1	NATIONAL CAPITOL CONTRACTING
2	RPTS HALATYN
3	HJU042000
4	MARKUP OF:
5	H.R. 759, THE "RECIDIVISM RISK REDUCTION ACT"; AND
6	H.R. 2947, THE "FINANCIAL INSTITUTION BANKRUPTCY ACT OF
7	2015"
8	Thursday, February 11, 2016
9	House of Representatives,
10	Committee on the Judiciary,
11	Washington, D.C.
12	The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in
13	Room 2141, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Bob
14	Goodlatte, [chairman of the committee] presiding.
15	Present: Representatives Goodlatte, Sensenbrenner,
16	Chabot, Issa, Forbes, King, Franks, Gohmert, Jordan, Poe,
17	Chaffetz, Marino, Labrador, Farenthold, Collins, DeSantis,
18	Walters, Buck, Ratcliffe, Trott, Bishop, Conyers, Nadler,
19	Lofgren, Jackson Lee, Cohen, Johnson, Pierluisi, Chu, Bass,
20	Richmond, DelBene, Jeffries, Cicilline, and Peters.

Staff Present: Shelley Husband, Staff Director; Branden Ritchie, Deputy Staff Director/Chief Counsel; Zachary Somers, Parliamentarian & General Counsel; Kelsey Williams, Clerk; Paul Taylor, Chief Counsel, Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice; Stephanie Gadbois, Senior Counsel; Perry Apelbaum, Minority Chief Counsel, Chief-of-Staff; Susan Jensen, Minority Chief Bankruptcy Counsel; Danielle Brown, Minority Chief Legislative Counsel; David Greengrass, Minority Counsel; James Park, Minority Chief Civil Justice Counsel; and Slade Bond, Minority Regulatory Reform Counsel.

Chairman Goodlatte. Good morning. The Judiciary Committee will come to order, and without objection the chair is authorized to declare recess to the committee at any time. Pursuant to notice, I now call up H.R. 759 for purposes of markup and move that the committee report the bill favorably to the House. The clerk will report the bill.

Ms. Williams. H.R. 759, to enhance public safety by improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the Federal prison system with offender risk and needs assessment, individual risk reduction incentives and rewards, and risk and recidivism reduction.

[The bill follows:]

45 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the bill is considered as read and open for amendment at any point, and I will begin by recognizing myself for an opening statement. Today we consider H.R. 759, the Recidivism Risk Reduction Act, introduced by Congressman Jason Chaffetz. When Ranking Member Conyers and I initiated our criminal justice reform initiative 8 months ago, we said, "Criminal justice is about punishing law-breakers, protecting the innocent, the fair administration of justice, and fiscal responsibility in a manner that is responsive to the needs of communities."

Congress has the responsibility to ensure that our criminal justice system metes out appropriate and effective justice. The committee's initiative will pursue responsible commonsense criminal justice reforms to make sure our Federal laws and regulations punish wrongdoers, protect individual freedom, work as efficiently and fairly as possible, do not duplicate State efforts, and do not waste taxpayer dollars. The measure we are considering today meets all of these objectives. The concept behind H.R. 759 is very simple: we can still be tough on crime, while being smart with our criminal justice system.

The bill places a new focus on rehabilitation, not just punishment and incarceration. It establishes a risk and needs assessment as the foundation of an effective

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

recidivism reduction program, and more importantly, an efficient and effective Federal prison system. H.R. 759 will incentivize prisoners to participate in recidivism reduction programs and jobs that actually reduce their risk of recidivism.

Why is this important? Well, it is important for two main reasons. First, the Bureau of Prisons has a growing prison population that because of its rising costs, is becoming a real and immediate threat to public safety. The growing prison budget is consuming an ever increasing percentage of the Department of Justice's budget. The more dollars we put into prison population, translates to fewer dollars we can invest in criminal and national security investigations and prosecutions.

Second, we know that without programming and intervention, prisoners are more likely than not to recidivate. We cannot allow the cycle to continue. Ву using a targeted approach for each prisoner, we can lower the risk of recidivism. Fever recidivists mean fewer prisoners in the future, and even greater savings to the This bill is important because, when American taxpayer. prisoners who have received intervention are released, they are less likely to commit crimes, and more likely to become productive members of our society, something that we all should support. When that happens, our streets and our

95 innocent citizens are safer.

An added benefit is former prisoners are more likely to leave the life of crime behind, and become productive members of society and contribute to our communities. I want to thank the gentleman from Utah, Mr. Chaffetz, for introducing this innovative and much needed piece of legislation, and all the other members who have contributed to this carefully-negotiated product. And I now yield to the ranking member, and a major partner in working on criminal justice reform, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Conyers for his opening statement.

[The prepared statement of Chairman Goodlatte follows:]

107 | ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

Mr. Conyers. Thank you, Chairman Goodlatte. I commend you, and all the other cosponsors for bringing H.R. 759 before the committee today. And I am pleased that today we will consider a bipartisan substitute amendment to this bill which will establish a better way of operating our prisons. It is critical; it is a part of our ongoing efforts to reform our criminal justice system that we take action to improve our Federal prisons at the same time. The massive growth of our prison population is a crisis in both human and fiscal terms. Over the past four decades, the United States' prison population has skyrocketed.

Since the early 1970s, the U.S. prison population has grown from 200,000 to over two million persons. And since 1980, the rate of imprisonment at the Federal level has grown by more than 500 percent. As a result, annual Federal spending on prisons has increased from \$970 million in 1980 to more than \$6.5 billion in inflation-adjusted dollars. The Department of Justice's expenditures on prisons now constitute more than 20 percent of its total outlays. This trend is unsustainable. While imprisonment is appropriate and necessary for some offenders, we must address this crisis by making fundamental changes to the Federal system.

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

first essential The and step is reforming our laws to ensure that sentences are not inappropriately and counterproductively long. And this committee, last year, approved a bipartisan bill that is a good first step toward doing so. Now, by taking up legislation concerning prison reform, we are taking another important toward changing step our approach to incarceration. For too long, our prisons have simply warehoused individuals whom we know will eventually return to society. For their benefit and ours, we must adopt a more constructive approach.

That is why I support a establishing a system in Federal prisons that will encourage prisoners to participate in programs that will improve their lives, both inside and outside prison. And that will reduce their risk of committing additional offences when they are released. This is the goal of this legislation; that is the goal of this legislation. Ιt simply makes sense that we provide incentives for prisoners to be better prepared to re-enter society, and be productive members of their communities. the discussion and forward to adoption of the substitute amendment, which will greatly improve the underlying bill in which will constitute a good first step toward making our Federal prison system more humane, more effective, and less costly. I thank the chair, yield back.

155	[The prepared statement of Mr. Conyers follows:]
156	****** COMMITTEE INSERT *******
157	Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman,
158	and is now pleased to recognize the ranking member of the
159	Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and
160	Investigations, the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. Jackson Lee,
161	for her opening statement.

Ms. Jackson Lee. Let me thank the chairman very much. And I would like to thank the ranking member, as well as Mr. Chaffetz, Mr. Gowdy, Mr. Richmond, Mr. Jeffries, for making the statement about a number of issues that I think are important and have taken the interest and the notice of the American people, and a number of organizations and groups. And people have spoken about mass incarceration, but they have also spoken about what we do when we incarcerate persons. And I think that this is a very important, collaborative statement of the House Judiciary Committee for both Republicans and Democrats, that I hope Mr. Chairman and ranking member will be on the President's desk. And that will certainly take collaboration with the other body.

The legislation that we will move today is not only a meaningful and significant product of that collaboration, but an absolutely critical next step in enacting comprehensive criminal justice reform.

Our work is not done, but when we finish here today, we must dig right back in so that we can bring youth justice and policing reform bills to this committee in the coming weeks. In the backdrop of this particular markup, we have

seen the Justice Department work with Ferguson, for what I believe is an important consent order; that hopefully after court proceedings, Ferguson will see a better day of improvement around the issues of criminal justice.

But today we have the opportunity to introduce or to present H.R. 759, the Recidivism Risk Reduction Act, which has a wonderful Federal prison reform. I have very many Federal prisons in and around my congressional district, and a Federal detention center. I have visited them all. This bill offers meaningful strategies. This legislation is truly commonsense. It determines what the prison's needs, match the prisoner with programming to address those needs, and encourages the prisoner to take full advantage of the programming through time off their prison sentence.

This is not a hand out. It is a hand up. It is not for naysayers of treating prison as soft, it is for investing in Americans, and investing in families, and investing in young people who were steered in the wrong direction and now incarcerated, but have a chance, a second chance.

It recognizes the urgent need for recidivism risk reduction program in the bureau prisons. It gives to the Federal Government the bully pulpit, to be able to say to other States, "You can get this done. You can do this right. This is the way that you will have productive

citizens when they are released." Allowing prisons who successfully participate in programming to earn time off; good time. Their prison sentence is not just a smart way to encourage rehabilitation, it is a responsible way to decrease costs and crowding; \$70 billion are spent annually on incarceration.

And while there are a number of improvements to be made to H.R. 759 as evidenced by the substitute amendment, we will soon consider this legislation sets forth a strong foundation.

