Criminal Information Center (NCIC) database, creating more complete, comprehensive databases and streamlining the reporting process.

The bill would also require the Attorney General to issue guidelines and best practices to the agencies that handle cases involving missing persons or unidentified remains.

Lastly, Billy's Law would expand current law to require that missing children be reported to NamUs, in addition to NCIC, and it will require the reporting of information on every unidentified deceased person, adults and children alike.

My State of Texas passed similar legislation just last year, requiring law enforcement agencies and medical examiners to use NamUs to solve missing and unidentified persons cases.

But while I am proud of the steps my State has taken, this is a national problem that demands a national solution. Billy's Law is that solution.

As a testament to the value of this bipartisan legislation, it is supported by numerous law enforcement and forensic specialist organizations, including the National Association of Police Organizations, the Fraternal Order of Police, The American Academy of Forensic Sciences, and the National Association of Medical Examiners.

I commend Senator MURPHY for his years of dedication to Billy's Law and missing persons across the country, and I thank Representative HAYES for her work on this issue as well. I urge my colleagues to support this significant bipartisan legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 5230.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

LAW ENFORCEMENT DE-ESCALATION TRAINING ACT OF 2022

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1518, I call up the bill (S. 4003) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for training on alternatives to use of force, de-escalation, and mental and behavioral health and suicidal crises, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HAYES). Pursuant to House Resolution 1518, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 4003

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act of 2022''.

SEC. 2. TRAINING ON ALTERNATIVES TO USE OF FORCE, DE-ESCALATION, AND MENTAL AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CRISES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 901(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10251(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (27), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (28), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(29) the term 'de-escalation' means taking action or communicating verbally or nonverbally during a potential force encounter in an attempt to stabilize the situation and reduce the immediacy of the threat so that more time, options, and resources can be called upon to resolve the situation without the use of force or with a reduction in the force necessary;

''(30) the term 'mental or behavioral health or suicidal crisis'—

''(A) means a situation in which the behavior of a person—

''(i) puts the person at risk of hurting himself or herself or others; or

''(ii) impairs or prevents the person from being able to care for himself or herself or function effectively in the community; and

''(B) includes a situation in which a person—

''(i) is under the influence of a drug or alcohol, is suicidal, or experiences symptoms of a mental illness; or

''(ii) may exhibit symptoms, including emotional reactions (such as fear or anger), psychological impairments (such as inability to focus, confusion, or psychosis), and behavioral reactions (such as the trigger of a freeze, fight, or flight response);

''(31) the term 'disability' has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102);

''(32) the term 'crisis intervention team' means a collaborative, interdisciplinary team that brings together specially trained law enforcement officers, mental health providers, and other community stakeholders to respond to mental health-related calls, use appropriate de-escalation techniques, and assess if referral to services or transport for mental health evaluation is appropriate; and

''(33) the term 'covered mental health professional' means a mental health professional working on a crisis intervention team—

''(A) as an employee of a law enforcement agency; or

''(B) under a legal agreement with a law enforcement agency.''.

(b) COPS PROGRAM.—Section 1701 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(n) TRAINING IN ALTERNATIVES TO USE OF FORCE, DE-ESCALATION TECHNIQUES, AND MENTAL AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CRISES.—

''(1) TRAINING CURRICULA.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall develop training curricula or identify effective existing training curricula for law enforcement officers and for covered mental health professionals regarding—

''(i) de-escalation tactics and alternatives to use of force;

''(ii) safely responding to an individual experiencing a mental or behavioral health or suicidal crisis or an individual with a disability, including techniques and strategies that are designed to protect the safety of that individual, law enforcement officers, mental health professionals, and the public;

''(iii) successfully participating on a crisis intervention team; and

''(iv) making referrals to community-based mental and behavioral health services and support, housing assistance programs, public benefits programs, the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline, and other services.

''(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The training curricula developed or identified under this paragraph shall include—

''(i) scenario-based exercises;

''(ii) pre-training and post-training tests to assess relevant knowledge and skills covered in the training curricula; and

''(iii) follow-up evaluative assessments to determine the degree to which participants in the training apply, in their jobs, the knowledge and skills gained in the training.

''(C) CONSULTATION.—The Attorney General shall develop and identify training curricula under this paragraph in consultation with relevant law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government, associations that represent individuals with mental or behavioral health diagnoses or individuals with disabilities, labor organizations, professional law enforcement organizations, local law enforcement labor and representative organizations, law enforcement trade associations, mental health and suicide prevention organizations, family advocacy organizations, and civil rights and civil liberties groups.

''(2) CERTIFIED PROGRAMS AND COURSES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which training curricula are developed or identified under paragraph (1)(A), the Attorney General shall establish a process to—

''(i) certify training programs and courses offered by public and private entities to law enforcement officers or covered mental health professionals using 1 or more of the training curricula developed or identified under paragraph (1), or equivalents to such training curricula, which may include certifying a training program or course that an entity began offering on or before the date on which the Attorney General establishes the process; and

''(ii) terminate the certification of a training program or course if the program or course fails to continue to meet the standards under the training curricula developed or identified under paragraph (1).

