

Our amendment would help ensure adequate funding for a grant program available to States, including my home State of Pennsylvania, to tailor assessment systems to work for teachers, parents, and students. The amendment would provide \$378 million in funding for State assessment grants, the amount authorized for these grants in the Every Student Succeeds Act but, notably, \$8.9 million more than that which was included in the legislation we are currently debating.

Including full funding for State assessment grants is a critical way for Congress to fulfill our promise under ESSA that we would streamline testing so the high-stakes testing culture that has burdened schools and students for too long is rolled back.

I thank the chairman and ranking member for the opportunity to offer this amendment, and I urge the adoption of the en bloc amendment.

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

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this bi-partisan amendment that would increase funding for the Black Lung Clinics Programs in the Health Resources Services Administration (HRSA) by \$2.7 million. This increase, when added to the \$7.2 million provided in the appropriations bill being considered, will provide \$10 million in total funding for Fiscal Year 2018. I want to commend Representative GRIFFITH for his leadership on this issue.

The additional funding proposed by the amendment is fully offset by a reduction in program management, and the total amount of \$10 million is equal to the permanently authorized amount. That level, I would note, has remained the same since the Black Lung Clinics Program was first authorized in the 92nd Congress as part of the Black Lung Benefits Act of 1972.

Today, there are 28 black lung clinics located in 15 coal mining states which, with small grants provided by HRSA's Federal Office of Rural Health Policy, serve as a lifeline for disabled miners.

In many cases, these coal miners spent a lifetime working in our nation's mines, but now face black lung disease—a debilitating and frequently fatal lung disease that continues to erode lung function even after a miner leaves work in the mines. Since 1968, 76,000 miners have lost their lives to black lung disease.

The black lung clinics program is expected to serve 13,800 miners this year. The need for these clinics is rising due to an increase in the number of black lung cases, coupled with an increased number of miners who are now seeking assistance following the closure of mines.

The rate of black lung disease in coal miners fell steadily in the 30 years following the enactment of binding coal dust exposure limits in the 1969 Coal Mine Safety and Health Act. However, that favorable downward trend started to reverse beginning in 2000, according to the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH). NIOSH is also finding that miners are becoming totally disabled from black lung at much younger ages.

The increase in black lung disease has been due in part to longer mining shifts, more

powerful mining machinery, and mine operators cutting into more rock because the easiest reach coal has been mined out. Much of that rock is quartz bearing sandstone which, when mined, releases large amounts of silica containing mine dust that is far more toxic than coal dust.

The most severe form of black lung disease, known as progressive massive fibrosis or PMF, has spiked dramatically. Earlier this year, NIOSH reported that the Stone Mountain Resources clinic in southwest Virginia had identified the largest cluster of PMF ever found—over 400 cases. National Public Radio has reported on large clusters in Kentucky and other states.

PMF produces large masses of scar tissue in the lung, and often the only means for survival is undergoing a high-risk lung transplant.

While funding for the black lung clinics has been frozen at virtually the same level for the past 5 years, a number of clinics, including many of those in Appalachia, have faced substantial increase in demand from coal miners for screening, diagnosis and pulmonary rehabilitation.

Clinics provide benefits counseling, including assisting miners with federal black lung benefits and state compensation claims.

Some clinics are so underfunded that they are operating with obsolete and inefficient diagnostic equipment, which needs to be upgraded.

Mr. Chair, we owe it to coal miners to get them the care and benefits they need and deserve. I urge a yes vote.

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

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania) assumed the chair.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills and agreed to a joint resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 102. An act to direct the Federal Communications Commission to commence proceedings related to the resiliency of critical communications networks during times of emergency, and for other purposes.

S. 327. An act to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to provide a safe harbor related to certain investment fund research reports, and for other purposes.

S. 416. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Incentive Act of 1980 to require an annual review by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the annual government-business forum on capital formation.

S. 444. An act to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to expand the investor limitation for qualifying venture capital funds under an exemption from the definition of an investment company.

S. 462. An act to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to refund or credit certain excess payments made to the Commission.

S. 494. An act to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to terminate an exemp-

tion for companies located in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and any other possession of the United States.

S. 488. An act to increase the threshold for disclosures required by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to compensatory benefit plans, and for other purposes.

S. 1311. An act to provide assistance in abolishing human trafficking in the United States.

S. 1312. An act to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States.

S.J. Res 49. Joint Resolution condemning the violence and domestic terrorist attack that took place during events between August 11 and August 12, 2017, in Charlottesville, Virginia, recognizing the first responders who lost their lives while monitoring the events, offering deepest condolences to the families and friends of those individuals who were killed and deepest sympathies and support to those individuals who were injured by the violence, expressing support for the Charlottesville community, rejecting White nationalists, White supremacists, the Ku Klux Klan, neo-Nazis, and other hate groups, and urging the President and the President's Cabinet to use all available resources to address the threats posed by those groups.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

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

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 131 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GRIFFITH). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 131 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 693, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 693, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 694, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 718, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: “(decreased by \$10,000,000)”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment that would increase funding for youth employment initiatives by \$10 million.

Michigan's unemployment rate is 4.7 percent, but for youth aged 16 to 24, it is more than double that, over 11 percent. Young people face high unemployment, and the lack of opportunity to find meaning in the world of work has implications that go far beyond just those years that they might find meaningful employment.

Investing in those young Americans ensures that they all do better. Providing those important employment

opportunities builds a strong foundation around the concept of hard work, and I know many Members support this effort. We just need to make sure that we find every opportunity that we can to make sure that every young person looking for an opportunity to earn a few dollars learns and, especially, understands the connection between their focus on work and the benefits that they will realize from that not only in terms of their own well-being, but the contributions they can make to their community.

