people are standing in line for is going to make a dent in this problem? I don't think so.

This problem has been around for a long time, and I really do want the Members on the opposite side of the aisle to understand what has not been done to help those people who have needed a lot of assistance and a lot of help.

I can recall, God bless her soul, when Nancy Reagan said to drug abusers, "Just Say No." This is another piece of legislation that falls in that category: 10,000 vouchers in a demonstration project.

You have been hearing how huge this problem is. We don't need a demonstration project for a few people taking 10,000 vouchers from those who have been standing in line. We need to appropriate the dollars that are necessary, number one, to help fund those organizations that have been working on this problem for years that need more money, that need more beds, that need more resources.

We need more money not only to deal with the housing issue that is attempting to be addressed in this demonstration project, but whether it is helping to equip police departments with the necessary equipment to save lives of the people on the street who are overdosed that they encounter in their daily work. Some communities have that, a few communities have that, but every community experiencing this problem needs to have that.

In addition to that, we need more beds for rehabilitation. You can't get to supportive housing until you deal with the addiction so that when people are ready to go into transitional housing, they get the support that goes

along with that. That is not just a bed and a roof, but it is the social services that go along with it.

It will cost money, and unless you are willing to put up the dollars, unless you are willing to work with our appropriators to do what is necessary to honestly and forcefully deal with this issue, we are just talking about it. We are just pontificating. We are just saying things that we don't even understand.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), a very hardworking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Chairman, I want to first thank my friend from Kentucky for his leadership on this bill. The THRIVE Act is an important piece of legislation, and I am proud to cosponsor it.

The National Institute on Drug Abuse has found that we lose about 115 Americans each and every day to the opioid crisis. These are our brothers, our sisters, our friends, and our co-workers. This is a national crisis, and inaction just won't change a single thing.

I have met with a number of people back home who told me that we need to think about more than just the prevention and the treatment stage of the opioid crisis, and they are exactly right.

When you hear people tell me this, it reminds me of a conversation I had recently with David Kessler, who lives in my district and started an organization called GRIP It based in Mocksville. Group classes, one-on-one coaching, and assistance with detox programs are just three of the things that this group offers.

David has found evidence of a "cultural method" that works, and it goes to show us that there are many different things that we could be trying.

□ 1400

This brings me to the bill that we are voting on today, the THRIVE Act, which is part and parcel of this approach. It would expand housing options for individuals who are transitioning out of addiction treatments and require continued support.

This is exactly the kind of policy that we need to be considering. Housing is part of a foundation that helps former addicts get off the streets and into a place that they can rise above poverty and addiction.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a larger point on this issue before I close. There has always been and still is a stigma around drug addiction. But if we want to make real progress on battling this epidemic, we need to change the way we look at those who are suffering. Rather than seeing them as liabilities, we need to see them as assets.

The THRIVE Act, by helping people transition from recovery to a home,



will do just that. And when they have a home, they will be more likely to get a job and get back to being a contributing member of society.

Bold ideas are needed in the public space, and there is no doubt that Mr. BARR's bill falls into this category.

I think Ronald Reagan said it best when he said: "That what is right will always eventually triumph. And there's purpose and worth to each and every life."

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

While I have this opportunity, I will refer to my bill on homelessness again. My bill is a bill that will end homelessness. It costs \$13 billion, and I would dare say that we could have funded this effort when we were thinking about the tax cuts.

Some of those tax cuts benefit the richest people in this country. While we were reducing the corporate tax rate from 35 percent to 21 percent, we could have easily spent \$13 billion to deal with ending homelessness.

That tax cut was worth \$1.8 trillion. \$13 billion from that \$1.8 trillion, what would that have done for homelessness in America? We could have been on the road to ending homelessness.

So the bill number is H.R. 2076. I am hopeful that the Members of the House and the Members of the Senate will take a look at this legislation so that they know that we have something that has been given a lot of attention, that has a lot of research, that understands what it takes to get rid of homelessness. So my bill, H.R. 2076, is a bill that I would ask my colleagues to immediately support.

Mr. Chairman, we have many Members of this Congress who want to do something about providing housing opportunities for those who are the victims of opioid abuse and drugs. I join with them, and I, too, am very concerned, and I know that we can do something substantive about this issue of providing housing opportunities.

