

Well, we have 67 terrorists convicted since 9/11 in American prisons and supermaxes in the United States. No one has ever escaped from a supermax prison. It is pure fear-mongering to say that a State or any place in the United States would be endangered by having a terrorist or anyone else in a supermax prison.

If the terrorist from Orlando had not been shot dead, he would presumably be either sentenced to death or sentenced to life in prison. He would be in a prison in the United States, and no one would say that is unsafe. No one would say: You have got to export him from the country. That is just pure, aberrant nonsense.

So we ought to shut the prison because it is fiscally sound. It would remove a terrorist propaganda point from al Qaeda and ISIS and everybody else. And not all those 91—some of them may be the worst of the worst. Some of them may not be. Some of them we know were simply handed over to bounty hunters because some other tribe in Afghanistan thought this is a good way—the Americans are handing out \$5,000, \$10,000—this is a good way to get rid of our rivals.

They ought to be tried. If guilty, they ought to be kept in prison for life, perhaps, depending on what they are guilty of. But if innocent, they ought to be released. And to say they ought to stay in Guantanamo without trial—and we know the military tribunals don't work; they haven't managed to convict anybody and make it stick—forever is un-American.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, President Obama's policy of releasing people willy-nilly from Guantanamo is a bad policy. The risk is real. In recent months, the administration has finally admitted that there have been Americans who have died because of Guantanamo detainees who have been released. The Director of National Intelligence has said one of every three released detainees has rejoined the fight.

Even if detainees are brought to the U.S. and never escape, to address what my colleague from New York said, there is a very real danger of proselytization within the prison system, radicalizing the inmate population, and allowing terrorists to have increased legal rights, the risk of contraband, and access to communications. If there ever were a trial on U.S. soil, they would have the right to access methods and sources used by our intelligence agencies, and those would be given away to the bad guys. The people of Colorado and other States certainly don't feel safe having these terrorists in their backyards for those reasons.

Transferring Guantanamo prisoners to American soil is illegal, period. We need to do everything we can to ensure the President doesn't break the law or overturn the will of the American people and increase the risk to the American people, all because of a foolish and misguided campaign promise.

I would like to inform the President that 9/11 happened way before there

ever was a Guantanamo prison. That is not why the Islamic radicals attacked us. They oppose our very way of life. They oppose us for who we are, not for what we do.

Let's keep GTMO open.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, following up on part of the discussion, we have had 443 people convicted of terrorist-related charges held in U.S. prisons, and as has already been indicated, they are very secure because no one has escaped.

I don't think it is necessarily wrong, even if a person is evil, that they have some modicum of legal rights under the United States of America. And you have 63 people being held in Guantanamo today for over 10 years with no trial. I just don't think that is according to the constitutional principles of this country.

But what I find upsetting is the prohibition on surveys, assessment, and reviews, the search for knowledge. There may be no better way to deal with the detention issue than keeping Guantanamo open. I would acknowledge that to the gentleman. There may not be a better way.

But if we don't search for knowledge and information and the truth, we will never know. What is the harm in asking?

I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, 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. 5293) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON H.R. 5485, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

Mr. CRENSHAW, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-624) on

the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 783 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5293.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1807

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5293) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, with Mr. CARTER of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 29, printed in House Report 114-623, offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 30 printed in House Report 114-623.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used for drug interdiction or counter-drug activities in Afghanistan.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, today my friend, Congressman JONES, and I are offering an amendment to end the DOD's involvement in and funding of the futile war on drugs in Afghanistan.

In his most recent quarterly report from April 2016, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan, Mr. John Sopko, said that the United States has provided a total of \$8.5 billion in funding for counternarcotics efforts in Afghanistan since 2002. But these efforts have failed. They have been a colossal failure.