Just last month, I had an opportunity to visit a really great example about how youth employment can make a positive impact in my home community. I visited a community garden run by Greg Gaines, who employs Flint area youth in summer jobs. They learn to grow crops. They learn that hard work pays off. Over time, they see these crops come in that they sell at the local farmers market. Very few of them will work in agriculture, but they come to understand that some patience and some effort and the focus on showing up on time and doing a day's good work literally and figuratively will produce fruits that they can benefit from.

So for 14- to 20-year-old kids in this program, obviously, it will make a difference in terms of the way their lives and their life trajectory goes forward, but it also sets a great example for their peers.

This is just one of those things that we do in the Federal Government that is an investment in our future. It is an investment in the lives of these kids. It pays us back tenfold. We should support it with every dollar we can find, and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by saying how much I, frankly, appreciate the gentleman's amendment.

Many programs in this bill, frankly, were eliminated or substantially reduced to stay within the allocation, which, as I know my good friend knows, was \$5 billion below the FY 2017 enacted level. Some other programs, including job training programs for youth, were reduced by relatively modest amounts, again, to stay within the allocation. The total amount in the bill for youth job training grants is \$832 million, a reduction over last year of just 4.5 percent.

While I support the job training grants and programs in question, I oppose the amendment out of concern that the offset to the Department of Labor's administration account will be too hard to absorb, including the administrative reductions already included in the bill.

I will commit to my friend that we will try to work with him through the process and see if there is some way that we can get these funds restored going forward.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my friend's comments. I understand the position he holds, and I do hope that we can work together, eventually, to make sure that this program is more fully funded.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, appreciate the chairman's comments, and I do hope, during this process, we will respond to this important request.

I rise in support of this amendment. The underlying bill cuts the Department of Labor's Youth Employment Program, which provides funding to all 50 States, by \$42 million, a shortsighted proposal that ignores the needs of millions of young people.

In the United States, there are roughly 5.5 million teenagers and young adults between the ages of 16 and 24 who are neither working nor in school. This translates to one in seven teens and young adults. The youth program helps prepare out-of-school and low-income youth in your communities for employment and postsecondary education. These youth represent extraordinary potential for our Nation's economy. Investing in them has a ripple effect on future generations of low-income children and families, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, a champion for this issue and many others.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which would increase funding for youth employment activities under the Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act.

As has been stated, about 5 million of our Nation's youth are both out of school and out of work, so we have a choice: Do we invest to help our youth get on a good path towards a good job, or do we pay considerably more later?

We have to choose to invest now. This includes increased funding for youth employment activities that help out-of-school and out-of-work youth, and it helps fund summer jobs, on-the-job training, apprenticeship training, and others. The alternative is to pay much more later in incarceration, teen pregnancy, and public assistance. When we make these Federal investments now, we make investments in our communities, our Nation, and our shared future, and we save money in the future.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment and urge its adoption.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I would simply urge my colleagues to join me in this. I think we all know of these individual cases where the life of a young person is changed permanently because of an experience that they had finding meaning in work.

Again, as I said at the outset, my view is we should try to find every way we can to support including as many young people in that experience as possible. This amendment would do that.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1715

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 133 OFFERED BY MR. MITCHELL

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 706, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,646,100)".

Page 706, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$17,560,000)".

Page 708, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$21,750,000)".

Page 708, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,112,900)".

Page 708, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$9,450,000)".

Page 708, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$11,437,700)".

Page 713, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$53,147,000)".

Page 715, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$35,997,500)".

Page 717, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$54,400,000)".

Page 718, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$27,253,900)".

Page 770, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$29,288,100)".

Page 805, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$43,100,000)".

Page 812, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$8,173,700)".

Page 817, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$24,900,000)".

Page 856, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$351,216,900)".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, our Nation faces a dire fiscal situation. We have now reached our debt ceiling and are determining how to control spending while funding necessary programs.

The path we are on is not sustainable. It jeopardizes our future, our children's future, and our national security. We must get our fiscal house in order and take this problem seriously.

Paying lip service to the problem will not solve it. We must be responsible now before it is too late. The reality is that we can make cuts to the size and cost of our Federal Government without impacting essential programs. In fact, the right cuts will allow our economy to grow by stopping over-eager bureaucrats who seem to believe everything should be regulated until it no longer functions.

We in Congress need to be focused on growing and protecting Main Street, not protecting an already bloated Federal Government and bureaucracy. The amendment I propose today is simple. It makes a cut to the bureaucracy of several offices of division F relating to Labor, Health and Human Services. My amendment cuts funds from the same Department of Labor that gave us the overtime rule and the persuader rule. This is an agency of bureaucrats that wishes to legislate through regulation.

My amendment puts forth a modest 10 percent reduction of administrative expenses, which would save taxpayers \$351 million annually on Labor and HHS alone. Let me restate that: We can actually save \$351 million annually by just cutting administrative costs.

We, in fact, may well find the money to put the additional \$10 million into youth employment services if we cut our bureaucracy.

I come from a world of privacy business, so I understand that fiscal responsibility starts on a small scale and requires commitment to changing the trend. My amendment, when combined with similar measures across all appropriations, will yield big savings to taxpayers, and will do so without cutting projects or essential programs that we hold dear.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to seriously consider my amendment as we work to secure our fiscal future, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by thanking my friend for the amendment, quite frankly. And while I understand and share many of the gentleman's concerns, most of the accounts that this amendment reduces have already been reduced in the bill. The allocations we are working on required us to find efficiencies and savings wherever possible.

I believe that cutting the administrative accounts in this amendment by

another 10 percent would unnecessarily increase the risk of significant disruption of services, and oversight responsibility of the agencies in this bill are charged with.

While I oppose the amendment for these reasons, I want to pledge to my friend that I will continue to work with him and others to identify specific areas where additional efficiencies and savings can be realized. And I know my friend also feels strongly about entitlement reform, where the real money is, and I look forward to working with him on that as well.

But in the meantime, Mr. Chairman, I must urge the rejection of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the efforts of the chairman, and, in fact, all of the appropriations efforts. In fact, this week we will pass a full set of appropriations bills out of the House to send to the Senate—something that has not happened here in a very long time, although I am new.