But again, I will say over and over again, it should not be done in such a way that we have a little demonstration project that will take away 10,000 vouchers from the neediest of people who have been standing in line, in order to say or think or have anyone believe that we are doing something about this crisis in America.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY), another hardworking member of the House Financial Services Committee.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to state my strong support of the Transitional Housing for Recovery in Viable Environments Act, or the THRIVE Act.

In my district and across the Nation, the opioid epidemic has ravaged communities, torn apart families, and destroyed the lives of everyday Americans.

Opioid abuse and drug-related deaths are rising at alarming rates. In my

rural New York district, drug-related deaths rose over 350 percent in the short period between 2012 and 2016.

Each day, I continue to hear from families across the 22nd District affected by this epidemic. They share their stories of loss and triumph and always urge me that more needs to be done. It is very difficult to find anyone in our communities who hasn't been affected by addiction, with either a family member or a friend. This week, we are delivering on the promises we have made to those struggling with the pain of addiction.

During a recent opioid roundtable that I hosted in Binghamton, New York, a young woman named Jessica shared her story of opioid addiction and recovery. Jessica's story is a story of loss, recovery, resilience, and survival. At the end, Jessica stressed the importance of post-treatment programs to help those who are addicted to remain in recovery programs and to avoid potential relapses.

The THRIVE Act begins the process of delivering on this important element of addiction recovery by expanding transitional housing options to those most in need.

Furthermore, the THRIVE Act focuses on evidence-based programs, ensuring that those in recovery are given access to proven, high-quality transitional housing options.

I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), for his hard work in crafting this legislation to provide a better future for those suffering from addiction.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5735 fills a critical void and will empower countless individuals in my district to break free from the grips of drug addiction.

I thank the chairman for providing me an opportunity to speak in support of this important legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. HANDEL), a member of the Judiciary Committee and the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mrs. HANDEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the THRIVE Act.

In the Sixth District, my district, Fulton and Cobb Counties have the highest opioid and heroin overdose rates of all counties in the entire State of Georgia.

For those struggling with addiction who make that hard commitment to recovery, aftercare and stability are critical to their ability to remain drug-free. Too often they return to the very same environments that helped foster their addiction, increasing the risk of relapse. Worse, many find themselves homeless, with no resources and no job.

The THRIVE Act would create a 5-year pilot program that expands housing options for individuals transitioning out of treatment programs but still needing help. The pro-

gram sets aside a small percentage of Section 8 housing choice vouchers for supportive and transitional housing nonprofits.

Earlier this year, former Kentucky Governor Ernie Fletcher attended an opioid summit in my district. He shared with us the incredible outcomes from the Recovery Kentucky initiative launched during his administration. This legislation draws on the program and its success.

I commend Governor Fletcher and, in particular, my colleague from Kentucky, ANDY BARR, for their leadership on this legislation. This bill will give recovering addicts the added help they need to rise above their addictions and fulfill their real potential in life.

I encourage my colleagues to support the THRIVE Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of Mr. HENSARLING how many more speakers he has.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I anticipate no more speakers. I am prepared to close.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this week, we are seeing my colleagues on the other side of the aisle advance legislation focused on individuals with opioid use disorders. We are really talking about drug addiction. These are the people they used to call drug addicts, and I don't want us to hide behind any new language. We are talking about a serious problem of addiction here.

But something very important is missing from these bills and that is new resources and funding necessary to actually make a difference for those individuals.

H.R. 5735 is a clear example of this problematic approach. Rather than providing funding for housing assistance vouchers for individuals with disorders, individuals who are addicted, this bill takes away 10,000 existing vouchers that would otherwise go to people in need, many of whom have been waiting and waiting for years.

There are millions of people on waiting lists across the country, including families with children, seniors, veterans, persons with disabilities, persons experiencing homelessness, and others in need. Redistributing these vouchers away from others who need housing is simply not a fair or reasonable step.

What we need is bold action to commit real dollars to tackling this public health crisis, and also to address the shortage of affordable housing in this country. Unfortunately, this bill falls short and commits no new funding for additional vouchers.

While H.R. 5735 has an important goal, the way it tries to get there is ultimately harmful and counterproductive.

For these reasons, I urge Members to vote "no" on this bill. This will not begin to make a dent in the crisis. We

don't need a demonstration project. We need to move forward with a committed project with the funding that is necessary in order to deal with drug addiction.