''(B) PARTNERSHIPS WITH MENTAL HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which training curricula are developed or identified under paragraph (1)(A), the Attorney General shall develop criteria to ensure that public and private entities that offer training programs or courses that are certified under subparagraph (A) collaborate with local mental health organizations to—

''(i) enhance the training experience of law enforcement officers through consultation with and the participation of individuals with mental or behavioral health diagnoses or disabilities, particularly such individuals who have interacted with law enforcement officers; and

''(ii) strengthen relationships between health care services and law enforcement agencies.

''(3) TRANSITIONAL REGIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY PERSONNEL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—During the period beginning on the date on which the Attorney General establishes the process required under paragraph (2)(A) and ending on the date that is 18 months after that date, the Attorney General shall, and thereafter the Attorney General may, provide, in collaboration with law enforcement training academies of States and units of local government as appropriate, regional training to equip personnel from law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government in a

State to offer training programs or courses certified under paragraph (2)(A).

''(B) CONTINUING EDUCATION.—The Attorney General shall develop and implement continuing education requirements for personnel from law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government who receive training to offer training programs or courses under subparagraph (A).

''(4) LIST.—Not later than 1 year after the Attorney General completes the activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2), the Attorney General shall publish a list of law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government employing law enforcement officers or using covered mental health professionals who have successfully completed a course using 1 or more of the training curricula developed or identified under paragraph (1), or equivalents to such training curricula, which shall include—

''(A) the total number of law enforcement officers that are employed by the agency;

''(B) the number of such law enforcement officers who have completed such a course;

''(C) whether personnel from the law enforcement agency have been trained to offer training programs or courses under paragraph (3);

''(D) the total number of covered mental health professionals who work with the agency; and

''(E) the number of such covered mental health professionals who have completed such a course.

''(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection—

''(A) $3,000,000 for fiscal year 2023;

''(B) $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2024;

''(C) $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2025; and

''(D) $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2026.''.

(c) BYRNE JAG PROGRAM.—Subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10151 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 508 as section 509; and

(2) by inserting after section 507 the following:

''SEC. 508. LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS.

''(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'certified training program or course' means a program or course using 1 or more of the training curricula developed or identified under section 1701(n)(1), or equivalents to such training curricula—

''(1) that is provided by the Attorney General under section 1701(n)(3); or

''(2) that is—

''(A) provided by a public or private entity, including the personnel of a law enforcement agency or law enforcement training academy of a State or unit of local government who have been trained to offer training programs or courses under section 1701(n)(3); and

''(B) certified by the Attorney General under section 1701(n)(2).

''(b) AUTHORITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the Attorney General completes the activities required by paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1701(n), the Attorney General shall, from amounts made available to fund training programs pursuant to subsection (h), make grants to States for use by the State or a unit of government located in the State to—

''(A) pay for—

''(i) costs associated with conducting a certified training program or course or, subject to paragraph (2), a certified training program or course that provides continuing education; and

''(ii) attendance by law enforcement officers or covered mental health professionals at a certified training program or course, including a course provided by a law enforcement training academy of a State or unit of local government;

''(B) procure a certified training program or course or, subject to paragraph (2), a certified training program or course that provides continuing education on 1 or more of the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A);

''(C) in the case of a law enforcement agency of a unit of local government that employs fewer than 50 employees (determined on a full-time equivalent basis), pay for the costs of overtime accrued as a result of the attendance of a law enforcement officer or covered mental health professional at a certified training program or course for which the costs associated with conducting the certified training program or course are paid using amounts provided under this section;

''(D) pay for the costs of developing mechanisms to comply with the reporting requirements established under subsection (d), in an amount not to exceed 5 percent of the total amount of the grant award; and

''(E) pay for the costs associated with participation in the voluntary National Use-of-Force Data Collection of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in an amount not to exceed 5 percent of the total amount of the grant award, if a law enforcement agency of the State or unit of local government is not already reporting to the National Use-of-Force Data Collection.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR USE FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION.—

''(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term 'covered topic' means a topic covered under the curricula developed or identified under clause (i), (ii), or (iv) of section 1701(n)(1)(A).

''(B) REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE INITIAL TRAINING.—A State or unit of local government shall ensure that all officers who have been employed with the State or unit of local government for at least 2 years have received training as part of a certified training program or course on all covered topics before the State or unit of local government uses amounts received under a grant under paragraph (1) for continuing education with respect to any covered topic.

''(C) START DATE OF AVAILABILITY OF FUNDING.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), a State or unit of local government may not use amounts received under a grant under paragraph (1) for continuing education with respect to a covered topic until the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act of 2022.

''(ii) EXCEPTION.—A State or unit of local government may use amounts received under a grant under paragraph (1) for continuing education with respect to a covered topic during the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act of 2022 if the State or unit of local government has complied with subparagraph (B) using amounts available to the State or unit of local government other than amounts received under a grant under paragraph (1).

''(3) MAINTAINING RELATIONSHIPS WITH LOCAL MENTAL HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS.—A State or unit of local government that receives funds under this section shall establish and maintain relationships between law enforcement officers and local mental health organizations and health care services.

''(c) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the total amount appropriated to carry out this section for a fiscal year, the Attorney General shall allocate funds to each State in proportion to the total number of law enforcement officers in the State that are employed by the State or a unit of local government within the State, as compared to the total number of law enforcement officers in the United States.