The reality is that many of the cuts we have talked about thus far are cuts to the increases many agencies requested. I worked in the private sector where a cut meant you really spent less real dollars.

Now, I believe there are a number of programs we need to be very careful of. Item by item would be the best way, but at some point in time, we need to draw a line. We can't continue spending what we are spending, and I hope that we are going to be fiscally responsible down the road.

So I appreciate the chairman's comments. I worked very carefully with him, and, yes, I agree that entitlement reform is a huge issue and we have got to take it on. We need to amend the Budget Control Act. There are so many things we need to accomplish.

I am going to support our appropriations package and continue to try and work to tweak those so we actually save money, and we are efficient, and we save programs that we hold dear that are productive.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my good friend, the distinguished ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment would truly decimate the ability of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education to meet the needs of Americans by indiscriminately transferring \$351 million to the spending reduction account.

This does nothing to improve the bill, which is already underfunded. The majority has imposed more than a \$5 billion cut to the Labor-HHS bill below the 2017 omnibus level. Further cuts are completely unnecessary, and that is not all. The committee's allocation

was approximately \$5 billion below the nondefense level allowed under the Budget Control Act.

We have the resources available, yet the majority refuses to allocate them to the essential programs funded through this bill.

This amendment would not encourage the agencies to do more with less. Simply put, it would force the agencies and our constituents to do less with less.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), my good friend.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce funding by 10 percent for programs administered by all accounts in the Labor-HHS appropriations bill. By making it across the board, it makes it more difficult for the agencies to actually administer their programs, making it harder, if not impossible, for the government to protect its citizens by enforcing wage and protection laws, ensuring safe workplaces, ensuring education for students with disabilities, support for those with drug addictions.

The bill, as the gentlewoman has already indicated, is already underfunded, and this would just make matters worse.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope we defeat this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 134 OFFERED BY MR. POCAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 134 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 706, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,400,000)".

Page 708, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 708, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$9,976,000)".

Page 708, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,051,000)".

Page 713, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$21,317,000)".

Page 715, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$13,841,000)".

Page 718, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$59,625,000)" "(decreased by \$7,865,000)".

Page 740, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 770, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert "(decreased by \$51,901,000)".

Page 805, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(decreased by \$112,060,000)".

Page 817, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$25,224,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman

from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I am doing this on behalf of Ms. DELAURO. As we know, her mother passed this weekend, and she is in our thoughts.

Mr. Chairman, this also incorporates two other amendments that we would have otherwise taken up separately under my name, but they are all-inclusive in here. So let me talk about what the amendment does.

This amendment would restore funding to worker protection programs to keep to the fiscal year 2017 levels. The bill, as it stands, has a cut of \$59 million to worker protection agencies, including a cut of \$21 million to OSHA, the elimination of the Susan Harwood training grants, and a cut of \$14 million to the Mine Safety and Health Administration.

This is the lowest budget OSHA has seen since 2009. We need OSHA. It saves lives. Since 1970, occupational deaths have been cut in half, saving over 80 million lives. But there is plenty of work left to do.

Last year alone, 4,800 workers were killed on the job, and over 3 million were seriously injured. An average of 15 workers die every day from job injuries, costing U.S. businesses over \$170 billion.

The proposed budget would further reduce enforcement personnel by 140 investigators. That is 2,318 fewer workplace investigations. In addition, in the bill under consideration, safety training grants to reach workers in the highest risk jobs are eliminated, despite being a core OSHA program through every administration, Republican and Democrat, since 1978.

OSHA has only enough funding to inspect every workplace under its jurisdiction every 159 years. Why would this bill eliminate funding for Susan Harwood training grants that protect and educate workers in the most dangerous jobs?

This program costs less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the Department of Labor's budget. This cut is irresponsible and reckless. We cannot cut NIOSH occupational health research, the primary Federal agency that conducts research to prevent work-related illness and injury. This research is a critical defense against tragedy. We must fund MSHA to keep our Nation's mines safe. There is too much on the line to neglect this sector.

This amendment would restore funding to the Bureau of International Labor Affairs, which is tasked with enforcing labor provisions of free trade agreements that are intended to protect American workers.

Finally, this amendment would restore funding to the National Labor Relations Board, which protects the rights of workers under the National Labor Relations Act.

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

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

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by saying how much I regret—I know my friend regrets that our good friend wasn't here to offer her amendment here this evening, and I appreciate my good friend from Wisconsin stepping up and doing that. He is a very valued member of this subcommittee, and one who contributes mightily to its deliberations.

I certainly understand the concern of some with the relatively modest reductions in this bill at labor enforcement agencies at the Department of Labor. It has been the subcommittee's policy for many years to protect workers' health and safety by increasing funding for compliance assistance, and reducing enforcement activities. That is exactly what this bill actually does.

I appreciate that the subcommittee has had to reduce funding for many programs in the bill to work within its allocation. My concern with this amendment is the substantial offset of the department management funds at the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

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

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I will close by saying that I have been an employer for nearly 30 years; and on behalf of the vast majority of employers who have very responsible workplaces and care for their workers and take care of their workers, it is the irresponsible businesses that hurt all of the other businesses.

When we don't inspect companies that could have workplace violations, when we can only get around every 159 years to every workplace that is under the jurisdiction, when we don't enforce wage laws, we hurt the responsible businesses in this country, and that is why it is important to do this.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair understands that amendment No. 135 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 136 OFFERED BY MR. SABLAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 136 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 713, line 4, after the dollar amount insert: "(increased by \$500,000) (decreased by \$500,000)".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. My amendment moves a small amount of money within the OSHA bureaucracy in order to put enforcement Federal boots on the ground in the Pacific region where my district, the Northern Mariana Islands, is.