We have drug addicts who are in the alleys and on the streets in communities who never saw this before, who never experienced this before.

Listen to someone who has seen it, who knows about it, who understands how many lives have been lost because of it, and let's do the right thing. It is not about a demonstration project. It is not about just a few vouchers. This is about real action.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PAULSEN). The gentleman from Texas has 4 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, in my congressional career, I have experienced a number of surreal moments. I think perhaps I am experiencing another one, and that is, typically, within my career, next to a study, I think the least controversial provisions we take up in this body are demonstration projects.

We do it all the time, and it is good that we do it all the time so we can find out if what is happening in a small subset within our society is going to work, and so we will roll out the program throughout our country. Typically, these receive very strong bipartisan support.

I couldn't help but notice, there are only two, two Members on the other side of the aisle, who are against this opioid housing recovery program, and we had almost a dozen Republicans on our side of the aisle come to support it.

I listened very carefully to the ranking member who, on more than one occasion, said we should not rob Peter to pay Paul. Well, what happens when she or other Members on the other side of the aisle decide to submit budgets that aren't balanced?

We just had a balanced budget amendment come to this floor, and if memory serves me right, it was not supported by the ranking member. So thus, she appears to be robbing Peter to pay Paul. If that is of great concern, I will certainly be happy to go to our leadership and see if we can bring that vote to the House floor, so that we might balance the budget.

I heard it said, well, this demonstration project may take away a voucher from a veteran, somebody homeless, somebody disabled. Who do you think these people who are suffering with opioid addiction are? They are veterans. They are homeless. They are disabled, Mr. Chairman, and that is why it is so critical that we reach out and we help them.

Then I continue to hear from the ranking member, well, this doesn't make a dent. This doesn't make a dent in the problem.

So let me get this straight. If we can't help everybody, we ought to help nobody is, I think, the logic of that argument. Well, we reject that. We reject that argument, Mr. Chairman.

So, again, I just cannot believe something that should be on our suspension calendar, something that should be receiving overwhelming bipartisan support apparently has to come with what we call a rule bill.

But we know that 42,000 people have died in the last calendar year, to where we have the data, due to opioid abuse—up tremendously. So there is just an urgent need to target resources for substance use treatment services, to make effective treatment more widely available.

We have an opportunity, right here in this House, right now, today, to say that we have the evidence. Let's take some Section 8 vouchers and make sure that they are part of the solution.

□ 1415

And so I thank the gentleman from Kentucky. What a wonderful leader he is on our committee in trying to help—and we are not helping everybody. I admit it.—to begin to put people in transitional housing.

Mr. Chair, I urge all Members to support the THRIVE Act. We can make a difference today.

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

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committee on Financial Services, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-73. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 5735

*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 "Transitional Housing for Recovery in Viable Environments Demonstration Program Act" or the "THRIVE Act".*

#### **SEC. 2. DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM TO STUDY THE IMPACT OF USING RENTAL VOUCHERS FOR SUPPORTIVE AND TRANSITIONAL HOUSING FOR INDIVIDUALS RECOVERING FROM OPIOID USE DISORDERS OR OTHER SUBSTANCE USE DISORDERS.**

*Section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:*

*"(21) RENTAL VOUCHER DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR SUPPORTIVE AND TRANSITIONAL HOUSING FOR INDIVIDUALS RECOVERING FROM OPIOID USE DISORDERS OR OTHER SUBSTANCE USE DISORDERS.—*

*"(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a demonstration program under which*

*the Secretary shall set aside, allocate, and distribute directly to eligible entities, from amounts made available for rental assistance under this subsection, the amounts specified in subparagraph (B) for an eligible entity to provide a voucher for such assistance to a covered individual through a supportive and transitional housing program that provides treatment for opioid use disorders or other substance use disorders (as applicable), job skills training, and such assistance for a period of 12 to 24 months.*

*"(B) AMOUNT.—The amount specified in this subparagraph is, for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, the amount necessary to provide the lesser of—*

*"(i) 0.5 percent of the total number of vouchers allocated under this subsection during the fiscal year ending immediately before the date of the enactment of this paragraph; or*

*"(ii) 10,000 vouchers.*

*"(C) CRITERIA FOR ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—An eligible entity shall—*