It cannot be overstated the purpose and the need for meaningful prison reform. The unfortunate reality is that our Federal Government is our Nation's largest jailer. And despite the fact that 95 percent of the inmates re-enter society, we fail to partner while they are incarcerated with an emphasis on re-entry.

And so, I would again commend the authors of H.R. 759, delighted as a ranking member on the Crime Subcommittee, to be part of moving this bill forward, and will be offering a bipartisan amendment. And H.R. 759 can have a direct positive impact on the lives of millions of Americans. And I call on my colleagues to support it once it is amended: 630,000 and individuals who re-enter each year, few are up for success; we now have an opportunity to change those numbers. With that, I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

233	[The prepared statement of Ms. Jackson Lee follows:]
234	****** COMMITTEE INSERT *******
235	Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentlewoman.
236	Without objection, all other members' opening statements
237	will be made a part of the record. I now recognize the
238	gentleman from Utah, Mr. Chaffetz, for purposes of offering
239	an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The clerk will
240	report the amendment.
241	Ms. Williams. Amendment in the nature of a substitute
242	to H.R. 759 offered by Mr. Chaffetz. Strike all after the
243	enacting clause.
244	[The amendment offered by Mr. Chaffetz follows:]
245	****** COMMITTEE INSERT *******

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute is considered as read, and I will recognize Mr. Chaffetz to explain his amendment in the nature of substitute.

Mr. Chaffetz. I thank the chairman, and I appreciate your leadership, Mr. Chairman, on this issue and bringing together one of the most impressive bipartisan groups and pieces of legislation that we have had. I want to thank you. I want to thank Congressman Gowdy. I also want to particularly thank Cedric Richmond and Hakeem Jeffries for their passion and work on this issue, spending countless hours working with us on this. I also want to thank Ranking Member Conyers and his passion for this. In the Senate, Senator Cornyn, Senator Lee, and Senator Booker have been particularly helpful in a good bipartisan way, bringing this together.

We have important additions to the bill from Congressman Marino and Congresswoman Jackson Lee that

improve the quality of this bill and addressed some topics that I know Mr. Marino and Ms. Jackson Lee are also very, very passionate about.

But we have a choice in this country; we have to understand, Mr. Chairman, that 95 percent of the people that go to prison, they are coming back out. So are they going to come back out and be better criminals? Or are we actually going to engage with these people and hope that we can reduce the rate of recidivism; because that ought to be our goal. We want them to become productive citizens. Something has gone awry, something, for whatever reason, is off track. There are certain criminals that should not come out; that should not be able to earn extra time.

There are 48 exclusions in this bill for people, for everything from terrorism to crimes against children and other heinous crimes that you are just not going to qualify for this. But let's also understand, Mr. Chairman, too, that in the Federal prison system, we are at about 120 to 140 percent of capacity. And what we do not want to do as a nation, is do what California did. California had overpopulation, what did they do? They just released them in mass. That is not the direction that we should be going. There should be a way to do what the States have done, and there are leading States out there, like Texas and Utah and Ohio and South Carolina and Georgia, that are actually

reducing the rate of recidivism and saving billions of dollars along the way.

I would point back to the Department of Justice Inspector General who testified before Congress in 2013, said, "It is clear that something must be done." The Department cannot solve this challenge by spending more money to operate more Federal prisons unless it is prepared to make drastic cuts to other important areas of the Department's operations.

Let's understand that one-third roughly of the Department of Justice budget goes to the Bureau of Prisons. One-third. We are spending nearly \$30,000, nearly \$30,000 per person per year to incarcerate these folk. There is a punishment component; there is a debt to society; there are some very valid reasons. But, as the States have learned, there are some key indicators that if, again, you're not engaged in some of the most heinous crimes; if you are participating in a post-sentencing world, in working at the prison; if you are furthering your education; if you are engaged in faith-based services, these are all key indicators that maybe you are moving in the right direction.

And, again, with 48 exclusions, let's learn from the States, let's, as fiscal conservatives understand, we got to figure out how to save money, but let's also engage in being truly the Department of Corrections, because I think that is

ultimately the goal.

I want to, again, as I studied before with this amendment in the nature of a substitute, I want to thank Mr. Marino, included some important provisions regarding pepper spray that the people that work in our prisons, they do a very difficult job. We cannot thank them enough for what they do. He also has a provision there dealing with gun lockers, something that should be easily dealt with.

Ms. Jackson Lee, adding a component, for instance, of restraints during pregnancy; these are commonsense things that do need to be addressed. And Mr. Chairman, I would also like to ask unanimous consent to introduce two different letters. One is from three dozen former prosecutors, a judge, other government officials. We also have a letter from former Attorney General Michael Mukasey, former FBI Director William Sessions, former FBI Director Louis Freeh, talking about the concepts involved in here.

And I would also point, Mr. Chairman, to the success that a version of this bill has had in the Senate. Again, bringing together a broad bipartisan support. I hope members will take a good hard look at this, but I do appreciate the good bipartisan support. I think this is ready for a vote here in this committee and look forward to bringing it to the floor sooner rather than later, and I thank you again for your leadership on this bill, and I

yield back.

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentlemen. Without objection, the two letters referenced will be made a part of the record. And the chair is now pleased to recognize the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Conyers, for five minutes.

Mr. Conyers. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to join Congressman Chaffetz, Chairman Goodlatte, especially Subcommittee Ranking Member Sheila Jackson Lee, and the Crime Subcommittee chairman, Jim Sensenbrenner, and other colleagues for sponsoring this substitute amendment. All of us have worked hard; although not always agreement, we have been able to develop this compromise measure. While I had hoped that the eligibility for earning credits under this system would have been more broad, I still believe it will change the operation of our Federal prison system in very important ways. While this bill does not address a range of issues related to the way our system treats juvenile offenders, I look forward to working with the chairman and many of my colleagues here to develop legislation in this area as our next order of business. thank the chairman and my colleagues for coming together to develop this bipartisan substitute amendment. And, course, I urge its adoption. And I yield back the balance of my time. I yield back.

364	Chairman Goodlatte. Thank you very much, Mr. Conyers.
365	I have an amendment at the desk. To the amendment, in the
366	nature of a substitute.
367	Ms. Jackson Lee. Mr. Chairman, may I just, on the
368	amendment, the same thing?
369	Chairman Goodlatte. Let me get this amendment in, and
370	then we will recognize you for that purpose. And the clerk
371	will report the amendment.
372	Ms. Williams. Amendment to the amendment in the nature
373	of a substitute to H.R. 759, offered by Mr. Goodlatte. Page
374	10, line 18, insert before the period at the end of the
375	following
376	[The amendment offered by Chairman Goodlatte follows:]
377	****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read, and I will recognize myself for a brief statement. This is a technical and conforming amendment. It makes various technical changes throughout the amendment in the nature of a substitute, and reflects agreed-upon and negotiated language. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. For what purpose does the gentlewoman from Texas seek recognition?

Ms. Jackson Lee. Mr. Chairman, I support the pending amendment, and I would like to also speak to the Chaffetz, Jackson Lee, Goodlatte, Conyers.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentlewoman is recognized for five minutes.

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

Ms. Jackson Lee. Strike the last word. Thank you so very much. Very briefly, let me just say, again, I want to raise this number, 630,000 individuals who re-enter each year out of our prisons. And so I think this bill clearly speaks to many of the issues, both inside a prison system, And I was glad to be able to provide more and out. opportunity for program innovation and pilot programs in this amendment, adding parenting skills and parent-child interaction, broadening life skills to cover rejection response and anti-bullying that may occur both inside the prison and outside for the prisoner, or the released individual, to be able to address these travails of life without then becoming incarcerated again; broadening the program list to cover arts, programs, trauma treatment, expanding recidivism partnerships to include arts organizations, making it easier for recidivism reduction partners to provide programming; allowing prisoners to earn credits for programming pre-sentencing; and also allowing prisoners to take care of animals. That is a very interesting process, and I look forward to it. And the amendment also includes important re-entry aspects dealing with facilities and a facilitator to help that particular inmate re-entry.

Let me also thank Ms. Bass for her commitment dealing with a matter that we worked to get in, her commitment and support of the idea of the way pregnant women are treated, to eliminate de-shackling. And I think this responds to the needs of prisoners who are incarcerated, but also invest in those who are being released for the betterment of the American people. I ask my colleagues to support the Chaffetz, Jackson Lee, Goodlatte, Conyers substitute amendment. With that, I yield back.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentlewoman. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania seek recognition?

Mr. Marino. Strike the last word.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Marino. Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, for the record, I would like to recognize two people in the audience, Don and Jean Williams. They are back there. Please stand. Thank you. Mr. and Mrs. Williams are the parents of Eric Williams. And three years ago this month, Eric was killed, brutally murdered, in a keen Federal prison by an inmate, who since then is in the process of being prosecuted. But Eric had no defense. He did not have anything to defend himself from the multiple stabbings. Not on one occasion, but this defender chased him and continued

439 to stab him until he was dead.