□ 1730

Some of you may know that the Northern Mariana Islands are in a transition from overreliance on foreign workers to an economy that is predominantly U.S. workers. As part of that transition effort, last month the House passed and the President signed into law an increase in the fee that is used to train U.S. workers to replace foreign workers. At the end of this month, minimum wage goes up bringing us within 20 cents of the U.S. minimum wage, \$7.05 an hour. These changes are all part of the strategy to make the workplace more accessible and attractive to U.S. workers who are still on the sidelines unemployed.

There is one more small but important move we can make: assure these potential U.S. workers that job sites are safe. We are fortunate to have lots of investment in the resort industry in the Northern Mariana Islands right now. Hotels are going up, and waterlines are being laid. I imagine some Members have had a first job working construction, so they know there are inherent dangers on a construction site. Frankly, we have already had accidents.

Now every State has an OSHA office. There is an OSHA office in Honolulu, but that is 4,000 miles away from my district, and we have no Federal safety officer on duty in the Northern Mariana Islands. We need a real Federal presence—boots on the ground—that will assure U.S. workers that if they get a job working construction, the workplace is safe. As I say, this is one more element in the strategy to put U.S. workers into jobs.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's amendment, and I agree that worker safety is one of the

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

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

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

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to rise in support of Mr. SABLAN's amendment which would improve enforcement of workplace safety standards in the territories. I would note that, adjusted for inflation, OSHA's enforcement budget has been cut by more than 20 percent since 2010, and OSHA's safety inspections declined by more than 20 percent during that time.

It is a sad commentary that we are placing less value on an American worker's safety at the workplace than we did a decade ago. We should be supporting workplace safety in the territories, and we should be supporting workplace safety in the 50 States as well.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support Mr. SABLAN's amendment.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers. I ask my friends and my colleagues to please support this lifesaving amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MITCHELL). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 137 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 138 OFFERED BY MS. MENG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 138 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

Page 718, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,064,000)".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to increase funding for the Women's Bureau within the Department of Labor by slightly more than \$1 million and would decrease funding for the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Prices and Cost of Living Division by the same amount.

This increase would restore the proposed cut the underlying bill would make to DOL's Women's Bureau while still allowing the BLS Prices and Cost of Living Division to be funded at almost \$3.5 million above the current enacted funding level and more than half a million dollars over the President's request for the coming fiscal year.

For those who might be unaware, the Women's Bureau within the Department of Labor conducts research to help departmental agencies develop policies that advance the interests of working women. It plans and executes research and advises other agencies on the structure and implementation of a wide range of worker programs.

Unfortunately, the President's budget request for next fiscal year sought to cut more than three-quarters of the existing staff within the Bureau as well as almost \$9 million. Thankfully, this bill does better than the request. My simple hope is that we can go one small step further and fund this program next year at the level it is currently funded at. That is all my amendment seeks to do.

I urge my colleagues to support funding for the Women's Bureau within the Department of Labor at existing funding levels while offsetting this change with funds in a manner that still permits the BLS Prices and Cost of Living Division to be funded almost \$3.5 million above the current enacted level and almost half a million above the President's request.

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

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

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

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

Many programs in this bill were eliminated or substantially reduced to stay within our allocation. In contrast, the Women's Bureau was reduced by a relatively modest \$1 million. The administration budget request proposed reducing the Women's Bureau by \$8.5 million, clearly a reduction the committee did not agree with in the bill.

I understand the importance of many of these programs, and these are some of the difficult decisions that have to be made to fund bipartisan priorities in this bill like increases in funding to the NIH and to TRIO and yet still stay within our allocation. I expect and hope that as the process moves forward

and we negotiate a bipartisan funding agreement, we will have further discussions regarding the funding of the Women's Bureau.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support Ms. MENG's amendment.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chairman, again, I urge support for this amendment. My amendment simply seeks to fund this program next year at the level it is currently funded at.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 139 OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 139 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 717, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1)(decreased by \$1)”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment highlights the need to think about our future workforce and how it will change because of technology and to encourage the Bureau of Labor Statistics to accept a wider and more forward-looking range of inputs into its range of projections for its workforce of the future.

I co-chair the New Democrat Coalition Future of Work Task Force with my colleagues, Congressman SETH MOULTON and Congressman JARED POLIS. Congressman JIM HIMES, the chair of the New Dem Coalition, has been active in the task force work and joins me in cosponsoring this amendment today.

Over the course of several months, the task force has held a series of forums to hear from experts on various areas that will require this body’s attention in the coming years and decades. We have heard from historians, economists, and policy experts about how technological revolutions of the past have impacted social and political institutions and how lessons from those experiences and from current conditions can help us prepare for the future.

We have also heard from labor and business leaders who are pioneering the way they attract talent, retain their services, and develop skills for the increasingly rapidly change economy. It is nearly unanimous among our experts that the economy will change significantly and change faster, but it is less clear just how quickly the workforce will need to adapt.

For decades, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has been doing excellent and invaluable work to track our labor trends, and its projections have been proven very reliable and useful—to business and to our educators—in times of slower and relatively predictable technological development.

However, they are based on historical data and historical trends, and some of the anticipated changes in technology—such as robotics, self-driving vehicles, and artificial intelligence—could fundamentally change our economy in ways that haven’t been seen before. So, in its current form, the way the Bureau calculates and estimates future development of the workforce may not be able to capture the dramatic changes that our future holds.

One panel convened by the task force suggested that it would be impossible

to do projections in any single way to predict the workforce, but that, with additional resources, the Bureau of Labor Statistics could model for a variety of scenarios of different rates of technological change in different areas.

My amendment increases the BLS account by a dollar and decreases it by a dollar, and I intend it to mean that the BLS should submit to Congress an estimate of the resources it would need to make a range of forward-looking estimates, including consultation with those industries that are driving this rapid technological change and those that will be affected by that change to account for the increasing rate of technological job displacement.

It is hard to estimate by backward-looking extrapolations how the changes from self-driving cars and vehicles or artificial intelligence will affect the real jobs of the future.