*"(i) provide an evidence-based treatment program and a job skills training program for individuals recovering from an opioid use disorder or other substance use disorder, as applicable, that meet standards established by the Secretary; and*

*"(ii) demonstrate prior experience administering rental assistance vouchers, demonstrate prior experience administering transitional housing programs under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Act, or demonstrate a partnership with a public housing agency or a housing program of a State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe (as such term is defined in section 4 of the Native American Housing and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4103)) that ensures effective administration of rental assistance vouchers.*

*"(D) APPLICATION.—To receive a rental assistance voucher under this paragraph, an eligible entity shall submit an application to the Secretary that shall include—*

*"(i) a description of the terms of treatment program, job skills training, and rental assistance to be provided to a covered individual, and assurances that such description shall be communicated to covered individuals that receive vouchers pursuant to the demonstration program established under this paragraph; and*

*"(ii) a transitional plan that begins on the date on which a covered individual completes the treatment program of the eligible entity that includes information on additional treatment, job skills training, and housing resources and services available to such covered individual.*

*"(E) SELECTION.—In selecting eligible entities to receive rental assistance vouchers under this paragraph, the Secretary shall—*

*"(i) ensure that such eligible entities—*

*"(I) are diverse;*

*"(II) represent an appropriate balance of eligible entities located in urban and rural areas; and*

*"(III) provide supportive and transitional housing programs in diverse geographic regions with high rates of mortality due to opioid use disorders or other substance use disorders, as applicable, based on data of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; and*

*"(ii) consider—*

*"(I) the success of each recipient eligible entity at helping individuals complete the treatment program of the eligible entity and refrain from opioid or other substance usage, as applicable;*

*"(II) the type of job skills training program provided by the eligible entity;*

*"(III) the percentage of participants in the job skills training program that gain and maintain employment;*

*"(IV) the percentage of participants in the treatment program of the eligible entity that—*

*"(aa) do not relapse into opioid or other substance usage, as applicable; and*

*"(bb) do not receive Federal assistance for treatment of an opioid use disorder or other substance use disorder, as applicable, after completion of the program.*



“(F) **TRANSFER OF VOUCHER.**—Upon termination of the provision of rental assistance through a voucher to a covered individual, the eligible entity that initially offered such voucher may use such voucher to provide rental assistance to another covered individual.

“(G) **DURATION.**—The Secretary shall not make rental assistance available under this paragraph after the expiration of the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this paragraph.

“(H) **REPORTS.**—

“(i) **BY THE ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—An eligible entity that receives a rental assistance voucher under this paragraph shall submit to the Secretary—

“(I) annually, the transitional plan described in subparagraph (D)(ii) and information on each covered individual’s housing upon termination of the provision of rental assistance through a voucher to such covered individual in a manner that protects the privacy of such covered individual; and

“(II) not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, a plan describing the treatment and housing options for any covered individual assisted by such voucher who will not have completed the program before the day that is 5 years after such date of enactment.

“(ii) **BY THE SECRETARY.**—The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that analyzes the impact of rental assistance provided under this paragraph—

“(I) not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this paragraph; and

“(II) not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, that includes recommendations for the continuation or expansion of the program established under this paragraph and improving the process for providing such assistance.

“(I) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this paragraph:

“(i) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—The term ‘eligible entity’ means a nonprofit organization that meets the criteria described under subparagraph (C).

“(ii) **COVERED INDIVIDUAL.**—The term ‘covered individual’ means an individual recovering from an opioid use disorder or other substance use disorder.”.

### SEC. 3. REPEAL OF RENTAL VOUCHER DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Effective the day that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, paragraph (21) of section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)), as added by this Act, is repealed.

### SEC. 4. RETURN OF VOUCHERS.

An eligible entity that provided vouchers for rental assistance under paragraph (21) of section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)), as added by this Act, shall return any such vouchers to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development on the day that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 115–751. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BARR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 115–751.

Mr. BARR. 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 1, line 7, strike “**AND TRANSITIONAL**”.

Page 1, line 15, strike “**AND TRANSITIONAL**”.

Page 2, line 11, strike “**and transitional**”.

Page 2, line 14, strike “job skills training” and insert “coordination with workforce development providers”.

Page 2, lines 15 and 16, strike “for a period of 12 to 24 months” and insert “, as determined by the entity”.

Page 2, lines 18 and 19, strike “for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023” and insert “for fiscal year 2019”.