That is why a group of us got together at the behest of my friends, the Williams. And I see my colleagues, former officers from the prison, as well, to address a piece of legislation that went into this overall legislation. And thank you and I thank Chairman Chaffetz for the pepper spray. Just a simple device like a can of pepper spray, I am convinced, would have prevented Eric from being murdered. And now, we are going to get this in the prisons where all the personnel have this. And I thank you for that. And I thank the Williams family for being here. I yield back.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman, and the chair thanks the Williams for being here, as well. And we are sorry for your loss, and we hope that we can do something to avoid that happening to Federal prison employees in the future. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. Conyers. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan seek recognition?

Mr. Conyers. To support the amendment.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Conyers. I join you, Chairman Goodlatte, in support of the Goodlatte-Conyers amendment to H.R. 759, which includes several updates to provisions in the bill

which have been agreed to on a bipartisan basis. Some of the changes fix technical errors, and others largely amend the text to conform it to what we had intended in the bipartisan agreement on the text of the substitute. I thank the chairman again for working with me on this issue. And I urge adoption of this amendment. I never used the word bipartisan so much in a bill that I can remember here on the Judiciary Committee. I yield back. Thank you.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman. For what purpose does the gentleman form Georgia seek recognition?

Mr. Collins. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, strike the last word.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Collins. Mr. Chairman, thank you for recognizing, again, I think it just was just brought out a moment ago from my friend from Pennsylvania, the importance of this work and my sympathies as well. But it brings out what we are doing here today as important on a lot of different levels.

But Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for working to bring this forward, this bipartisan legislation to reform the Federal prison system. I am proud to join you as a cosponsor of the amendment. Also want to thank Mr. Chaffetz

for his work in introducing H.R. 759 and on this amendment.

Before I speak to the nature of the bill, I want to make it clear that I believe that when people break the law, there should be consequences. Punishment should fit the crime and justice should be served. I stand firm on this and have never wavered. However, that does not prevent me from believing that each and every one of us was created in God's image, and every person has value. Those who commit crimes should be punished. We should also offer a chance at redemption to those who can safely reintegrate into society. And we need a system that provides a chance for success after that time has been served. Too often, the current system sets offenders up for failure by forcing people back into the same or worse circumstances that led to the crime in the first place.

The amendment before us offers sensible solutions to reduce recidivism, which in turn reduces the burden to taxpayers and to increase public safety. The bill also includes protections fundamental to our legal system.

Mr. Jeffries and I offered legislation to ensure that the age-old and well-established right to a current attorney client privilege is available to Federal inmates and their legal representatives. I am proud to say that this legislation is reflected in the amendment. I want to thank Mr. Jeffries for his commitment and partnership, and

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

Chairman Goodlatte and Ranking Member Convers for their willingness to work with us on this issue. Currently, electronic communications are treated differently than traditional forms of communication, such as snail mail or phone calls, for the purposes of attorney-client privilege. The use of email to communicate with an attorney is of tantamount to signing away the right privileged communication. This creates considerable hurdles to an attorney and an inmate exercising their right to privileged This is not sensible. As methods of communications. communication change, so, too, should the system.

This provision ensures that critical legal protections do not fall by the wayside simply because technology has changed. Importantly, the language also establishes a retention policy for these communications if the court determines that the crime fraud exemption to the attorney time privilege exists.

The amendment contains numerous other meaningful provisions, including the creation of an offender risk and needs assessment system. It creates a sensible earned time credit system and ensures that pregnant women are treated in a way that better protects both them and the life of their unborn child. It provides for better safety protections for the Bureau of Prisons employees, and this bill also established important de-escalation training to better

recognize the unique needs of the mentally ill offenders.

It is time we make reforms to strengthen our public safety and reduce costs, and better help released offenders adjust to society rather than recidivism. This is something that I have had the privilege of witnessing in Georgia, and the issues that we have dealt with in Georgia, which were -- when I first entered the General Assembly back in 2006 to where we are now, it has been an amazing transformation. The use of accountability courts, the use of alternative means to take those, as our governor has said and I have said many times, there has to be a determination in our society in which we have space and we have the facilities to lock up those people that we are scared of, and we have to work better with those that we are just mad at. And that is something we have got to work at.

So as we go forward with this, Mr. Chairman and the others involved in this, I just appreciate your work and hard work on this and look forward to the support on this bill. And with that, I yield back.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman. For what purpose does the gentlewoman from California, Ms. Bass, seek recognition?

Ms. Bass. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentlewoman is recognized for

five minutes.

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587

588

Ms. Bass. I want to express my real appreciation for the hard work from all of the committee members that went into this bill. Aside from providing critical tools to help inmates reduce their sentences and prepare for life after incarceration, this bill will enhance safety by training correction officers in de-escalation techniques that reduce conflict and violence in prison. I am really heartened to see the committee doing criminal justice reform work in a way that puts human dignity and restoration at the core. And I hope that this work continues.

I also want to thank the members for working with me to insert my legislation to protect pregnant inmates. We work together to develop language that will prevent the unnecessary shackling of pregnant incarcerated women. In California, we outlawed this practice. But I was shocked to learn that in some States, women have actually been chained down while giving birth. There was an example of a woman in Nevada that suffered agonizing muscle tearing and bone separation because she was chained down during labor and could not move. According to the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, physical restraints have interfered with the ability of physicians to safely practice medicine by reducing their ability to assess and evaluate the physical condition of the mother and fetus, and have

similarly made the labor and delivery process more difficult than it needs to be.

589

590

591

592

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

It is my hope that by codifying this standard, we will send a message that incarcerated women should be treated humanely, especially while pregnant, giving birth, and recovering. There are some provisions related to shackling pregnant women that did not make it into the bill that I think we should still work on down the line.

For instance, I think we need better data collection on pregnant inmates and prison births. I would like to know about the quality of care for pregnant women in prison, and know the demographic information about such women, including their offenses and their sentences. Another provision not included was a deadline for the Bureau of Prisons to establish a process for inmates to report shackling in violation of this act. Finally, I would like to work with the committee on legislation to address shackling pregnant women on the State level. I am pleased that 23 States have anti-shackling codes on their books. But I would like to work with the committee to see how we can incentivize other States to codify a standard of care much like the one we are advancing here. Again, I am very pleased to see this bill move forward. And I look forward to working together on other ways to improve our justice system. I yield back.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentlewoman

and looks forward to working with her moving forward. For what purpose does the gentleman from Louisiana seek recognition?

Mr. Richmond. I would move to strike the last word.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Richmond. Mr. Chairman, to our ranking member, and the chairman and the ranking members of subcommittees, I just wanted to, one, thank them for the hard work and recognize the bipartisan manner in which this was done, and just offer just a few words. And that is to say that this bill is about safety. It is about safety inside of our correctional institutions to make sure that our guards can go to work every day, and that they can return home to their families in one piece. And that is very important. And the Marino amendment allows us to do that, to help them do that.

Second, it is about safety for society. And what we realized a long time ago, that we have long passed the point of diminishing returns. Every dollar that we spend on incarceration actually makes the country less safe, because it is money that could go to programs and other things that could make communities safer and prevent crime. And when we talk about recidivism, most of the time we talk about recidivism in terms of the fact that if we can keep guys from coming back to prison, guys or women, from coming back

to prison, we do not have to spend that money on them. Well, that is true.

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

648

649

650

651

652

653

654

655

656

657

658

659

660

661

662

663

Now, let's think of it this way, too. Every person that we prevent from coming back to prison means that there is one less victim out there. So when we talk about this bill to reduce recidivism, we are going to save money and we are going to prevent future victims of crime. And I think that those are the things that, when Congress can come together, and come up with a goal, and give and take a little bit so that we can achieve that goal, it becomes a success and a win. Does this bill do everything that I would like it to do, and as aggressive as I would like it to The answer is no. But in a democracy, when you be done? really want to get something done, you are going to give a little bit and you are going to take a little bit. And you hope that at the end of the day, you move to make the country a little bit better. And here, we move to make the country a little bit better. But we hope to make people a little bit safer.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I would just, again, like to applaud the effort, I think of everybody on the committee, and urge support of the legislation.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York seek recognition?

Mr. Jeffries. I move to strike the last word.

664

665

666

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675

676

677

678

679

680

681

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Jeffries. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership. And I want to thank Ranking Member Conyers, the ranking members, and the chairman of the subcommittees, Representative Chaffetz, of course, Cedric Richmond, and many, many others who worked together in a bipartisan fashion to bring us to this moment. As has been mentioned, this is not a perfect bill. But in the legislative process, the perfect should never be the enemy of the good. legislation is a significant step toward meaningful reform criminal а broken justice system which remains overcrowded and underfunded. If enacted into law, this bill will encourage rehabilitation, promote successful re-entry, and save taxpayer dollars. States like New York, Texas, South Carolina, and Georgia have all reduced their prison populations, while at the same time experienced significant decrease in crime and saved precious taxpayer dollars.

We can now do this same thing at the Federal level. This bill contains several important provisions, including a risk assessment tool and a requirement that the attorney general regularly review that tool to identify any potential disparities.