Technological changes in the workforce are not new. The industrial revolution and the automation of agriculture transformed the way work was performed in our country and significantly improved, on the whole, our standard of living over time.

□ 1745

The results have not been uniform for all communities and all populations. Those transformations typically played out over generations, so our social and political institutions had ample time to respond. But today, development and deployment of technology is far more rapid, and Congress, business, and our educational system need the best possible data to evaluate policy proposals and to produce the workforce training needed for future employees and to develop educational curricula to ensure that our economy works for everyone.

Like in the industrial revolution, technological development presents the opportunity for a greatly improved standard of living, but it will also bring challenges to our workforce. Businesses, communities, and the government must work together.

Additional considerations in the projections made by the BLS will help Congress to anticipate these changes and to weigh proposed solutions. Objective projections based on empirical evidence are crucial to a debate that will be based on our different views of the role of government and its relationship with market forces. Those are the differences that should shape our ideas for helping Americans enjoy prosperous and full lives in the future.

I urge my colleagues to join me and vote “yes” on my amendment to begin to establish a range of scenarios for the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the future world that we will inhabit.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not object to it.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman’s amendment has no net impact on the funding of the bill, so I do not oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FOSTER. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 141 OFFERED BY MS. MENG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 141 printed in House Report 115–297.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM), and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 734, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 770, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to encourage my colleagues to support my amendment, which simply increases funding for the Behavioral Health Workforce and Training program by \$5 million. This is a reasonable show of support for this important program, which saw its funding cut in half in this bill.

The Behavioral Health Workforce and Training program supports education and training for careers in behavioral health at institutions of higher education and through professional and paraprofessional training programs, with a focus on rural and medically underserved communities. This program was created as part of the 21st Century Cures Act in response to the significant nationwide shortage of behavioral health providers.

According to SAMHSA, 55 percent of U.S. counties do not have a practicing behavioral health provider, and 77 percent of counties reported unmet behavioral health needs. These statistics would be alarming at any time, but they are particularly concerning in the midst of a national opioid epidemic.

A 2016 Surgeon General’s Report found that only 10 percent of people with a substance abuse disorder receive any type of specialty treatment. Additionally, 60 percent of adults with a mental illness didn’t receive mental health services in the previous year.

This lack of access to services has severe consequences for the individuals seeking treatment, their families, and

our communities. When they don't have access to treatment, individuals with behavioral health needs receive a whole different set of services. Jails and sometimes emergency rooms become the de facto behavioral health system.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to make this important investment in the behavioral health workforce, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from New York, representing the gentlewoman from New Mexico, raises a very important point.

The amendment offered is for an increase to a workforce training program. Our committee understands the value of this program, which is why we did not accept the administration's budget request which actually terminated the program. We were able to fund it, though, below last year's level.

Our committee received an allocation that was lower than fiscal year 2017, and as I have explained several times before and doubtless will again, we had to make some very tough decisions. I do pledge to work with the gentlewoman as we work toward the fiscal year 2018 final bill. At this time, though, I must oppose the amendment and urge its rejection.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG). The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 142 OFFERED BY MS. MENG

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 734, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$4,000,000)".

Page 770, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,000,000)".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, this amendment seeks to increase funding for HRSA's Geriatrics Workforce Enhancement Program by \$4 million, restoring program funding to the current enacted level.

I am thankful to the chairman for the funding amount already provided for in this bill, but I am hopeful that we can go one step further and fully fund this program again in the coming fiscal year.

The Geriatrics Workforce Enhancement Program improves healthcare for

older Americans by providing clinical training opportunities to students, medical faculty and providers, direct service workers, patients, families, and caregivers that integrate geriatric and primary care delivery systems.

In the 2015-2016 academic year, grantees provided training to 18,451 students and fellows participating in a variety of geriatrics-focused degree programs, field placements, and fellowships. Of these trainees, 11,824 graduated or completed their training during the most recent academic year, and grantees partnered with 365 hospitals, long-term care facilities, and academic institutions to provide clinical training experiences to trainees.

America's population is aging, and it is imperative that new generations of healthcare professionals and providers have the skills needed to care for older Americans. Every person in this Chamber at some point in their life will wish their healthcare provider had this training. I hope we will all recognize that fact today and do what is prudent.

I hope we will unanimously support this amendment, plan for the future healthcare of our Nation, and restore funding to the HRSA Geriatrics Workforce Enhancement Program account.

Mr. Chair, I urge support for this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, frankly, there is considerable merit to the amendment the gentlewoman is suggesting.

The amendment offered is for an increase to the workforce training program. Our committee understands the value of this program, which is why we did not accept the administration's budget request, which terminated the program. We were able to fund it, though, below last year's level. However, I will certainly commit to my friend that we will work with her as we go through the process toward the final bill, and hopefully we can find a way to increase this at a later time.

At this time, however, Mr. Chairman, I must oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, again, this amendment requires that the program be fully funded. I do look forward to working with the chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG). The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 145 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 145 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 735, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$24,800,000)".

Page 770, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$24,800,000)".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment that I have offered to increase funding for the very successful Healthy Start program, adding \$24.8 million to match the President's funding request.

The Healthy Start program helps infants start out life with the support they need to grow into successful adults. It provides prenatal care, basic health needs, and promotes positive parenting practices for thousands of children.

It is especially important to the people of my hometown, as I mentioned before, and many other communities trying to work through exposure to high levels of lead, which is a neurotoxin. Of course, we know there is no cure, but the way we treat and the support we provide these youngsters often gives them a chance to overcome these sorts of developmental hurdles. Healthy Start is a critical way to do that by helping infants and their families mitigate the effects of that lead exposure.

Flint's ongoing process brought to light the nationwide issues that we face in drinking water. People are more aware of these issues and the impacts they can have on families. So it is incumbent upon us to do everything we can not just to repair the damage, but to actually help those who are struggling to get through these sorts of developmental challenges.