Page 2, line 22, strike “allocated” and insert “renewed”.

Page 3, lines 5 and 6, strike “a job skills training program” and insert “demonstrate the ability to coordinate with workforce development providers”.

Page 3, line 13, strike “transitional” and insert “supportive”.

Page 4, line 4, strike “job skills training” and insert “coordination with workforce development providers”.

Page 4, line 15, strike “job skills training” and insert “coordination with workforce development opportunities”.

Page 5, line 3, strike “and”.

Page 5, after line 3, insert the following:

“(III) have adequate resources for treatment, recovery, and supportive services;

“(IV) fully comply with the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.) and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000a et seq.); and”.

Page 5, line 4, strike “(III)” and insert “(V)”.

Page 5, line 12, before the dash insert “, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Labor”.

Page 5, line 17, before “opioid” insert “illicit”.

Page 5, strike lines 19 through 25 and insert the following:

“(II) the coordination with workforce development providers by the eligible entity;

“(III) the percentage of participants in unsubsidized employment during the second and fourth calendar quarter after exit from the program;”.

Page 6, strike “that—” in line 3 and all that follows through “do not” in line 4 and insert “that do not”.

Page 6, line 6, strike “; and” and insert a period.

Page 6, strike lines 7 through 12.

Page 6, line 13, strike “TRANSFER” and insert “REISSUANCE”.

Page 6, after line 23, insert the following:

“(H) **WAIVERS.**—The Secretary may, through publication of a notice in the Federal Register, waive or specify alternative requirements for any provision of statute or regulation governing the use of vouchers under this subsection (except for requirements relating to fair housing, non-discrimination, labor standards, or the environment) upon a finding by the Secretary that such waiver or alternative requirement is necessary for the purposes of this paragraph.”.

Page 6, line 24, strike “(H)” and insert “(I)”.

Page 8, line 11, strike “(I)” and insert “(J)”.

Page 9, line 1, strike “**RETURN OF VOUCHERS**” and insert “**DEMONSTRATION CLOSE-OUT**”.

Page 9, line 6, strike “on” and insert “not later than”.

Page 9, line 8, before the period insert “for use only for renewals of expiring contracts for such assistance”.

Page 9, after line 8, add the following new section:

### SEC. 5. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 934, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my manager’s amendment to the legislation at issue today, H.R. 5735, the THRIVE Act, which, again, would make supportive housing more accessible to those most in need by allocating a limited number of housing choice vouchers to nonprofits that provide housing, workforce development, job placement, and continued addiction recovery support for individuals who are transitioning out of rehab and back into the workforce.

This manager’s amendment introduces improvements to the THRIVE Act based on feedback we have received from various stakeholders in the affordable housing and recovery communities, my colleagues on the House Financial Services Committee, as well as technical drafting assistance from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Among these changes include:

Clarifying the distinction between illicit drug use and medication-assisted treatment;

Requiring nonprofits to show that they have experience administering housing programs and are in full compliance with the Fair Housing Act and Civil Rights Act of 1964;

Requiring HUD and eligible entities to coordinate with the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Labor, and local workforce development boards;

Eliminating time limits for individuals in the program;

Authorizing waiver authority allowing HUD greater flexibility to administer the program, while still requiring full compliance with statutes and regulations related to fair housing non-discrimination, labor standards, and other requirements; and other technical changes.

Mr. Chair, I would like to thank my Democratic colleagues, including Congresswoman SINEMA, for suggesting several of the improvements to the bill that are included in this amendment. I would also like to emphasize, once again, my commitment to working with Ms. SINEMA and other colleagues to request additional funding from the Appropriations Committee to support this demonstration program.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that the total economic burden of prescription opioid misuse alone in the United States is \$78.5 billion per year. Our Federal housing programs are an underutilized

source in the fight against this national public health crisis.

The THRIVE Act is a small investment of only 10,000 housing choice vouchers out of a total of over 2 million, to people who are literally dying every day. It has earned the support of over 140 recovery organizations who are on the front lines of this epidemic.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, it is not a reason to vote against this legislation because it is using existing appropriations for the Housing Choice Voucher Program.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle who are objecting to this legislation are making the wrongheaded and misguided argument that claims that this is somehow taking away from other members of the program.