In addition, the bill provides incarcerated individuals with a right to appeal any adverse determination of their recidivism risk. This appeal is to be heard by the warden. And I know this provision is not in the Senate bill. That is an important step that we have taken. The inclusion of the escalation training in this bill should result in dramatic improvements to the quality of life for all inmates, especially those who suffer from mental illness, while simultaneously making the prison environment safer for both prison guards, who put their life on the line, as well as incarcerated individuals.

Lastly, the legislation corrects a current practice where Federal prosecutors review email communications between Bureau of Prison inmates and their attorneys, in contravention of the Sixth Amendment. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia, my good friend Representative Collins and I have worked together on this provision, and I want to thank him specifically for his partnership and his leadership on this issue.

Lastly, given that all inmates are eventually released, it is in our best interests for everyone to be able to participate in programming designed to promote successful re-entry. I think we should explore expanding that eligibility and the opportunity to earn good time credits as we move this process forward. Since proven recidivism

reduction programming, like family and phone visitation, should be as broadly available as possible, that is in everyone's best interests. Reforming our broken criminal justice system is fiscally prudent and socially responsible. And in this spirit, I look forward to working with the chairman, the ranking member, and individuals on both sides of the aisle who have come together in good faith to bring us to this moment. With that, I yield back.

722 Mr. Jordan. Mr. Chairman?

723 Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose would the gentleman from Ohio seek recognition?

725 Mr. Jordan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Jordan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield to Mr. Marino from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Marino. Thank you, Congressman Jordan. First of all, I would like to recognize Helen Pavarotti (?). If she could please stand. Helen, thank you for being here. Helen's husband, who worked at the prison, was killed on the way to prison. And another piece of this legislation that we are working on, believe it or not, Federal guards are not allowed to carry weapons to a Federal prison. So we have put in legislation; and I thank Chairman Goodlatte and

739

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

762

763

Chairman Chaffetz and Mr. Conyers, again, that allows correction officers who are clearly trained and need the protection to carry a weapon with them. And it can be safely and securely locked down in a box in the facility.

But I also want to thank Chairman Goodlatte, Chairman Chaffetz, Chairman Conyers, Ranking Member Conyers, others for this legislation. I was a prosecutor for 18 years. And I have a reputation of being a tough prosecutor. If you are going to commit the crime, you are going to do But it is important, because there are too many the time. people going back to prison. And just as vehemently as I want to put the bad guys away, I want to just aggressively make sure that we have programs that can at least help a portion of those individuals from going back to prison, seeing that they have the education, they have training, they have counseling. That's ongoing. They are just not put back in the streets. And to make them citizens that can contribute to society.

So I want to thank everyone for putting that part of the legislation, my legislation, in the overall bill, as well. We are tightening another part of the legislation. We are tightening up the credit standards for serious rehab programs. There are many programs, but we have got to make sure there are serious rehab programs.

I want to thank, also, my colleague and former U.S.

Attorney Brett Tolman from Utah. And Brett is here. And thank you very much for what you have done in this. This legislation, again, is a serious start to curtail people from going back to prison. But make no mistake about it, if you commit a serious crime, you are going to do serious time in a Federal prison. And I yield back.

Mr. Cicilline. Mr. Chairman?

764

765

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

777

778

779

780

781

782

783

784

785

786

787

788

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia seek recognition?

Mr. Johnson. Move to strike the last word.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Last week I encouraged strongly the committee to come forward with legislation on criminal justice reform, and the chairman is to be congratulated and commended for bringing forth this legislation. And also, the ranking member, John Conyers; I want to also send out my appreciation to Ranking Member with Crime Jackson Lee, along Subcommittee Chair Sensenbrenner for bringing this legislation forward, and my friend Jason Chaffetz, the sponsor this legislation, along with Cedric Richmond and Hakeem Jeffries, along with Trey Gowdy, have done yeoman's work on this bill in a bipartisan way, and they are to be commended along with Representative

Karen Bass, Tom Marino, and Doug Collins, for their fine work. This is a commonsense bill. It is a bipartisan bill. I think Members of Congress, particularly in this committee, can take great -- well, this is an example of what the public expects Congress to do. This is an example that should make the American people proud of their representatives. And with that, I will yield back. I ask my colleagues to pass this bill.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman. For what purpose does the gentleman from Rhode Island seek recognition?

Mr. Cicilline. Move to strike the last word.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Cicilline. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you and Ranking Member Conyers for your extraordinary leadership on this bill, and thank Representative Chaffetz and Representative Richmond and Representative Bass and Representative Jackson Lee and Representative Sensenbrenner and Representative Jeffries, who contributed enormously to the final product that we will consider today. For too long, the Federal Government has failed to invest in strategies that reduce the likelihood that those released from prison will return again, committing more crimes, impacting more families, creating more suffering from

victims of crime, as well as those families of the individuals who are sent back to prison. And as a result of this failure to have a strategy to really focus on this, from 1980 to 2013, the rate of imprisonment by our Federal Government grew by 518 percent, increasing from 11 inmates per 100,000 U.S. residents to 68 inmates per 100,000 residents. And during that same period of time, spending increased from \$970 million to \$6.7 billion in inflationary-adjusted spending.

So, the costs of our failure to really respond to this are really enormous. And beyond the financial cost, of course, the importance of focusing on reducing recidivism and enabling people to successfully re-enter the community, is that we also reduce the societal cost of imprisonment, which are enormous and fall disproportionately on low-income communities, communities of color and particularly vulnerable communities, particularly those with mental illness.

So, this legislation really begins to change that in a very important and fundamental way, by allowing for the development of strategies really to promote successful reentry, to increase public safety by reducing likelihood that people will re-commit, or commit additional crimes, increasing the safety of our prisons and the safety of our correctional officers, making sure that prisons are operated

839 in more humane way, more consistent with our values. And I 840 think this is an extraordinary bipartisan effort. I commend 841 everyone who has been a part of it and I am proud to be a 842 co-sponsor, and I urge all of my colleagues to proudly vote 843 on this legislation. And with that I yield back. 844 Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the 845 gentleman from Texas seek recognition? 846 Mr. Gohmert. I have an amendment at the desk. 847 Chairman Goodlatte. There is an amendment pending 848 right now, my amendment to the substitute amendment. 849 Mr. Gohmert. I am sorry. I will await the amendment. 850 Chairman Goodlatte. Who seeks recognition on this 851 amendment? If not, the question occurs on the amendment. 852 All those in favor, respond by saying aye. 853 Those opposed, no. 854 In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it. The 855 amendment is agreed to. And the gentleman from Iowa has an 856 amendment. We will consider his first. 857 Mr. King. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the 858 desk. 859 clerk will Chairman Goodlatte. The report 860 amendment. For what purpose does the gentleman from Utah 861 seek recognition? 862 Mr. Chaffetz. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of 863 order.

864	Chairman Goodlatte. Okay. Which amendment?
865	Mr. King. This is the amendment that deals with the
866	first time felons.
867	Chairman Goodlatte. Very good. For what purpose does
868	the gentleman from Utah seek recognition?
869	Mr. Chaffetz. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of
870	order.
871	Chairman Goodlatte. Point of order is reserved. The
872	clerk will report the amendment.
873	Ms. Williams. Amendment to the amendment in the nature
874	of a substitute to H.R. 759 offered by Mr. King of Iowa.
875	Page 19.
876	[The amendment offered by Mr. King follows:]
877	****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read, and the gentleman is recognized for five minutes on his amendment.

Mr. King. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My amendment addresses a situation that under the bill and under the bill as amended, it allows for those who have already been proven recidivists that have been released and come back on subsequent charges, convictions on subsequent charges, to also get a second chance. And I submit that they've had their first chance when they are proven recidivists.

And so what my amendment does is that it prohibits an inmate with a second or a subsequent felony conviction,

whether it be State or Federal, and it expands this onto the State and Federal, from earning credits under the bill. And, you know, we do not need to start with proven recidivists on an unproven program. We do not know whether we can help them or not. This bill is a social experiment, and I suggest let's first experiment with the people who have only had one conviction and are serving time for that conviction or combination of convictions, and limit it to those, rather than opening this up for a second or subsequent convictions.

The proven recidivists should not get this second chance; they have already had their second chance, and I am somewhat familiar with what happens with crime victims. And I know that I have quoted from studies in the past on price to society for releasing criminals out onto the streets.

And when this topic first came up some year and a half or so ago, I remember asking the main proponents of the bill if they had looked at the other side of this equation, if they had done the studies and evaluated the available studies, to see that if you let a certain number of criminals out of prison, there will be an amount of recidivism, and that recidivism we are talking about is if it were somehow benign or it is not even quantified.

And I can tell you that we need to quantify it and we need to understand it is individual crime victims that will

pay the price for over-exuberance here on a bill that I think releases too many too early, that need to still pay their price to society. And even if they are not recovered, the time that they are in prison keeps them from committing crimes against innocent people. And so, this says give them a second chance, but not give them a third chance.

So, the first chance was when they committed the crime in the first place. The second chance was when they did their time and we give them an opportunity to be let out early. That's what this amendment would allow. But if you have already done your time, been released, committed a crime, and you are back in again, then that universe of inmates should not be considered under this bill. That is the philosophy that this amendment brings. I think it is sound. If we are going to do social experiments, then we should do it in the safest zones that we can. And walk into this thing slowly, not dive into this thing headfirst. And so that is what this amendment does, and I believe that it is the right and prudent way for us to go forward, if we should go forward at all with this bill. I would urge its adoption and I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman Goodlatte. Does the gentleman from Utah insist on his point of order?