Healthy Start is a proven program. It does that. It is one of the reasons that I essentially take the same position that President Trump is taking: we should have a greater investment in Healthy Start. I don't often find myself in that position, but in this case, I am willing to assert that on this floor.

Early childhood education gives kids, regardless of their socioeconomic background, a chance. I think it is our duty to give every child a fair chance to succeed. That is what this amendment is intended to do.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend for his amendment. I wish I could support it, quite frankly, because I very much support Healthy Start and very much appreciate his support for that program.

As the gentleman knows, again, our subcommittee received an allocation below last year's level. As a result, we did not have the ability to increase funding for some programs, this one included.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1800

AMENDMENT NO. 149 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 740, line 7, insert "(increased by \$40,000,000)" after the dollar amount.

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

Page 744, line 7, insert "(increased by \$40,000,000)" after the dollar amount.

Page 746, line 12, insert "(increased by \$40,000,000)" after the dollar amount.

Page 756, line 21, insert "(decreased by \$120,000,000)" after the dollar amount.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment that redirects \$120 million from CMS overhead spending, which is a 3½ percent reduction, towards increasing funding in three specific areas: \$40 million for pediatric research, \$40 million for Alzheimer's research, and \$40 million to address our country's opioid crisis.

The approval of this amendment will motivate CMS to modify its current punitive bureaucratic culture. Today, hardworking American families are demanding that their government find competent solutions for a struggling healthcare system, and CMS' failure to properly implement the Taking Essential Steps for Testing Act of 2012—or the TEST Act, as it is more commonly known—is a notable example of bureaucratic incompetence.

American families expect the Federal Government to work with healthcare providers, not against them, to ensure the efficient delivery of healthcare.

In 2012, the TEST Act was passed and signed into law due to the mandatory and harsh sanctions that CMS was then imposing on hospitals and labs that violated the Clinical Laboratory Improvements Amendments Act—or CLIA, for short.

While CLIA regulations are necessary, in some instances, the sanctions that CMS imposed against hospitals and laboratories at the time that inadvertently violated the statute were found to be draconian and at odds with the efficient delivery of healthcare.

At the time the TEST Act was considered in 2012, Congress determined that there were instances where a hospital or laboratory's violations were accidental, unintentional, and resulted in no patient harm.

At the time, CMS lacked the flexibility to align the severity of the sanctions for minor and inadvertent actions at the lab, resulting in needless punitive penalties, such as revoking lab certificates and banning principals from owning or operating certified laboratories.

The TEST Act was passed in 2012 to provide CMS with needed discretion to substitute reasonable alternative sanctions in the event of minor or inadvertent violations. In lieu of the previously mandatory sanctions, the TEST Act allowed more appropriate remedies like directed plans of action, onsite monitoring, and/or modest monetary penalties.

Yet, despite being given this mandate and this flexibility, CMS has written its regulations and interpreted the underlying statute in a way that are clearly at odds with Congress' intent in the TEST Act. There are serious impacts when CMS fails to use their congressionally mandated discretionary authority to issue appropriate sanctions.

Healthcare providers are forced to divert scarce resources to severe penalties, to oppressive settlements, and/

or to a costly appeals process. These would not be needed if CMS had properly implemented the TEST Act. This diverts scarce resources from patient care to dealing with an out-of-control CMS, and negatively impacts healthcare in our communities.

I have seen this firsthand in my district where a nonprofit faith-based community hospital committed an unintentional CLIA violation that resulted in no patient harm. The hospital then self-reported that violation, as we would expect any healthcare provider to do.

This hospital is my community's only level II trauma center and provides a significant amount of uncompensated care to the lower income population, including minority families. Yet, rather than working collaboratively with the hospital, CMS ignored the TEST Act and, instead, imposed crippling sanctions and forced the hospital to engage in a burdensome appeals process.

This action will cost this important community resource over \$100 million per year. This arbitrary unwarranted action by CMS forces the hospital to divert finite resources toward an unnecessary bureaucratic process instead of taking care of patients.

CMS needs to change its implementation of the TEST Act to follow the law. In the meantime, my amendment sends a message that this is not how we expect our Federal Government to act in a time when we are articulating a new vision for building a better American healthcare system.

This amendment does this by reducing CMS spending on bureaucracy by \$120 million and directing those funds toward true solutions for better healthcare by finding cures for pediatric cancer, Alzheimer's, and opioid abuse.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I have considerable sympathy with my friend's concerns. Frankly, I think he has certainly every right to be concerned about a hospital in his district. I certainly agree with an effort to put additional funding for the opioid epidemic, for pediatric cancer, and for Alzheimer's disease. These are all critical issues facing our country.

Nevertheless, I must oppose the amendment. The bill actually includes \$126 million within the CDC for surveillance and prevention of opioid misuse, which continues the large increase provided in fiscal year 2017. The bill also provides a \$1.1 billion increase for the National Institutes of Health, which includes a targeted increase of \$400 million for research on Alzheimer's disease, as well as increases for each institute center, including the National



Cancer Institute, to support vital research on disease such as pediatric cancer.

Furthermore, the bill also continues to provide funds authorized in the 21st Century Cures Act, including \$300 million for the Cancer Moonshot, and \$500 million for opioid abuse.

Finally, the reduction of funding at CMS proposed by my friend would weaken the agency's ability to properly manage and administer Medicare and Medicaid. So for that reason, I must oppose my friend's amendment.

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chair, the bottom line is that hardworking American families are tired of having unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats ignore congressional intent when implementing legislation such as the important TEST Act.

We must send a message to CMS today. Now is the time to right this wrong. In the meantime, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment to cut CMS by 3½ percent, \$120 million, and to increase research funding for pediatric cancer, for Alzheimer's, and for opioid treatment. This amendment is a win-win amendment for American healthcare.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to this amendment. I strongly support additional funding for the CDC, the National Cancer Institute, and the National Institute on Aging. I have spent my time in Congress fighting for those agencies.