There are 198,000 vouchers that come up each and every year. We are talking about not taking vouchers away from anyone, but using those vouchers that become available for new recipients. These recipients are oftentimes eligible for the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program anyway, because they come out of rehab without resources. They are statutorily eligible.

So when they talk about taking away from veterans, when they talk about taking away from the disabled, or from the homeless, that is who these people are. These people typically are without homes. They are, in many cases, veterans.

Saint James Apartments, which is one of these recovery centers in my district, focuses exclusively on veterans who are addicted to opioids, and these people, obviously, are also struggling with a disability. So the THRIVE Act deserves every one of our Members' support. These organizations and these folks who are struggling with addiction are literally crying out for Congress to help, and we need to answer that call.

I urge support for my manager's amendment, and the underlying legislation so we can work together in a bipartisan manner to improve housing options for individuals recovering from opioid addiction and other substance abuse disorders.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, this manager's amendment is simply a last-ditch attempt to address significant administrative concerns and questions about the correct interpretation of the underlying legislation.

The fact that this amendment had to be revised three times before a final version was submitted past the deadline for consideration by the Rules Committee, is indicative of the hasty and haphazard nature in which this bill has been cobbled together.

For example, in response to a Congressional Budget Office score that in-

terpreted the bill to create up to 50,000 new vouchers, resulting in a cost of \$1.2 billion, this amendment would clarify that the intent of the gentleman from Kentucky was not to provide new funding, but, instead, to take vouchers away from people waiting in line for housing assistance.

And while this amendment resolves a few technical issues, it also creates new problems. In particular, this amendment would add broad authority for the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to waive requirements that would otherwise apply under the Section 8 program. This includes being able to waive basic tenant protections as well as the requirement that rents are affordable to residents at 30 percent of their adjusted income, which is known as the Brooke amendment.

In sum, this amendment does nothing to address the fundamental issues with this bill, including the fact that it prohibits new funding.

Mr. Chairman, I really do need to point out that perhaps it was not clear in Mr. BARR's presentation about this amendment that this amendment additionally reinforces his point that no additional funds would be authorized.

As a matter of fact, if you look at section 5 of the amendment where it says, "No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the requirements of this act and the amendments made by this act. Such requirement shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated," which simply means taking 10,000 vouchers from people who are waiting in line, who are desperate for the need for safe and secure housing, and it makes sure that you understand that he does not want any more funds appropriated. Except, there is some kind of contradiction that can be confusing.

When he first introduced the bill—and I talked about the fact that he had not only asked me to sign on to a letter to the appropriators asking for more money, and I decided not to do that because of the fact that he still had this amendment that would say that there should be no additional funds spent on this.

What is my friend doing? What is he talking about? How can he send a letter to the appropriators asking for more money when, not only does he have in the bill, but in the amendment to the bill, very clear language that says there should be no additional funds appropriated.

Well, of course, that is confusing. And I am not so sure why the contradiction is there. But I do know this: I believe that the intent of my colleague is a good intent; that he really would like to do something about opioid addiction. I believe that most of the Members who have gotten involved in this issue and who are learning about it for the first time, and understanding that there is a crisis for the first time, want to do something about this issue.

But what they have not done is, they have not taken the time to construct legislation to truly deal with the issue, and spend the money, ask for the money, ask for the resources that are necessary to deal with what they say is a crisis.

They come here and they talk about homelessness, and they talk about the opioid abusers who are on the streets who need housing. Yes, they do. Just as all of those people who have been standing in line waiting for Section 8 housing need housing.

They talk about veterans who are homeless. They are absolutely correct. Some of those veterans have drug problems. Others don't have drug problems. They have come back from their service to their country without jobs, without a place to live, and here we are, talking about robbing the folks who have been standing in line and who are in need—including the veterans on the street—robbing them of their opportunities because we want to take away 10,000 housing vouchers from them.

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, just to respond briefly to some of those claims, our efforts to work in a bipartisan way, an overture to the ranking member to actually meet her halfway, should be actually welcomed. It shouldn't be rejected.

And if she is concerned about more funding, guess what, that is not what the authorizing committees do. That is what the appropriators do, and if the ranking member were sincere, she would sign on to the letter to the appropriators with respect to providing additional funds.