Mr. Chaffetz. Yes, I insist on my point of order.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized.

940 Mr. Chaffetz. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa's 941 amendment seeks to amendment a clause in the bill that was 942 already amended in the Goodlatte amendment, which was agreed 943 An amendment may not amend already amended text. 944 Therefore, I must insist on my point of order. 945 Chairman Goodlatte. Does the gentleman from Iowa 946 offering the amendment wish to speak on the point of order? 947 Mr. King. Yes, Mr. Chairman. 948 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized. 949 Mr. King. I am going to do a rare thing here today, 950 and I am going to concede to the validity of the argument of 951 my colleague from Utah, and I will also concede the point of 952 order. And I would ask unanimous consent to withdraw the 953 amendment. 954 The gentleman's amendment Chairman Goodlatte. 955 withdrawn. And for what purpose does the gentleman seek 956 recognition now? 957 Mr. King. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment at 958 the desk. 959 The clerk will Chairman Goodlatte. report the 960 amendment. 961 Mr. King. Dealing with immigration. 962 Ms. Williams. Amendment to the amendment in the nature 963 of a substitute to H.R. 759, offered by Mr. King of Iowa. 964 [The amendment offered by Mr. King follows:]

965 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read. And the gentleman is recognized for five minutes on his amendment.

Mr. King. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is an amendment that arises out of the review of the bill, and understanding that those who are unlawfully present in America are going to be included in this "get out of jail early" proposal that is there, and also be included in the training programs that help them qualify for points in order to qualify for early release. And especially if it is a

second or a subsequent offense, which by the way, my earlier amendment being out of order, legitimately out of order, I would reiterate, keeps us from addressing this as far as first time offenders, but we could have multiple offenders, we could have people in prison that are, say, for example, the murder of Kate Steinle, could conceivably qualify under this bill.

And I believe that is what my amendment does, it prohibits those who are in prison for illegal entry from qualifying, and it is a perverse incentive. If you are facing potentially a two-year penalty for unlawful entry into the United States, you end up in a United States Federal prison for that purpose, and we might cut that sentence in half by they could earning training credits. We could be training a work force for the countries they came from and should go back to. And I might even concede that getting them back to that home country with a trained workforce is an improvement for those countries, but we are not turning them back to their home country in enough instances.

This administration has refused to enforce the law, and often we have people released from our penitentiaries that should be going directly to the border for direct deportation, and we find out they are on the streets committing crimes against Americans. And so, that is the

1001 essence of this amendment, excuse me, and I urge its
1002 adoption, and I would yield back the balance.

Chairman Goodlatte. Would the gentleman yield?

1004 Mr. King. I would yield.

Chairman Goodlatte. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate him bringing up this subject because it is an important one, and it needs to be carefully addressed. People who enter this country illegally and commit crimes should be sent out of the country. Some, like the murderer of Kate Steinle, re-entered the country on a number of occasions, and finally wound up in a horrific tragedy regarding her murder, and therefore, keeping them in prison for the longest time possible to avoid that kind of thing is well worth considering.

However, I think we need to take it into context very carefully, so I would ask the gentleman to consider withdrawing the amendment and working with us on this issue, and also taking note of the fact that the whole purpose of Mr. Chaffetz' bill is to make sure that people in prison get the opportunity to receive training, to receive treatment of various kinds, and so on, to make recidivism less likely, and hopefully also to make it less likely that they are sent home, they stay home. But the gentleman's concern is a legitimate one, and so, I would be happy to work with him on it, if he would agree to withdraw and work with us as we

1026 | move to the floor.

Mr. King. In reclaiming my time, and appreciating the chairman's argument here. There are a number of things that, of course, I would be interested in looking at, and I want to make sure that we can protect the citizens of this country to the maximum amount. And I think that your proposal here, Mr. Chairman, fits with that overall broad theme that I brought here to the committee today. And I would look forward to working with you and other members of this committee in an effort to, let's just say, work towards perfection of the bill and this ideal. And so, with that request, I would ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman.

The amendment is withdrawn. Who seeks recognition? For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas seek recognition?

Mr. Gohmert. I have an amendment to the amendment in

the nature of substitute?

Chairman Goodlatte. The clerk will report the amendment.

Ms. Williams. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of the substitute offered by Mr. Gohmert, Section 110, Early Release Date Threshold.

[The amendment offered by Mr. Gohmert follows:]

1050	*****	COMMITTEE	INSERT	* * * * * * * * *

1051 Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the amendment
1052 is considered as read. And the gentleman is recognized for
1053 five minutes on his amendment.

1054 Mr. Gohmert. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I want to

1055

1056

1057

1058

1059

1060

1061

1062

1063

1064

1065

1066

1067

1068

1069

1070

1071

1072

1073

1074

1075

1076

1077

1078

1079

commend all the work and all those who did the work on this It is addressing an important subject. glad my friend, Mr. Marino, has given prison officials additional tools to protect themselves. So, the tools are good; I do not want to affect or delay them whatsoever. this administration has demonstrated things that ought to concern everybody in here. Look at the Bergdahl trade. Take a guy that is now charged with desertion and trade him for five people, some of whom will kill Americans, kill Christians, kill Jews, who, when we look at the number of people who have been released by this administration, even in violation of the law by not giving Congress notice, it is a clear indication that the best interests of the American people have not been at the forefront of all of policies.

The recidivism rate for those released from Gitmo has already shown that the actions of choosing and releasing people by this administration will cause future Americans to lose their lives, their limbs, their property. When we look at this administration's policy going back to Fast and Furious, we still have not gotten the documents that this Congress asked for. We do not know who brought about such an egregious thing that continues to cause and be a part of killing Americans, not to mention all the Mexicans that have likely been killed by the weapons this administration forced

1080 | into the hands of criminals.

I saw the article from January 6 of this year entitled, "Justice Department Plans Attorney Hiring Spree to Keep Place with Obama's Pardon Push." It says the Justice Department will drastically increase the numbers it has on staff to deal with what is expected to be a massive push by President Obama to grant clemency to Federal prisoners before the end of his term.

It also says the number of expected hires is more than double the agency's staffing level as of May 2013. Over past decades, we have seen crime rates go up and we have seen them go down. And it seems that as you watch the pendulum swing back and forth, that when we are tougher on crime, have tougher sentences, the crime rates go down. And then there are periods in the last few decades when, all right, going back five decades, where we saw the pendulum swing back. We got less tough on crime, crime rates went up. We started releasing more people more quickly, crime rates went back up.

We see crime rates going up now, as we see the pendulum swinging back, especially in the last seven years under this administration, with what appears to be more concerns for the criminals than for their victims.

So, my concern is not with the tools that we give prison officials to protect themselves and to enforce the

1105

1106

1107

1108

1109

1110

1111

1112

1113

1114

1115

1116

1117

1118

1119

1120

1121

1122

1123

1124

1125

1126

1127

1128

1129

law. My concern is with the judgment of this administration. And the current Attorney General said she did not see any problems with the way the prior Attorney General enforced the law, and we know he did not enforce it properly.

So, my amendment is to try to protect those lives and limbs and property that will be adversely affected by the judgments of this administration, so that it simply delays the date by which anyone may be released from incarceration. I realize the bill uses incarcerated prisoners, and it says incarcerated individuals because it should apply No one should be released from prison before everyone. April 1st, 2017, so that another Attorney General and his or her staff will have time to review it. That is why I make the amendment and ask for your support.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes himself. First of all, I want to thank the gentleman for his concern about this issue and for his comments and for his intentions, but I cannot support the amendment. A couple of things. I think that this should be considered in the overall picture on criminal justice reform. For one thing, the President has been engaged in a very aggressive pardoning process, far beyond what I have seen previous presidents do, and I expect to see that to accelerate the rest of this year. And I do not approve of

that. That is one of the reasons why we are doing this legislation, and the whole criminal justice reform process here, because it is the Congress' responsibility to change how we do things and not the President's to abuse the pardon power, which I believe he is doing.

Secondly, I think the Sentencing Reform Commission has begun the process by which a number of prisoners are being released right now, and I do not think they got it right either. And again, that is the reason why the Congress should be taking this responsibility and why we should be doing it.

But this bill that we are considering today will not be affected by the State. First of all, I want to assure the gentleman that the truth in sentencing is still retained and made explicit in this bill. Secondly, no prisoner is released. They are pre-released to home confinement or to a half-way house. And the date of enactment of this bill is as yet unknown, and six months just to develop the post-sentencing risk and needs assessment will, I think, obviate the date that the gentleman has offered.

So the system is not likely to be in place to effectuate a release under this bill before the date and amendment. However, the sentencing reform bill does include, under certain circumstances, for prisoners who meet certain criteria, when the mandatory sentences are modified,

some people who are in prison today will receive retroactive reductions, and that would fit right into the gentleman's concern.