''(2) RETENTION OF FUNDS FOR TRAINING FOR STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS PROPORTIONAL TO NUMBER OF STATE OFFICERS.—Each fiscal year, each State may retain, for use for the purposes described in this section, from the total amount of funds provided to the State under paragraph (1) an amount that is not more than the amount that bears the same ratio to such total amount as the ratio of—

''(A) the total number of law enforcement officers employed by the State; to

''(B) the total number of law enforcement officers in the State that are employed by the State or a unit of local government within the State.

''(3) PROVISION OF FUNDS FOR TRAINING FOR LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A State shall make available to units of local government in the State for the purposes described in this section the amounts remaining after a State retains funds under paragraph (2).

''(B) ADDITIONAL USES.—A State may, with the approval of a unit of local government, use the funds allocated to the unit of local government under subparagraph (A)—

''(i) to facilitate offering a certified training program or course or, subject to subsection (b)(2), a certified training program or course that provide continuing education in 1 or more of the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A) to law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government; or

''(ii) for the costs of training local law enforcement officers, including through law enforcement training academies of States and units of local government, to conduct a certified training program or course.

''(C) CONSULTATION.—The Attorney General, in consultation with relevant law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government, associations that represent individuals with mental or behavioral health diagnoses or individuals with disabilities, labor organizations, professional law enforcement organizations, local law enforcement labor and representative organizations, law enforcement trade associations, mental health and suicide prevention organizations, family advocacy organizations, and civil rights and civil liberties groups, shall develop criteria governing the allocation of funds to units of local government under this paragraph, which shall ensure that the funds are distributed as widely as practicable in terms of geographical location and to both large and small law enforcement agencies of units of local government.

''(D) ANNOUNCEMENT OF ALLOCATIONS.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a State receives an award under paragraph (1), the State shall announce the allocations of funds to units of local government under subparagraph (A). A State shall submit to the Attorney General a report explaining any delays in the announcement of allocations under this subparagraph.

''(d) REPORTING.—

''(1) UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—Any unit of local government that receives funds from a State under subsection (c)(3) for a certified training program or course shall submit to the State or the Attorney General an annual report with respect to the first fiscal year during which the unit of local government receives such funds and each of the 2 fiscal years thereafter that—

''(A) shall include the number of law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government that have completed a certified training program or course, including a certified training program or course provided on or before the date on which the Attorney General begins certifying training programs and courses under section

1701(n)(2), the topics covered in those courses, and the number of officers who received training in each topic;

''(B) may, at the election of the unit of local government, include the number of law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government that have completed a certified training program or course using funds provided from a source other than the grants described under subsection (b), the topics covered in those courses, and the number of officers who received training in each topic;

''(C) shall include the total number of law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government;

''(D) shall include a description of any barriers to providing training on the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A);

''(E) shall include information gathered through—

''(i) pre-training and post-training tests that assess relevant knowledge and skills covered in the training curricula, as specified in section 1701(n)(1); and

''(ii) follow-up evaluative assessments to determine the degree to which participants in the training apply, in their jobs, the knowledge and skills gained in the training; and

''(F) shall include the amount of funds received by the unit of local government under subsection (c)(3) and a tentative plan for training all law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government using available and anticipated funds.

''(2) STATES.—A State receiving funds under this section shall submit to the Attorney General—

''(A) any report the State receives from a unit of local government under paragraph (1); and

''(B) if the State retains funds under subsection (c)(2) for a fiscal year, a report by the State for that fiscal year, and each of the 2 fiscal years thereafter—

''(i) indicating the number of law enforcement officers employed by the State that have completed a certified training program or course, including a certified training program or course provided on or before the date on which the Attorney General begins certifying training programs or courses under section 1701(n)(2), the topics covered in those courses, and the number of officers who received training in each topic, including, at the election of the State, a certified training program or course using funds provided from a source other than the grants described under subsection (b);

''(ii) indicating the total number of law enforcement officers employed by the State;

''(iii) providing information gathered through—

''(I) pre-training and post-training tests that assess relevant knowledge and skills covered in the training curricula, as specified in section 1701(n)(1); and

''(II) follow-up evaluative assessments to determine the degree to which participants in the training apply, in their jobs, the knowledge and skills gained in the training;

''(iv) discussing any barriers to providing training on the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A); and

''(v) indicating the amount of funding retained by the State under subsection (c)(2) and providing a tentative plan for training all law enforcement officers employed by the State using available and anticipated funds.

''(3) REPORTING TOOLS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Attorney General shall develop a portal through which the data required under paragraphs (1) and (2) may be collected and submitted.

''(4) REPORTS ON THE USE OF DE-ESCALATION TACTICS AND OTHER TECHNIQUES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, relevant law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government, associations that represent individuals with mental or behavioral health diagnoses or individuals with disabilities, labor organizations, professional law enforcement organizations, local law enforcement labor and representative organizations, law enforcement trade associations, mental health and suicide prevention organizations, family advocacy organizations, and civil rights and civil liberties groups, shall establish—

''(i) reporting requirements on interactions in which de-escalation tactics and other techniques in curricula developed or identified under section 1701(n)(1) are used by each law enforcement agency that receives funding under this section; and

''(ii) mechanisms for each law enforcement agency to submit such reports to the Department of Justice.