But in any event, this is not hastily put together. This is the result of a lot of feedback, of hearings, of many years of actually talking and listening to not-for-profits that are in this line of work. And they are begging us, along with 144 other organizations in addiction recovery, to pass this bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the manager's amendment, and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 115-751.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. 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 4, line 10, strike "and".

Page 4, line 17, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 4, after line 17, insert the following: "(iii) evidence sufficient to demonstrate that the local government having jurisdiction over the location of any supportive

housing facility to be used by the eligible entity in connection with the demonstration program under this paragraph permits such facilities in such location.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 934, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a simple but crucial amendment to the THRIVE Act to ensure that local governments have a say in which sober living homes are able to participate in this demonstration program.

My amendment would require the nonprofits who apply for funding under this bill to prove that the Federal dollars they receive are distributed only to facilities that have permission from the relevant local government to operate in that location.

The proliferation of unlicensed sober living homes in residential communities in my district and throughout our country has had a deleterious impact on local residents and has not well-served the drug and alcohol addicts the program is supposed to help.

□ 1430

Many—not all, but many—of these facilities are owned and operated by unscrupulous actors. These bad actors totally disregard the impact on local residents of the neighborhoods as well as those who reside in the sober living homes themselves. The Federal Government must not subsidize this.

It is not only the surrounding neighborhood that suffers in these circumstances, but also recovering addicts whose treatment facility has no oversight and sometimes no actual personal program for recovery. This bill with my amendment produces a balanced first step toward helping the victims of the opioid epidemic while safeguarding the rights of families, homeowners, and local communities.

I am grateful for the support of my friend and colleague Congressman BARR, and I am grateful for his support through this amendment. I urge the rest of my colleagues to join with us and vote in favor of this amendment.

I would also note that it is the Federal Fair Housing Act that shields the bad actors and prevents local governments from doing anything meaningful about the problems associated with sober living homes. Municipalities face costly litigation for trying to address their transient nature, and local residents often experience an increase in crime in their neighborhoods, not to mention other threats to their quality of life.

The THRIVE Act does not address the Fair Housing Act, but I have authored a bill that would do this. I encourage a serious consideration of H.R. 5724, the Restoring Community Oversight of Sober Living Homes Act.

My bill would narrowly amend the Fair Housing Act to return to local

governments their proper zoning authority to manage sober living homes in a manner acceptable to the local people and something that will help those drug addicts as well as the local community. So I gladly offer this amendment and ask my colleagues to consider both this amendment as well as the bill that I will submit on this issue.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I don't think the amendment really does what the gentleman would like to have it do, but I am not opposed.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 115-751.

Ms. MOORE. 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 5, line 3, strike “; and” and insert “, including tribal communities;”.

Page 5, after line 3, insert the following: “(III) appropriately reflect the impact that opioids are having in tribal communities; and”.

Page 5, line 4, strike “(III)” and insert “(IV)”.

Page 8, line 13, after “means” insert the following: “a tribally designated housing entity (as such term is defined in section 4 of the Native American Housing and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (24 U.S.C. 4103)), or”.

Page 8, line 14, after “tion” insert a comma.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 934, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us today makes nonprofit organizations eligible for Federal Government vouchers to house people in recovery for drug addiction. My amendment simply makes Tribal housing authorities also eligible to apply and receive the vouchers.

I, like the gentlewoman from California, am concerned that this bill, without additional funding, however well-intended, really robs Peter to pay Paul, and it would cannibalize our local housing authorities of funds and prioritize seeking housing solutions for those individuals with addiction prob-

lems over other individuals who are victims of domestic violence, who are low-income families who have been waiting in line and need a subsidy in order to make ends meet, and other homeless populations.

Again, I think this is a laudable goal, but I am concerned about this bill not having any appropriations connected to it.

But, Mr. Chairman, if we, in fact, are going to take this approach, I am sure we can all agree that Tribal housing authorities should also be eligible. Indian Country has been devastated by drug addiction, and Tribes from across the Nation have struggled to keep pace with treating their addicted population and all the tertiary problems associated with addiction, including housing problems.

The reality is that nonprofits are not really operating in Indian Country now, and the unique geographic and cultural challenges make it very unlikely that any nonprofit will actually be able to serve Indian Country even if the program is successful in other areas.

Indian Tribes are making do. There are some success stories, like the Potawatomi in Milwaukee, but the need is so overwhelming. So as we provide aid to our States, I strongly believe that our sacred trust obligations to Indian Country make it necessary for us to include our Tribes in this legislation.