In fact, over the past 2 years, Democrats on the Labor-HHS Subcommittee have worked closely with Chairman TOM COLE to increase the NIH budgets by \$2 billion annually, and I hope we are able to do it again this year.

But this amendment is fundamentally flawed because it slashes \$120 million from the CMS Program Management. Keep in mind that the CMS Program Management account is already cut by a \$524 million in the underlying bill. That is a 13 percent cut. This amendment would increase that cut to more than 16 percent.

According to HHS, over 143 million Americans will rely on programs administered by CMS, including Medicare, Medicaid, CHIP, and the Federal health insurance exchanges.

Why would my colleagues in the majority support more than \$600 million in cuts to the Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP programs?

Slashing their administrative budgets by 16 percent is certain to harm services that impact Americans on a daily basis. These cuts will directly harm America's seniors, the blind, low- and middle-income families, children with disabilities, and Americans with chronic conditions like end-stage renal disease, as well as pregnant mothers and newborns.

CMS programs face historic growth in the years to come. A cut of \$644 million to its administrative budget would open up the program to mismanagement, fraud, and abuse.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 150 OFFERED BY MS. TENNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 150 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 741, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$14,000,000)".

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

Page 764, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to increase funding to the Community Services Block Grant program. I am proud to represent the 22nd District of New York, a once thriving hub of innovation and manufacturing. My district has suffered the fate of too many Rust Belt communities.

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

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

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

In my district, the Mohawk Valley Community Action Agency in Utica has received more than \$640,000 from the CSBG program, which they have used to support Head Start programming that promotes early childhood development, and the Home Energy Assistance Program, which helps seniors meet ever-rising energy costs in the very cold Northeast.

All told, the CSBG program accounts for more than \$55 million in financial assistance to New York State funding, which touches the lives of more than 705,000 New Yorkers. This number includes more than 46,000 individuals with disabilities and more than 317,000 children in my district. Cuts to this program will have a disproportionate impact on some of the most at-risk and forgotten constituents in our district.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman for working with us on this, and I want to assure that we will work with her. I appreciate her concern for the Community Services Block Grant program. As my good friend from New York knows, that program was actually zeroed out in the administration's budget. We replaced \$600 million of \$715 million, but it clearly is an important program to many Members on both sides of the aisle, has a superb reputation, and we are going to do everything that we possibly can to build upon that and get back to at least the fiscal year 2017 level.

The gentlewoman's leadership in this is greatly appreciated, and we look forward to working with her as we go forward.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chairman, because of Chairman COLE's great willingness to work with and help the truly needy people in our communities, I am going to be withdrawing my amendment this evening. I look forward to working with Chairman COLE as we move forward in this process, and I just want to say thank you.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 152 OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 152 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 744, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,819,000)".

Page 770, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,819,000)”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

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

Make no mistake, these extra funds that are in my measure, the \$3.8 million for cancer research at the National Cancer Institute, are urging that it be spent on lung cancer, in particular. Those extra funds will make an enormous difference in battling lung cancer, which is, as you all know, the most deadly of all the cancers.

□ 1815

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to advise my friend we certainly intend to

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

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I express my thanks and gratitude, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 154 OFFERED BY MS. CLARK OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 751, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$231,330,000)”.

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

Page 805, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$11,710,000)”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

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

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

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

This amendment also restores funding for Project AWARE and the Healthy Transitions grant program, which were created in the aftermath of the Sandy Hook school shooting, which took the lives of 6 adults and 20 beau-

tiful children. In response to this tragedy, the administration and Congress came together to support several new programs to help communities identify and treat behavioral disorders.

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

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

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

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's concern. She is a very valuable member of the subcommittee. This is an area in which she not only has considerable passion, but considerable expertise. However, as the gentlewoman also knows, we have an allocation well below last year's level, and we had to make, again, a difficult decision.

Reduction of this magnitude of the Health and Human Services' administrative functions would eliminate the core funding for the Secretary's office completely, and for that reason I would oppose the amendment.

However, I want the gentlewoman and, certainly, our good mutual friend from Connecticut whom she is representing tonight to know that, as we work with our colleagues in the Senate on a bill to reach the President's desk, I intend to work on these issues with her and with my friends on both sides of the aisle to address the concerns that she raised in her remarks.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OLSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

**LITTLE ROCK CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE BOUNDARY MODIFICATION ACT**

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 0, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 485]  
YEAS—390

Abraham	Carbajal	Doyle, Michael
Adams	Cárdenas	F.
Aderholt	Carson (IN)	Duffy
Aguilar	Carter (TX)	Duncan (SC)
Allen	Cartwright	Duncan (TN)
Amash	Castro (TX)	Dunn
Amodel	Chabot	Ellison
Arrington	Cheney	Emmer
Babin	Chu, Judy	Engel
Bacon	Cicilline	Eshoo
Banks (IN)	Clark (MA)	Españolat
Barletta	Clay	Estes (KS)
Barr	Cleaver	Esty (CT)
Barragán	Clyburn	Evans
Barton	Coffman	Farenthold
Bass	Cohen	Faso
Beatty	Cole	Ferguson
Bera	Collins (GA)	Fitzpatrick
Bergman	Collins (NY)	Fleischmann
Beyer	Comer	Flories
Biggs	Comstock	Fortenberry
Bishop (GA)	Conaway	Foster
Bishop (MI)	Connolly	Fox
Bishop (UT)	Conyers	Frankel (FL)
Black	Cooper	Franks (AZ)
Blackburn	Correa	Frelinghuysen
Blum	Costello (PA)	Fudge
Blumenauer	Courtney	Gabbard
Blunt Rochester	Cramer	Gaetz
Bonamici	Crawford	Gallagher
Bost	Cuellar	Gallego
Boyle, Brendan	Culberson	Garamendi
F.	Cummings	Gianforte
Brady (PA)	Davidson	Gibbs
Brady (TX)	Davis (CA)	Gohmert
Brat	Davis, Danny	Gomez
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Rodney	Gonzalez (TX)
Brooks (IN)	DeFazio	Goodlatte
Brown (MD)	DeGette	Gosar
Brownley (CA)	Delaney	Gotthelmer
Buck	DelBene	Gowdy
Bucshon	Denham	Granger
Budd	Dent	Graves (GA)
Burgess	DeSaulnier	Graves (LA)
Bustos	DesJarlais	Green, Al
Byrne	Dingell	Green, Gene
Calvert	Doggett	Griffith
Capuano	Donovan	Grothman