''(B) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements developed under subparagraph (A) shall—

''(i) specify—

''(I) the circumstances under which an interaction shall be reported, considering—

''(aa) the cost of collecting and reporting the information; and

''(bb) the value of that information for determining whether—

''(AA) the objectives of the training have been met; and

''(BB) the training reduced or eliminated the risk of serious physical injury to officers, subjects, and third parties; and

''(II) the demographic and other relevant information about the officer and subjects involved in the interaction that shall be included in such a report; and

''(ii) require such reporting be done in a manner that—

''(I) is in compliance with all applicable Federal and State confidentiality laws; and

''(II) does not disclose the identities of law enforcement officers, subjects, or third parties.

''(C) REVIEW OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, and every 2 years thereafter, the Attorney General, in consultation with the entities specified under subparagraph (A), shall review and consider updates to the reporting requirements.

''(5) FAILURE TO REPORT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An entity receiving funds under this section that fails to file a report as required under paragraph (1) or (2), as applicable and as determined by the Attorney General, shall not be eligible to receive funds under this section for a period of 2 fiscal years.

''(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to prohibit a State that fails to file a report as required under paragraph (2), and is not eligible to receive funds under this section, from making funding available to a unit of local government of the State under subsection (c)(3), if the unit of local government has complied with the reporting requirements.

''(e) ATTORNEY GENERAL REPORTS.—

''(1) IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, and each year thereafter in which grants are made under this section, the Attorney General shall submit a report to Congress on the implementation of activities carried out under this section.

''(2) CONTENTS.—Each report under paragraph (1) shall include, at a minimum, information on—

''(A) the number, amounts, and recipients of awards the Attorney General has made or intends to make using funds authorized under this section;

''(B) the selection criteria the Attorney General has used or intends to use to select recipients of awards using funds authorized under this section;

''(C) the number of law enforcement officers of a State or unit of local government who were not able to receive training on the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A) due to unavailability of funds and the amount of funds that would be required to complete the training; and

''(D) the nature, frequency, and amount of information that the Attorney General has collected or intends to collect under subsection (d).

''(3) PRIVACY PROTECTIONS.—A report under paragraph (1) shall not disclose the identities of individual law enforcement officers who received, or did not receive, training under a certified training program or course.

''(f) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE STUDY.—

''(1) STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the first grant award using funds authorized under this section, the National Institute of Justice shall conduct a study of the implementation of training under a certified training program or course in at least 6 jurisdictions representing an array of agency sizes and geographic locations, which shall include—

''(A) a process evaluation of training implementation, which shall include an analysis of the share of officers who participated in the training, the degree to which the training was administered in accordance with the curriculum, and the fidelity with which the training was applied in the field; and

''(B) an impact evaluation of the training, which shall include an analysis of the impact of the training on interactions between law enforcement officers and the public, any factors that prevent or preclude law enforcement officers from successfully de-escalating law enforcement interactions, and any recommendations on modifications to the training curricula and methods that could improve outcomes.

''(2) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE ACCESS TO PORTAL.—For the purposes of preparing the report under paragraph (1), the National Institute of Justice shall have direct access to the portal developed under subsection (d)(3).

''(3) PRIVACY PROTECTIONS.—The study under paragraph (1) shall not disclose the identities of individual law enforcement officers who received, or did not receive, training under a certified training program or course.

''(4) FUNDING.—Not more than 1 percent of the amount appropriated to carry out this section during any fiscal year shall be made available to conduct the study under paragraph (1).

''(g) GAO REPORT.—

''(1) STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the first grant award using funds authorized under this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the grant program under this section and submit to Congress a report assessing the grant program, including—

''(A) the process for developing and identifying curricula under section 1701(n)(1), including the effectiveness of the consultation by the Attorney General with the agencies, associations, and organizations identified under section 1701(n)(1)(C);

''(B) the certification of training programs and courses under section 1701(n)(2), including the development of the process for certification and its implementation;

''(C) the training of law enforcement personnel under section 1701(n)(3), including the

geographic distribution of the agencies that employ the personnel receiving the training and the sizes of those agencies;

''(D) the allocation of funds under subsection (c), including the geographic distribution of the agencies that receive funds and the degree to which both large and small agencies receive funds; and

''(E) the amount of funding distributed to agencies compared with the amount appropriated under this section, the amount spent for training, and whether plans have been put in place by the recipient agencies to use unspent available funds.

''(2) GAO ACCESS TO PORTAL.—For the purposes of preparing the report under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall have direct access to the portal developed under subsection (d)(3).

''(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

''(1) $40,000,000 for fiscal year 2025; and

''(2) $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2026.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on S. 4003.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, S. 4003, the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act of 2022, is bipartisan legislation that would improve training for law enforcement officers, including training on using alternatives to force and de-escalation tactics.

This bill was previously brought to the floor under suspension of the rules, but it failed to garner the necessary two-thirds majority support. I was disappointed to see some of my Republican colleagues continue to lead efforts to withhold desperately needed training resources from law enforcement officers.

I am hopeful that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle may have had more time to consider the significance and importance of passing this critical legislation to not only improve policing practices through increased training, but also to make our communities safer by ensuring individuals in crisis receive the help they need.

Law enforcement officers are often the first responders to individuals in crisis. While we have worked to develop and implement non-law enforcement crisis response services, there continues to be a need to train and equip law enforcement officers to de-escalate interactions and divert individuals to appropriate mental and behavioral health services.