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim time in opposition to this amendment, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I want to make an observation that, in the course of this debate, not one of the Members speaking in opposition to this legislation has made the argument that these evidence-based transitional housing models won't work. None of the arguments are that this model won't work and won't help people achieve long-term recovery. So why would anyone oppose the legislation?

I will accept my friend's, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin's amendment. I appreciate the contribution that she is making to make sure that Native American Tribal communities and their Tribal housing authorities are designated as eligible entities to receive vouchers.

This amendment will ensure that Native American communities residing in Tribal areas would have the opportunity to benefit from this demonstration, similar to urban, suburban, and other rural areas, and this amendment protects persons recovering from addiction in Native American Tribal communities by ensuring that vouchers

might still be available through Tribal housing authorities should an eligible nonprofit not be available.

Because some of the Tribal areas are located in very remote areas, the nonprofit entities envisioned under this demonstration program may not have the capacity to reach onto those reservations. This amendment provides remote Tribal communities an avenue for providing transitional housing to persons recovering from addiction when such nonprofit participation could be low. This amendment ensures that Tribal communities are not disadvantaged by a lack of nonprofit access so that they have an adequate voucher dispersion entity to community individuals in need of transitional housing as they recover from addiction.

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I have absolutely no doubt at all about the gentleman's commitment and his sincerity to solve the problem of housing challenges for those who are addicted.

I would just note that my own experience in my community is similar to the gentlewoman from California. We have seen people be on the waiting list for 10 years to get in housing. If we appear to be skeptical about there being enough housing resources, it is only because of that experience where we have seen people on the wait list for 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, again, I thank the gentleman for his consideration, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I accept and support the gentlewoman's amendment.

I will just remind all Members, and especially Members who might be considering whether or not they want to vote for the legislation, if you are concerned about additional appropriations, the proper channel is to request that from the appropriators. Any Member of Congress considering voting on this legislation can sign this bipartisan letter to the appropriators asking for additional financial support for this demonstration project. But it is not a reason to not vote "yes."

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 115-751.

Mr. BIGGS. 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 8, strike " , that includes" in line 6 and all that follows through "such assistance" in line 10.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 934, the gentleman

from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

First of all, I commend Chairman HENSARLING and the gentleman from Kentucky for their thoughtful efforts on this bill to put together a pilot program that is designed to help people who suffer this opioid addiction. I am grateful to them for their thoughtful efforts.

My amendment simply narrows the reporting requirements that are imposed on the Secretary. This does not proscribe or necessarily limit the parameters of the report, but it prevents unnecessary prognostication on the part of the Secretary, which I believe will allow for an accurate and valuable assessment at the conclusion of the pilot program's testing period.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for coming and offering this very simple amendment. I thank him for his kind words for the gentleman from Kentucky, who has been an outstanding leader in this effort.

The amendment will simply allow Congress to work its will on the report from the Secretary and allow us to have our own full analysis. I think it is a helpful amendment. I would urge its adoption.

Finally, I would just echo what my friend from Kentucky, the leader of this effort, has said. We are an authorizing committee, not an appropriating committee under the rules of the House, and we authorize programs based upon priorities.

We do demonstration projects all the time, and if there were ever a worthy one that should be considered by this body in the midst of, again, a legitimate crisis on opioid addiction, it ought to be this program.

We have had several amendments that have been agreed to by the majority. I think all have probably improved the underlying legislation. But again, this is something that should have been on the suspension calendar. I don't understand why we have to take so much floor time on this. I don't understand the argument that, if you can't help everybody, then don't help anybody. I don't understand the argument that, since you are not an appropriating committee, then don't authorize the help. I simply don't understand that.

Again, we have the opportunity in this Congress, on this floor, at this moment to make a difference, a huge difference, in the road to recovery for thousands of opioid addicts who are trying to get their lives back together. If we believe in their hope and if we believe in their cause, then we should support the THRIVE Act of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly support the amendment from the gentleman from Arizona, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BIGGS). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PAULSEN) having assumed the chair, Mr. BIGGS, 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. 5735) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a demonstration program to set aside section 8 housing vouchers for supportive and transitional housing for individuals recovering from opioid use disorders or other substance use disorders, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 934, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. HENSARLING. 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