So I think moving forward overall, the gentleman might want to look at that. That measure has already passed out of this committee, but there will be opportunities between now and the floor, and on the floor, and after the floor as we negotiate with the Senate to make sure that we have a good plan for the release of prisoners who benefit from what this law finally winds up being. And the gentleman's concern in that regard is very well taken. But I do not think it fits the measure that we are considering today for the reasons that I have outlined, and therefore, I cannot support the amendment as offered.

And I thank the gentleman. The question occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

All those in favor, respond by saying aye.

Those opposed, no.

In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it, and the amendment is not agreed to.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee seek recognition?

1177 Mr. Cohen. Strike the last word.

1178 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for 1179 five minutes.

Mr. Cohen. Thank you, sir. I want to thank the chairman and the ranking members and the other people who have worked together to bring this bill to us. I understand the makeup of this committee. Those of us who are on this committee are here generally because we have a strong belief in issues that are controversial and are dealt with by this committee. And we have districts that can sometimes survive having those strong opinions.

Accordingly, there is a great divergence in opinion, maybe the strongest differences of opinion in this committee of any committee in Congress. And it makes it all the more amazing that the chairman and the ranking member and Chairman Sensenbrenner and Ranking Member Lee have been able to bring together a bill, and it is a good bill that does not go as far as I would like. It does not go as far as Mr. Gohmert might like or Mr. King or some other people, but that is the way you get legislation passed is you get some progress and you are satisfied with it.

I filed some amendments I would like to have brought up, but understanding the situation, I will not bring them up to a vote. But I do think that reform of our cannabis laws are real important in criminal justice. More people end up in jail because of marijuana than any other product in our society, and today 58 percent of Americans believe marijuana should be legalized and 85 percent think medical

1205

1206

1207

1208

1209

1210

1211

1212

1213

1214

1215

1216

1217

1218

1219

1220

1221

1222

1223

1224

1225

1226

1227

1228

1229

marijuana should be legalized. And when you put somebody in jail and take away their liberty and force them to hire a lawyer and possibly deny them a scholarship, deny them public housing, and deny them a job forever, that is wrong. And that is why people do not believe in our criminal justice system, and that is why Donald Trump and Bernie Sanders are getting a lot of their votes, because people are turned off to this place, because Congress is not responsive to issues that affect everyday Americans. And everyday Americans know that the whole policy we have got on drugs, and particularly marijuana, is wrong and out of step with America. We are putting people in jail for engaging in an activity that the President has said is less harmful than alcohol. And many people agree with that and think that it should not be criminalized.

Now I have an amendment that would take it away from scheduling so that marijuana would be left to the States, and I have another amendment that would make it Schedule II. That would at least allow science to have more opportunity to see medical efficacies that could help people. I had a constituent die, a young lady, of epileptic seizures, and there is a part of non-psychotic, or not psychotic, but non-psychotropics. It is not psychotropic, but the part of the marijuana that does not get you high. The cannabinoids, that is called Charlotte's Web. And Charlotte's Web can

help children with epileptic seizures and save their lives. And that ought to be studied to see what it does, and it ought to be studied to see what marijuana can do for people who have cancer, from nausea, with appetite, with Parkinson's, and other illnesses, and glaucoma. We should have it studied. That would be a Schedule II.

I also think that people, marijuana included, who have victimless crimes in Federal court, one victimless crime and have gone seven years without doing anything else that is wrong, have any other arrests or convictions, should get their records expunged and get a second chance. It is important that Americans get a second chance.

And while I have to admit that the spaces of my position on this is people with drug offenses, it would affect mostly white collar criminals who might have committed one crime, had seven years gone clean, and they ought to be able to wipe the records and have a clean record and not have this follow them like a scarlet letter forever. It does say if you have a financial crime of over \$25,000, you would not be included, or a sex crime where it is likely to be a recidivist.

But otherwise, I would like to ask the chairman and the ranking members when they markup other bills to consider to have hearings and to have consideration of reforming the marijuana laws to where they are not taking people's

liberty, and not treating it in a class where it is with LSD and ecstasy, but in a class where it belongs, which really is with alcohol, but not with LSD and ecstasy, to have it be studied, to have children that have epileptic seizures have a chance to have Charlotte's Web studied and to know the efficacy of it and possibly make it available to them, and not to take people's liberties and to give people second chances with expungement laws.

With that, I thank the member, the ranking member, the chairs, and all, and I hope that they will take these issues into consideration in the future and bring us closer to what justice should be, and have the American people have more respect for Congress for dealing with issues that hit them at the everyday level and affect people's lives. And it makes our criminal justice system look like a joke to so many people to think people are getting arrested and losing their liberty because of smoking marijuana that most people in America now think should be legal.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time and thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Goodlatte. Are there any amendments to the amendment?

1277 Mr. Cohen. It was not an amendment, it was a 1278 statement.

Mr. Goodlatte. No, no. There was an amendment on

1280 | consideration.

1281 Mr. Cohen. Oh, I see. Thank you. I thank you.

1282 Mr. Goodlatte. The question is on the amendment in the 1283 nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Utah.

Those in favor, respond by saying aye.

Those opposed, no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to. At this point, I had asked unanimous consent to place in the record a letter to myself and Ranking Member Conyers from Grover Norquist, president, Americans for Tax Reform; Timothy Head, executive director of the Faith and Freedom Coalition; Jason Pye, director of justice reform for FreedomWorks; Craig DeRoche, senior vice president, Advocacy and Public Policy Prison Fellowship; and Eli Lehrer, president of R Street Institute in support of this legislation.

And I would also like to give special thanks, we do not often do this in this committee; we should do it more often, but special thanks to our legislative counsel from the Office of Legislative Counsel, Megan Chasnoff, for her tremendous work on this bill. Thank you, Megan.

And with that, a reporting quorum being present, the question is in the motion to report the Bill H.R. 759 as amended favorably to the House.

Those in favor will respond by saying aye.

1305 Those opposed, no.

The ayes have it, and the bill as amended is ordered reported favorably. Members will have two days to submit views, and without objection, the bill will be reported as a single amendment in the nature of a substitute incorporating all adopted amendments, and staff is authorized to make technical and conforming changes. Do not go anywhere. We have more. Pursuant to notice, I now call up H.R. 2947 for purposes of markup and move that the committee report the bill favorably to the House. The clerk will report the bill.

Ms. Williams. H.R. 2947, to amend title 11 of the United States Code in order to facilitate the resolution of insolvent financial institution in bankruptcy.

[The bill follows:]

1320 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

Mr. Goodlatte. Without objection, the bill is considered as read and open for amendment at any point, and I will begin by recognizing myself for an opening statement. In 2008 our economy suffered one of the most significant financial crises in history. In the midst of the crisis, and in response to a fear that some financial firms' failures could cause severe harm to the overall economy, the Federal Government provided extraordinary taxpayer-funded assistance in order to prevent certain financial firms' failures.

In the ensuing years, experts from the financial, regulatory, legal, and academic communities have examined how best to prevent another similar crisis from occurring, and to eliminate the possibility of using taxpayer monies to bail out failing firms. The Judiciary Committee has advanced the review of this issue with the aim of crafting a solution that will better equip our bankruptcy laws to resolve failing firms, while also encouraging greater

1339

1340

1341

1342

1343

1344

1345

1346

1347

1348

1349

1350

1351

1352

1353

1354

1355

1356

1357

1358

1359

1360

1361

private counter-party diligence in order to reduce the likelihood of another financial crisis. Among other things, this responded to provisions of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act that called for an examination of how to improve the bankruptcy code in this area.

Congress, after three hearings the Last Judiciary Committee favorably reported the Financial Institution Bankruptcy Act, legislation that improved the bankruptcy code to better facilitate a resolution of a financial firm. That legislation was the culmination of a bipartisan process that solicited and incorporated the views of a wide range of leading experts and relevant regulators. The bill ultimately passed the House by a voice vote under suspension of the rules.

This Congress, Representative Trott reintroduced the Financial Institution Bankruptcy Act as H.R. 2947. Following its introduction, the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial, and Antitrust Law conducted a hearing on the bill. The hearing witnesses all supported the legislation, while providing recommendations for further refinements to the bill. Those recommendations have been incorporated into a manager's amendment.

As a result, the bill before us today is the product of a careful, deliberate, and thorough process, and reflects a

diverse range of views from a variety of interested parties. The Financial Institution Bankruptcy Act makes several improvements to the bankruptcy code in order to enhance the prospect of an efficient resolution of a financial firm through the bankruptcy process. The bill allows for a speedy transfer of the operating assets of a financial firm over the course of a weekend. This quick transfer allows the financial firm to continue to operate in the normal course, which preserves the value of the enterprise for the creditors of the bankruptcy without a significant impact on the firm's employees, suppliers, and customers.

The bill also requires expedited judicial review by a bankruptcy judge randomly chosen from a pool of judges designated in advance, and selected by the Chief Justice for their experience, expertise, and willingness to preside over these complex cases.

Furthermore, the legislation provides for key regulatory input throughout the process. The Financial Institution Bankruptcy Act is a bipartisan, balanced approach that increases transparency and predictability in the resolution of a financial firm.