Additionally, there is a need to provide officers and crisis response teams the tools they need to understand and respond to individuals with disabilities. One study found that disabled individuals make up one-third to one-half of all people killed by law enforcement officers.

Reforms to law enforcement, including de-escalation training, both improve public safety and reduce crime. A study of the Louisville, Kentucky, police department found that de-escalation training reduced use-of-force incidents by 28 percent and community member injuries by 26 percent. Officer injuries were reduced by an even larger margin of 36 percent.

S. 4003 would require the Department of Justice's Office of Community Oriented Policing Services to consult with a broad range of stakeholders in developing the training curriculum, including law enforcement and behavioral health groups, as well as civil rights and civil liberties groups and associations that represent individuals with disabilities.

This bill also requires the National Institute of Justice and the Government Accountability Office to evaluate the implementation of the program and the effect of the training to ensure that the curricula have a tangible impact on law enforcement encounters with people in crisis and to identify possible changes that would further improve outcomes.

This bipartisan bill has broad support from law enforcement, mental health, and community advocacy groups, and would improve public safety by developing and implementing evidence-based de-escalation training for law enforcement officers.

I thank Senator CORNYN for introducing this bill and former Congresswoman Karen Bass for leading the House version of this important legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to S. 4003, the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act of 2022, which would duplicate existing programs.

S. 4003 creates a new Federal grant program to provide training for law enforcement officers on de-escalation techniques, participation in crisis intervention teams, making referrals to community-based service providers safely responding to individuals in a behavioral or mental health crisis, and alternatives to use of force.

It requires the Department of Justice to develop training curriculum in collaboration with mental health providers, law enforcement agencies, civil rights organizations, and other stakeholders.

It also authorizes $133 million in new money over the next 4 years with no offsets.

There are several problems with this legislation. First, the COPS Office at the Justice Department currently funds programs that already do what this bill purports to support.

□ 1845

For instance, the COPS Office funds the Community Policing Development De-escalation Training program through two different mechanisms.

Through one mechanism, the COPS Office provides $3 million over the next 2 years for the expansion of a network of regional centers to provide nationally certified de-escalation training opportunities for law enforcement.

The other mechanism, Law Enforcement Agency De-escalation Grants, provides nearly $12 million in grant funding over the next 2 years to support whole agency de-escalation, implicit bias, and duty-to-intervene training efforts.

These programs are appropriated and up and running as we speak tonight.

We should not be creating new programs that are duplicative of current programs without at least examining the efficacy of the currently funded programs.

Second, this legislation represents a departure from traditional law enforcement techniques, one that advances a soft-on-crime approach.

In recent years, these kinds of approaches to fighting crime have been a boon to criminals and have led to our current crime epidemic.

We need to seriously address this crime epidemic, not fund duplicative programs that would keep cops in cars.

Finally, this bill is yet another step in federalizing our local police departments.

The bill imposes onerous reporting requirements that would be created with input from liberal special interest groups which can amount to a backdoor way to defund the police.

Law enforcement organizations that fail to meet rigorous reporting requirements created by input from some organizations that advocated for defunding the police would lose training funding under these programs for 2 years.

Local policing is a function of local government. The Federal Government should not be imposing its will over these departments and expanding its spending program with this bill.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA), a distinguished member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Act that will add additional funding for our local police officers. In my local police agencies, they are asking for this funding, they are asking for additional training.

Today, the job of a police officer goes beyond protecting our family. Today, we are asking police officers, protect our families and address mental health issues and address substance abuse issues and address the issue of homelessness. We have watched in horror on television as situations get out of control because police officers are not trained to deal with these issues on a day-to-day basis.

It is time to make a difference. It is time to train our peace officers to do the job that we hired them to do, which is protect our families and to address the local issues, to address the new jobs that we have asked them to take on.

This bill will assure that our peace officers are trained and prepared to handle the situations they encounter on a day-to-day basis.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to please support additional funding that our local police officers and local police agencies are asking for.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters in support of this legislation from the Louisiana Sheriffs' Association, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, the National Fraternal Order of Police, the American Conservative Union, the American Academy of Social Work and Social Welfare, the American Association for Psychoanalysis and Clinical Social Work, the American Association of Psychiatric Pharmacists, the American Association of Health and Disability, the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention, the American Group Psychotherapy Association, the American Psychiatric Association, the American Psychological Association, the Anxiety and Depression Association of America, the Association for Ambulatory Behavioral Healthcare, the Children and Adults with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder, Depression and Bipolar Support Alliance, the Maternal Mental Health Leadership Alliance, the Meadows Mental Health Policy Institute, NAADAC, the Association for Addiction Professionals, the National Alliance on Mental Illness, the National Alliance to Advance Adolescent Health, the National Association for Children's Behavioral Health, the National Board for Certified Counselors, the National Council for Mental Wellbeing, the National Eating Disorders Association, the National Federation of Families, and National Network of Depression Centers, Catholic Charities USA, Catholic Prison Ministry Coalition, the Committee on Domestic Justice and Human Development, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, the Center for Public Justice, the Jesuit Conference Office of Justice and Ecology, the National Association of Evangelicals, the National Latino Evangelical Coalition, National Hispanic Christian Leadership Coalition, and the Prison Fellowship.