Guthrie	Luján, Ben Ray	Roybal-Allard
Gutiérrez	Lynch	Royce (CA)
Hanabusa	MacArthur	Ruiz
Handel	Maloney, Sean	Ruppersberger
Harper	Marchant	Rush
Harris	Marshall	Russell
Hartzler	Massie	Sánchez
Hastings	Matsui	Sanford
Heck	McCarthy	Sarbanes
Hensarling	McCaul	Schakowsky
Herrera Beutler	McClintock	Schiff
Hice, Jody B.	McCollum	Schneider
Higgins (LA)	McEachin	Schweikert
Higgins (NY)	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Hill	McHenry	Scott, David
Himes	McKinley	Sensenbrenner
Holding	McMorris	Serrano
Hollingsworth	Rodgers	Sessions
Hoyer	McNerney	Sewell (AL)
Hudson	McSally	Shea-Porter
Huffman	Meadows	Sherman
Huizenga	Meehan	Shimkus
Hultgren	Meeks	Shuster
Hunter	Meng	Simpson
Hurd	Mitchell	Sinema
Issa	Moolenaar	Sires
Jackson Lee	Mooney (WV)	Slaughter
Jayapal	Moore	Smith (MO)
Jeffries	Moulton	Smith (NE)
Jenkins (KS)	Mullin	Smith (NJ)
Jenkins (WV)	Murphy (FL)	Smith (TX)
Johnson (GA)	Murphy (PA)	Smith (WA)
Johnson (LA)	Nadler	Smucker
Johnson (OH)	Napolitano	Speier
Johnson, E. B.	Neal	Stefanik
Johnson, Sam	Newhouse	Stewart
Jones	Noem	Stivers
Jordan	Nolan	Suozi
Joyce (OH)	Norcross	Swalwell (CA)
Kaptur	Norman	Takano
Katko	Nunes	Taylor
Keating	O'Halleran	Tenney
Kelly (IL)	O'Rourke	Thompson (CA)
Kelly (MS)	Olson	Thompson (MS)
Kelly (PA)	Palazzo	Thompson (PA)
Kennedy	Pallone	Thornberry
Khanna	Palmer	Tipton
Kihuen	Panetta	Tonko
Kildee	Pascrell	Torres
Kilmer	Paulsen	Trott
Kind	Payne	Turner
King (IA)	Pearce	Upton
King (NY)	Pelosi	Valadao
Kinzinger	Perlmutter	Vargas
Knight	Perry	Veasey
Krishnamoorthi	Peters	Vela
Kuster (NH)	Peterson	Velázquez
Kustoff (TN)	Pingree	Visclosky
LaHood	Pittenger	Wagner
LaMalfa	Pocan	Walberg
Lamborn	Poliquin	Walden
Lance	Polis	Walker
Langevin	Price (NC)	Walorski
Larsen (WA)	Quigley	Walters, Mimi
Larson (CT)	Raskin	Walz
Latta	Ratcliffe	Waters, Maxine
Lawrence	Reed	Watson Coleman
Lee	Reichert	Weber (TX)
Levin	Renacci	Welch
Lewis (GA)	Rice (NY)	Wenstrup
Lewis (MD)	Rice (SC)	Westerman
Lieu, Ted	Richmond	Williams
Lipinski	Roby	Wilson (FL)
LoBiondo	Roe (TN)	Wilson (SC)
Loeb sack	Rogers (AL)	Wittman
Lofgren	Rogers (KY)	Womack
Long	Rohrabacher	Woodall
Love	Rokita	Yarmuth
Lowenthal	Rooney, Thomas	Yoder
Lowey	J.	Yoho
Lucas	Rosen	Young (AK)
Luetkemeyer	Roskam	Young (IA)
Lujan Grisham,	Rothfus	Zeldin
M.	Rouzer	

NOT VOTING—43

Bilirakis	Demings	Mast
Bridenstine	DeSantis	Messer
Buchanan	Deutch	Poe (TX)
Butterfield	Diaz-Balart	Posey
Carter (GA)	Garrett	Rooney, Francis
Castor (FL)	Graves (MO)	Ros-Lehtinen
Clarke (NY)	Grijalva	Ross
Cook	Labrador	Rutherford
Costa	Lawson (FL)	Ryan (OH)
Crist	Loudermilk	Scalise
Crowley	Maloney,	Schrader
Curbelo (FL)	Carolyn B.	Scott, Austin
DeLauro	Marino	

Soto	Tsongas	Webster (FL)
Tiberi	Wasserman	
Titus	Schultz	

□ 1852

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes due to work in my Congressional District regarding hurricane relief. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 485.

**AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL TO PRESENT CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO FILIPINO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II**

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 23, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 23

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),*

**SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY TO PRESENT THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE FILIPINO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II.**

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on October 25, 2017 for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the Filipino Veterans of World War II in recognition of their dedicated military service.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**CONDEMNING THE VIOLENCE AND DOMESTIC TERRORIST ATTACK THAT TOOK PLACE DURING EVENTS BETWEEN AUGUST 11 AND AUGUST 12, 2017, IN CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA**

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 49) condemning the violence and domestic terrorist attack that took place during events between August 11 and August 12, 2017, in Charlottesville, Virginia, recognizing the