Furthermore, it ensures that shareholders and creditors, not taxpayers, bear the losses related to the failure of a financial company. I am pleased that Ranking Member Conyers joined in introducing this important

legislation, and want to thank him and his staff for their efforts in developing this bill.

I would also like to thank Chairman Marino of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial, and Antitrust Law, who chaired the hearing on this legislation, and is one of the original co-sponsors of the bill. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation and yield back. And at this time, it is my pleasure to recognize the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Conyers, for his opening statement.

[The prepared statement of Chairman Goodlatte follows:]

1400 | ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

Mr. Conyers. Thank you, Chairman. As an original cosponsor of H.R. 2947, there are several reasons I would like to advance as supporting this measure and finding it to be of extremely important usefulness. To begin with, the bill addresses a real need recognized by regulatory agencies, bankruptcy experts, and the private sector to amend the bankruptcy law so that it can expeditiously restore trust in the financial marketplace after the collapse of a major financial institution.

As we all recall the failure of Lehman Brothers in 2008 caused a worldwide freeze on the availability of credit, which not only affected Wall Street, but Main Street as well. Even after Lehman sought bankruptcy relief, the filing did not prevent the new collapse of our national economy. The Lehman case revealed that current bankruptcy

law is ill-equipped to deal with complex financial institutions in economic distress. H.R. 2947 addresses these shortcomings by establishing a specialized form of bankruptcy relief, whereby the holding company of a large financial institution could expeditiously obtain such relief, while allowing its operating subsidiaries to function outside of bankruptcy.

Through this mechanism, the debtors' principle assets, such as its secured property, financial contracts, and the stock of its subsidiaries would be transferred to a temporary bridge company, which in turn would liquidate these assets for the benefit of debtors under the supervision of a trustee. This process should reduce the likelihood of disruption to the financial marketplace and avoid any worldwide freeze of the availability of credit.

Now I also support this bill because it appropriately recognizes the important role of Dodd-Frank Act in the regulation of large financial institutions. Without a doubt, the great recession was a direct result of the regulatory equivalent of the Wild West.

What do I mean? In the absence of any meaningful regulation of the mortgage industry, lenders developed high-risk, sub-prime mortgages and used predatory marketing tactics targeting the most vulnerable. These doomed-to-fail mortgages were then securitized and sold to unsuspecting

1441

1442

1443

1444

1445

1446

1447

1448

1449

1450

1451

1452

1453

1454

1455

1456

1457

1458

1459

1460

1461

1462

1463

1464

investors, including pension funds and school districts.

Millions of Americans were trapped in mortgages they could
no longer afford, causing vast waves of foreclosures,
massive unemployment, and international economic upheaval.

The Dodd-Frank Act goes a long way toward reinvigorating a regulatory system that makes the financial marketplace more accountable, more transparent, and more resilient. Nevertheless, H.R. 2947 will make the Dodd-Frank Act even more effective by ensuring the bankruptcy law is better equipped to resolve these companies.

Finally, I am pleased that the bill is the product of a very collaborative, inclusive, and deliberative process. While an excellent measure, it unfortunately does not include any provision allowing the Federal Government to be lender of last resort, which nearly every necessary element to ensure financial recognizes is a stability. I recognize, however, that this is an issue not within the jurisdiction of the House Judiciary Committee. to acknowledge the excellent level Again, I want cooperation on both sides of the aisle in producing the is pending before legislation that us today. And accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support the measure. thank the chair and yield back the balance of my time.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Conyers follows:]

1465 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman. Without objection, all other members opening statements will be made a part of the record. I now recognize the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Trott, for purposes of offering an amendment in the nature of substitute.

Mr. Trott. I want to thank the chairman for scheduling this markup, but also Chairman Marino for his work in moving this bill forward and also ranking members.

Chairman Goodlatte. Let's call the amendment up first, and then I will get right back to you. The clerk will report the amendment.

Ms. Williams. Amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 2947 offered by Mr. Trott of Michigan.

1479	[The	${\tt amendment}$	${\tt offered}$	by	Mr.	Trott	follows:	
------	------	-------------------	-----------------	----	-----	-------	----------	--

1480 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute is considered as read, and I now recognize the gentleman from Michigan to explain his amendment.

Mr. Trott. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you again for scheduling this markup, and Chairman Marino for your efforts in moving the bill forward, and Ranking Member Conyers for his bipartisan support. The amendment in the nature of a substitute makes several revisions to the introduced bill. Most significantly, the amendment removes the Federal Reserve's ability to initiate an involuntary bankruptcy petition against a financial institution.

At the July 9th hearing before the Subcommittee on

Regulatory Reform, all of the witnesses testified in support of this revision. The witnesses stated that it was highly unlikely that an involuntary petition would ever be filed, and that the Federal Reserve already has sufficient regulatory power to compel a financial institution into a subchapter-five bankruptcy process.

The amendment also clarifies that the chief judge of the Court of Appeals for the district in which the subchapter-five case has commenced will be the person who randomly selects the bankruptcy judge to preside over the case from the predesignated pool of judges. This revision reflects comments provided by the administrative office of the courts.

Finally, the legislation makes several clarifying, technical revisions to the introduced text; for example, the amendment clarifies that the term "agreement" includes qualified financial contracts, as well as revises the short title to refer to the year 2016, rather than 2015.

Mr. Chairman, we all see the deep frustration in the American people. While families are working hard to pay their taxes, far too often Washington seems to waste tax money and has proven to be a bad steward of our Nation's finances. Many of us were disappointed to see \$700 billion spent on bailing out failed financial institutions back in 2008.

1519

1520

1521

1522

1523

1524

1525

1526

1527

1528

1529

1530

1531

1532

1533

1534

1535

1536

1537

1538

1539

1540

1541

1542

1543

The American people should not be on the hook for the failures of bad businesses practices. That is why this important effort is aimed at reducing the risks of another taxpayer-funded bailout of failing banks, and reducing the risk of disruption to our economy by the failure of a large financial institution. The legislation protects taxpayers by reforming the process of how banks proceed through bankruptcy. The single point of entry contemplated in H.R. 2947 is also available utilizing the FDIC as a receiver, pursuant to Title II of Dodd-Frank.

H.R. 2947 makes the single-point-of-entry solution available through the bankruptcy code as well. Many commentators believe a bankruptcy solution to handle the failure of a large, systemically important financial institution is a preferable resolution strategy. individuals who testified before our committee indicated that transparency, due process, impartial administration, and the precedence associated with the bankruptcy process will provide an orderly process, which in turn will minimize the risk of significant disruption to the financial system, and will also place the risks of loss appropriately on shareholders and creditors, and not the American taxpayer.

Finally, under my plan, the bankruptcy process will be handled by an experienced judge who has the expertise to implement critical decisions within extremely tight

timeframes to ensure the continuity and stability in our global markets. This bill is the kind of commonsense legislation that I believe offers important solutions, protects the American people, protects our economy, and is deserving of bipartisan support. I encourage all my colleagues on the committee to support this effort. Thank you, and I yield back.

1551 Mr. Conyers. Mr. Chairman?

1552 Chairman Goodlatte. What purpose does the gentleman 1553 from Michigan seek recognition?

1554 Mr. Conyers. I rise in support of this manager's amendment.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Conyers. And to congratulate my colleague from Michigan, Mr. Trott, for his proposal here today. The amendment eliminates one of the problematic provisions of H.R. 2947, the Financial Institution Bankruptcy Act, that witnesses cited at the hearing held on this legislation last year.

As many of you know, Title 2 of the Dodd-Frank Act authorizes the Federal Reserve Board, under certain circumstances, to involuntarily place a systematically important financial institution into an orderly resolution process. As originally drafted, H.R. 2947 gave similar

powers to the Board whereby it could apply to the court for an order, forcing the financial institution involuntarily into the specialized form of bankruptcy relief established under the bill.

Based on testimony received at the hearing from the National Bankruptcy Conference and other witnesses, as well as informal consultations held with interested parties, it was determined that this authority was unnecessary, and that it possibly presented due process concerns given the contracted 48-hour timeframe that the bill provides for the court to make its required determination.

Also, in response to informal suggestions provided by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, the amendment revises the bill's provisions concerning notice provided to the Federal courts and judge selection.

And finally, the amendment makes a number of technical revisions, clarifying the treatment of qualified financial contracts.

So in sum, this amendment improves the bill from both substantive as well as technical perspectives, and accordingly, I support it and urge my colleagues to do so as well. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman.

Are there any amendments to the amendment? The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 2947.

1594	Those in favor respond by saying aye.
1595	Those opposed, no.
1596	In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it, and the
1597	amendment is agreed to. Reporting quorum being present, the
1598	question is on the motion to report the bill H.R. 2947 as
1599	amended favorably to the House.
1600	Those in favor, respond by saying aye.
1601	Those opposed, no.
1602	Mr. Trott. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the yeas and nays.
1603	Chairman Goodlatte. The yeas and nays have been
1604	requested, and the clerk will call the roll.
1605	Ms. Williams. Mr. Goodlatte?
1606	Chairman Goodlatte. Aye.
1607	Ms. Williams. Mr. Goodlatte votes aye.
1608	Mr. Sensenbrenner?
1609	[No response.]
1610	Mr. Smith?
1611	[No response.]
1612	Mr. Chabot?
1613	Mr. Chabot. Aye.
1614	Ms. Williams. Mr. Chabot votes aye.
1615	Mr. Issa?
1616	[No response.]
1617	Mr. Forbes?
1618	[No response.]