LOUISIANA SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION,
Baton Rouge, Louisiana, October 19, 2022.

Hon. STEVE SCALISE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR HONORABLE STEVE SCALISE: On behalf of Louisiana's 64 sheriffs and the over 14,000 deputies they serve, I am writing you today to express our strong support for the bi-partisan Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act which passed the Senate by Unanimous Consent on August 1, 2022. This legislation seeks to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for training on alternatives to use of force, including de-escalation and mental and behavioral health and suicidal crises training.

As you know, Louisiana currently has a population of approximately 4.52 million people. According to the most recent Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration Behavioral Health Barometer, close to 5.6 percent of adults (253,120) in our state live with serious mental health conditions such as schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and major depression. During 2017–2019, the annual average prevalence of past-year serious thoughts of suicide was 4.4 percent. Yet, only 39.5 percent of adults with mental illness in Louisiana receive any form of treatment from either the public system or private providers. The remaining 60.5 percent receive no mental health treatment. Furthermore, according to Mental Health America, Louisiana is ranked 35th out of the 50 states and Washington D.C. for providing access to mental health services.

Despite our sheriffs best efforts to train our deputies in incident response that includes deescalation, problem solving, and mental health awareness, we are asking Louisiana's law enforcement community to compensate for an overworked mental and behavioral health system. If we are going to ensure more citizens who are in need of mental healthcare receive such care when they encounter a deputy, we need to ensure our deputies have the tools and training to help facilitate this transition to care. This is why the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act is so important.

For the first time, the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act would provide federal support for Louisiana's sheriff offices to adopt de-escalation training to respond more effectively to people suffering with a mental or behavioral crises. It would require the Attorney General to develop de-escalation training curricula, authorize annual grant funding for training, evaluate implementation to improve trainings and outcomes and foster greater collaboration with community mental and behavioral support centers. The legislation also enjoys the support ofthe National Sheriffs' Association, the Major Country Sheriff's Association, the National Criminal Justice Association along with the National Association for Rural Mental Health, The Anxiety and Depression Association of America, and the Meadows Mental Health Policy Institute.

Senator John Cornyn, one of the lead sponsors of the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act put it best when he stated ''We ask law enforcement in our communities to wear too many hats, including that of mental health provider, and they often do not have enough resources or training to provide the level of care individuals in crisis need.'' With your support, the House of Representatives has an opportunity to fix this, and we hope it can do so before the end of the year.

Thank you for your continued efforts in support of Louisiana's law enforcement community. We look forward to working with you to ensure this critical legislation's enactment.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL RANATZA,
Executive Director.

MAJOR CITIES CHIEFS ASSOCIATION,
April 05, 2022.

Hon. JOHN CORNYN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CORNYN AND SENATOR WHITEHOUSE: I am writing on behalf of the Major Cities Chiefs Association (MCCA) to register our support for S. 4003, the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act of 2022. The MCCA is a professional organization of law enforcement executives representing the largest cities in the United States and Canada.

The MCCA is a leader in national policy debates on policing reform and, in January 2021, released a comprehensive report that addressed a number of topics, including training. This report recommended that all law enforcement officers undergo training on de-escalation tactics.

De-escalation training is already a part of many MCCA members' standard training curriculums. Law enforcement training is quite expensive, however, and the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act will provide critical grant funding to help offset the costs associated with de-escalation training. Furthermore, MCCA members will also be able to use these resources for continuing education. which will help further enhance existing de-escalation training programs.

Thank you for your leadership on this issue and your continued support of law enforcement. Please do not hesitate to contact me if the MCCA can be of additional assistance.

Sincerely.

JERI WILLIAMS,
Chief, Phoenix Police Department,
President, Major Cities Chiefs Association.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,
Washington, DC, April 8, 2022.

Hon. JOHN CORNYN III,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS CORNYN AND WHITEHOUSE: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our support for S. 4003, the ''Law Enforcement De-escalation Training Act.''

Law enforcement officers face numerous challenges when responding to threats against public safety, and not all of these threats are necessarily criminal in nature. Police are on the front lines and are often called to deal with individuals experiencing mental illness, substance abuse issues, or similar psychological impairments who may become dangerous to themselves or to the public. Recent studies found that as many as ten percent of all law enforcement encounters involve individuals experiencing these issues. The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) has estimated that over 2 million individuals arrested each year are struggling with a serious mental illness.

Your legislation would address this issue by providing $70 million in annual grant funding from the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (Byrne–JAG) to State and local law enforcement agencies to train officers in de-escalation tactics and alternatives to the use of force. The U.S. Department of Justice's Office on Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), through

consultation with State and local law enforcement agencies, would be required to develop a curriculum of relevant training topics, including de-escalation tactics, use of force alternatives, establishing and maintaining crisis intervention teams, as well as how to safely respond to mental and behavioral health crises using public benefits programs, housing assistance programs, and other relevant services. The funding from this bill will be used to cover the cost of training, attendance, overtime fees, and the procurement of certifications. Additionally, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and the Government Accountability Office (GAO) would study and evaluate the impacts of the training. This would ensure that the training has a meaningful, tangible impact on law enforcement encounters with individuals in crisis.

The implementation of de-escalation techniques would have a tremendous positive impact on public safety and the relationship between the public and law enforcement officers. Numerous studies have shown that civilians base their perceptions of law enforcement on their last encounter. Providing officers with the skills and training to avoid needless escalation of calls for service enable officers to protect the public more effectively. This improved communication will create a better police force and safer communities.

On behalf of the more than 364,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, we thank you both for your leadership on this important issue. If I can provide any additional information about this bill, please do not hesitate to contact me or Executive Director Jim Pasco in our Washington, DC office.

Sincerely,

PATRICK YOES,
National President.

AMERICAN CONSERVATIVE UNION,
Alexandria, Virginia, September 29, 2022.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman, House Judiciary Committee,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JIM JORDAN,
Ranking Member, House Judiciary Committee
Rayburn HOB
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER AND RANKING MEMBER JORDAN: The American Conservative Union (''ACU'') is the nation's oldest grassroots advocacy organization. Founded in 1964 by William F. Buckley. we have a 50–plus-year track record of advancing policies that reduce the size and scope of government, advance liberty, and reduce burdens on families. Criminal justice reform, if done properly, fits squarely within this rubric.

ACU also strongly supports law enforcement. We have asked our police officers to do more and more in recent years. Today, our men and women in blue are not only cops putting their lives on the line every day; they also serve as family, marriage and addiction counselors, mental health responders, and social workers, too. As a result, officers have day-to-day interactions with people in crisis, and this often escalates to the point that a use of force is necessary. Deescalation is an important skillset for officer safety as well as for those in crisis when they encounter law enforcement.

Accordingly, we support the efforts of Senators John Cornyn (R–TX) and Sheldon Whitehouse (D–RI) to ensure that funding for de-escalation training is expanded. S. 4003 establishes funding through the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant (''JAG'') program totaling $90 million for two years to help state and local law enforcement obtain de-escalation crisis intervention training. This funding will be targeted to smaller law enforcement departments that would otherwise lack resources for this type of training.

It is notable that the curriculum will leverage the ''train the trainer'' model to allow a significant increase in training opportunities by having officers train their colleagues. Not only is this an efficient use of resources, it helps inculcate the lessons and values of de-escalation in the culture of the departments funded by this program.

Finally, S. 4003 includes strong reporting and evaluation requirements on grants for the Department of Justice, the National Institute of Justice, and the Government Accountability Agency. ACU believes the justice system must be accountable for a wise use of tax dollars, and these requirements will ensure that state and local law enforcement are effectively using their grants to serve their communities well.

We believe S. 4003 would be a prudent use of taxpayer resources and as such, urge you to take this important legislation up as soon as possible. Should S. 4003 come to the floor, we will recommend to our colleagues at our sister organization, the ACU Foundation's Center for Legislative Accountability, to score this bill positively.

Respectfully,

DAVID H. SAFAVIAN,
General Counsel.

August 3, 2022.

Office of Senator JOHN CORNYN,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Office of Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS CORNYN AND WHITEHOUSE: Our faith-based organizations write to urge for broad co-sponsorship among your colleagues and the swift passage of the Law Enforcement De-escalation Training Act of 2022 (S.4003) as it would help police officers better serve vulnerable populations and keep our communities safe. Furthermore, this bill would promote a more restorative justice system that respects the God-given dignity of each person and promote safe communities for both law enforcement officers and residents. The bill would also provide law enforcement officers with the skills and tools needed to respond appropriately to the needs of the communities they protect and serve.

Police officers respond every day to calls for service for men and women grappling with grave mental and behavioral health challenges. However, they are not consistently trained to address these situations effectively. Inadequate training can undermine law enforcement officers' wellbeing and job satisfaction, and increase incidents of excessive use of force that erodes public trust. Policymakers must better equip law enforcement officers with evidence-based training for interactions with people in crisis that fosters community partnership, promotes understanding of mental illness, and prioritizes the lowest level of force necessary to keep communities safe.

Several key provisions position the Law Enforcement De-escalation Training Act (S.4003) to be a catalyst for modernizing American policing. The legislation would create a new federal funding stream to provide training for law enforcement agencies on de-escalation techniques, on participation in crisis intervention teams, on making referrals to community-based service providers, on safely responding to individuals in a behavioral or mental health crisis, and on alternatives to use of force. Furthermore, the bill would advance transparency and accountability to best practices through strong reporting and evaluation requirements from the Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, and Government Accountability Office. To foster public trust, the Department of Justice will develop training curriculum in collaboration with mental health providers, law enforcement agencies, civil rights organizations, and other stakeholders. The legislation would provide funding for continuing education for law enforcement officers to further refine their knowledge and tactical skills beyond initial training requirements.

We support the passage of the Law Enforcement De-escalation Training Act of 2022 as it would provide law enforcement officers the training needed to carefully respond to the needs of the community in a way that would promote human dignity and strengthen public trust.

Sincerely,

Catholic Charities USA,
Catholic Prison Ministry Coalition,
Committee on Domestic Justice and Human Development, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops,
Center for Public Justice,
Jesuit Conference Office of Justice and Ecology,
National Association of Evangelicals,
National Latino Evangelical Coalition,
National Hispanic Christian Leadership Coalition,
Prison Fellowship.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. TRONE), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Speaker, it is clear everybody supports this legislation. All of my police departments, all of my sheriffs, all support this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to pass the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act, a bill I am proud to co-lead with my friend, Los Angeles' new mayor, Karen Bass.