ı	
1619	Mr. King?
1620	Mr. King. Aye.
1621	Ms. Williams. Mr. King votes aye.
1622	Mr. Franks?
1623	Mr. Franks. Aye.
1624	Ms. Williams. Mr. Franks votes aye.
1625	Mr. Gohmert?
1626	Mr. Gohmert. Aye.
1627	Ms. Williams. Mr. Gohmert votes aye.
1628	Mr. Jordan?
1629	[No response.]
1630	Mr. Poe?
1631	[No response.]
1632	Mr. Chaffetz?
1633	Mr. Chaffetz. Aye.
1634	Ms. Williams. Mr. Chaffetz votes aye.
1635	Mr. Marino?
1636	Mr. Marino. Yes.
1637	Ms. Williams. Mr. Marino votes yes.
1638	Mr. Gowdy?
1639	Mr. Gowdy. Yes.
1640	Ms. Williams. Mr. Gowdy votes yes.
1641	Mr. Labrador?
1642	Mr. Labrador. Yes.
1643	Ms. Williams. Mr. Labrador votes yes.

1644 Mr. Farenthold? 1645 [No response.] 1646 Mr. Collins? 1647 Mr. Collins. Aye. 1648 Ms. Williams. Mr. Collins votes aye. 1649 Mr. DeSantis? 1650 Mr. DeSantis. Aye. 1651 Ms. Williams. Mr. DeSantis votes aye. 1652 Ms. Walters? 1653 [No response.] 1654 Mr. Buck? 1655 [No response.] 1656 Mr. Ratcliffe? 1657 Mr. Ratcliffe. Yes. 1658 Ms. Williams. Mr. Ratcliffe votes yes. 1659 Mr. Trott? 1660 Mr. Trott. Yes.
1646 Mr. Collins? 1647 Mr. Collins. Aye. 1648 Ms. Williams. Mr. Collins votes aye. 1649 Mr. DeSantis? 1650 Mr. DeSantis. Aye. 1651 Ms. Williams. Mr. DeSantis votes aye. 1652 Ms. Walters? 1653 [No response.] 1654 Mr. Buck? 1655 [No response.] 1656 Mr. Ratcliffe? 1657 Mr. Ratcliffe. Yes. 1658 Ms. Williams. Mr. Ratcliffe votes yes. 1659 Mr. Trott?
Mr. Collins. Aye. Ms. Williams. Mr. Collins votes aye. Mr. DeSantis? Mr. DeSantis. Aye. Ms. Williams. Mr. DeSantis votes aye. Ms. Williams. Mr. DeSantis votes aye. Ms. Walters? Ms. Walters? Mr. Buck? Mr. Buck? Mr. Ratcliffe? Mr. Ratcliffe. Yes. Ms. Williams. Mr. Ratcliffe votes yes. Mr. Trott?
1648 Ms. Williams. Mr. Collins votes aye. 1649 Mr. DeSantis? 1650 Mr. DeSantis. Aye. 1651 Ms. Williams. Mr. DeSantis votes aye. 1652 Ms. Walters? 1653 [No response.] 1654 Mr. Buck? 1655 [No response.] 1656 Mr. Ratcliffe? 1657 Mr. Ratcliffe. Yes. 1658 Ms. Williams. Mr. Ratcliffe votes yes. 1659 Mr. Trott?
Mr. DeSantis? Mr. DeSantis. Aye. Ms. Williams. Mr. DeSantis votes aye. Ms. Walters? Ms. Walters? Ms. Buck? Mr. Buck? Ms. Watcliffe? Mr. Ratcliffe. Yes. Ms. Williams. Mr. Ratcliffe votes yes. Mr. Trott?
Mr. DeSantis. Aye. Ms. Williams. Mr. DeSantis votes aye. Ms. Walters? [No response.] Mr. Buck? [No response.] Mr. Ratcliffe? Mr. Ratcliffe. Yes. Ms. Williams. Mr. Ratcliffe votes yes. Mr. Trott?
Ms. Williams. Mr. DeSantis votes aye. Ms. Walters? Ino response.] Mr. Buck? Ino response.] Mr. Ratcliffe? Mr. Ratcliffe. Yes. Ms. Williams. Mr. Ratcliffe votes yes. Mr. Trott?
1652 Ms. Walters? 1653 [No response.] 1654 Mr. Buck? 1655 [No response.] 1656 Mr. Ratcliffe? 1657 Mr. Ratcliffe. Yes. 1658 Ms. Williams. Mr. Ratcliffe votes yes. 1659 Mr. Trott?
[No response.] 1654 Mr. Buck? 1655 [No response.] 1656 Mr. Ratcliffe? 1657 Mr. Ratcliffe. Yes. 1658 Ms. Williams. Mr. Ratcliffe votes yes. 1659 Mr. Trott?
1654 Mr. Buck? 1655 [No response.] 1656 Mr. Ratcliffe? 1657 Mr. Ratcliffe. Yes. 1658 Ms. Williams. Mr. Ratcliffe votes yes. 1659 Mr. Trott?
<pre>1655 [No response.] 1656 Mr. Ratcliffe? 1657 Mr. Ratcliffe. Yes. 1658 Ms. Williams. Mr. Ratcliffe votes yes. 1659 Mr. Trott?</pre>
<pre>1656 Mr. Ratcliffe? 1657 Mr. Ratcliffe. Yes. 1658 Ms. Williams. Mr. Ratcliffe votes yes. 1659 Mr. Trott?</pre>
Mr. Ratcliffe. Yes. Ms. Williams. Mr. Ratcliffe votes yes. Mr. Trott?
1658 Ms. Williams. Mr. Ratcliffe votes yes. 1659 Mr. Trott?
1659 Mr. Trott?
1660 Mr. Trott. Yes.
Ms. Williams. Mr. Trott votes yes.
Mr. Bishop?
Mr. Bishop. Aye.
Ms. Williams. Mr. Bishop votes aye.
1665 Mr. Conyers?
Mr. Conyers. Aye.
Ms. Williams. Mr. Conyers votes aye.
1668 Mr. Nadler?

4000	
1669	Mr. Nadler. Aye.
1670	Ms. Williams. Mr. Nadler votes aye.
1671	Ms. Lofgren?
1672	Ms. Lofgren. Aye.
1673	Ms. Williams. Ms. Lofgren votes aye.
1674	Ms. Jackson-Lee?
1675	[No response.]
1676	Mr. Cohen?
1677	[No response.]
1678	Mr. Johnson?
1679	[No response.]
1680	Mr. Pierluisi?
1681	[No response.]
1682	Ms. Chu?
1683	Ms. Chu. Aye.
1684	Ms. Williams. Ms. Chu votes aye.
1685	Mr. Deutch?
1686	[No response.]
1687	Mr. Gutierrez?
1688	[No response.]
1689	Ms. Bass?
1690	[No response.]
1691	Mr. Richmond?
1692	[No response.]
1693	Ms. DelBene?

1694	Ms. DelBene. Aye.
1695	Ms. Williams. Ms. DelBene votes aye.
1696	Mr. Jefferies?
1697	[No response.]
1698	Mr. Cicilline?
1699	Mr. Cicilline. Aye.
1700	Ms. Williams. Mr. Cicilline votes aye.
1701	Mr. Peters?
1702	Mr. Peters. Aye
1703	Ms. Williams. Mr. Peters votes aye.
1704	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from Virginia.
1705	Mr. Forbes. Aye.
1706	Ms. Williams. Mr. Forbes votes aye.
1707	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from Colorado?
1708	Mr. Buck. Aye.
1709	Ms. Williams. Mr. Buck votes aye.
1710	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentlewoman from California,
1711	Ms. Chu? Oh, sorry. The gentleman from Tennessee?
1712	Mr. Cohen. Aye.
1713	Ms. Williams. Mr. Cohen votes aye. Do you have 24?
1714	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Poe?
1715	Mr. Poe. Yes.
1716	Ms. Williams. Mr. Poe votes yes.
1717	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentlewoman from Washington,
1718	Ms. DelBene? She has already voted. Has every member voted

1719	who wishes to vote? The clerk will report.
1720	Ms. Williams. Mr. Chairman, 25 members voted aye, zero
1721	members voted no.
1722	Chairman Goodlatte. And the ayes have it. And the
1723	bill, as amended, is ordered reported favorably. Members
1724	will have two days to submit views.
1725	Without objection, the bill will be reported as a
1726	single amendment in the nature of a substitute incorporating
1727	all adopted amendments, and staff is authorized to make
1728	technical and conforming changes.
1729	This concludes our business today. I want to thank all
1730	the members for their participation, and we thank you all
1731	for attending, and for your good work on both these bills in
1732	a very bipartisan fashion, and the markup is adjourned.
1733	[Whereupon, at 11:51 a.m., the committee adjourned
1734	subject to the call of the chair.]