By funding improved training for police calls involving individuals suffering from mental or behavioral health issues, we make our communities safer.

Up to 10 percent of all police encounters involve a person experiencing serious mental health issues.

This bill will equip our officers with skills that better secure the safety of our citizens and our first responders. That is what matters.

De-escalation improves the trust between law enforcement and the community they are sworn to protect. That is what matters.

Building safer communities and protecting lives. That is what matters.

After passing unanimously in the Senate, this effort deserves similar support in the House. I thank Senators CORNYN and WHITEHOUSE, and Representatives BASS, CHABOT, and ISSA for their leadership on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEVIN of Michigan). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Speaker, it is time we do right by our officers in our community.

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

Mr. Speaker, as I offer this in closing and continue in our opposition, we have programs that take care of this already, those that are already expending $15 million. This has $130 million-

plus, and actually adds federalization of policing that's going to be overseen by Federal agencies and special interests.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 4003 is bipartisan legislation that would improve training for law enforcement officers, including training using alternatives to force and de-escalation tactics. This training will reduce use-of-force incidents and improve officer and community safety.

It passed the Senate unanimously. The most conservative Republican Senators all voted for it. I read a long list of organizations supporting it. The American Conservative Union is not a group noted for profligate Federal spending.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to have some perspective on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1518, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1900

PREVENTING ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST IN FEDERAL ACQUISITION ACT

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1518, I call up the bill (S. 3905) to prevent organizational conflicts of interest in Federal acquisition, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1518, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3905

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Preventing Organizational Conflicts of Interest in Federal Acquisition Act''.

SEC. 2. PREVENTING ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST IN FEDERAL ACQUISITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council shall revise the Federal Acquisition Regulation—

(1) to provide and update—

(A) definitions related to specific types of organizational conflicts of interest, including unequal access to information, impaired objectivity, and biased ground rules;

(B) definitions, guidance, and illustrative examples related to relationships of contractors with public, private, domestic, and foreign entities that may cause contract support to be subject to potential organizational conflicts of interest, including undue influence; and

(C) illustrative examples of situations related to the potential organizational conflicts of interest identified under this paragraph, including an example of the awarding by a Federal regulatory agency of a contract for consulting services to a contractor if employees of the contractor performing work under such contract are permitted by the contractor to simultaneously perform work under a contract for a private sector client under the regulatory purview of such agency;

(2) to provide executive agencies with solicitation provisions and contract clauses to avoid or mitigate organizational conflicts of interest, for agency use as needed, that require contractors to disclose information relevant to potential organizational conflicts of interest and limit future contracting with respect to potential conflicts of interest with the work to be performed under awarded contracts;

(3) to allow executive agencies to tailor such solicitation provisions and contract clauses as necessary to address risks associated with conflicts of interest and other considerations that may be unique to the executive agency;

(4) to require executive agencies—

(A) to establish or update as needed agency conflict of interest procedures to implement the revisions to the Federal Acquisition Regulation made under this section; and

(B) to periodically assess and update such procedures as needed to address agency-specific conflict of interest issues; and

(5) to update the procedures set forth in section 9.506 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation to permit contracting officers to take into consideration professional standards and procedures to prevent organizational conflicts of interest to which an offeror or contractor is subject.

(b) EXECUTIVE AGENCY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''executive agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 133 of title 41, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform or their respective designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

General Leave

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure before us.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 3905, the Preventing Organizational Conflicts of Interest in Federal Acquisition Act, which was introduced by Senator GARY PETERS, chairman of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, has strong bipartisan support and passed the Senate this summer with unanimous consent.

In April, we introduced a companion bill, H.R. 7602, following one of the Oversight Committee's investigations, which highlighted the need to strengthen government contracting laws on conflicts of interest.

The committee's investigation found that a consulting contractor advised the Food and Drug Administration at the same time they were advising private-sector clients that were regulated by the FDA. Many times, it was the exact same consultants advising the FDA and private-sector clients on the same issue.

In this case, the consultant failed to follow the rules on disclosing these amazing conflicts, collecting millions of dollars from both the regulator and the private-sector client.

Although this is one extreme example, other organizational conflicts of interest, large and small, occur across government. The Government Accountability Office regularly fields bid protests involving organizational conflicts of interest.

In 2014, a major defense contractor paid a settlement for allegedly failing to disclose conflicts while advising the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Organizational conflicts of interest can occur when a contractor's competing interests raise questions about their ability to provide impartial advice to the government. It is crucial that government contractors are providing impartial advice, particularly when the government is paying for their expertise and objectivity on sensitive matters.

The rules on organizational conflicts of interest have not changed significantly since the 1990s. This bill would make long-overdue revisions to strengthen these rules.

The current rules set basic standards to prevent organizational conflicts of interest but leave the details up to individual agencies. The current patchwork system creates the risk of egregious breaches of the public trust.

In 2009, Congress asked for the organizational conflict of interest rules to be reassessed. Draft rules were issued, but the reform effort was eventually abandoned, and the rules were never finalized.

This bill requires the revisions that were then started to be completed. This bill would also mandate that rules on government contractor conflicts are thoroughly revised and ensure that there is a uniform set of standards.

These reforms will help government contractors as well by ensuring clarity