



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 2016

No. 56

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 13, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID W. JOLLY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2016, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MODERNIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, I introduced the Information Technology Modernization Act, a bill that will make our government more transparent, more efficient, more responsive, and more secure.

Dangerously, many Federal Government agencies, as we have seen, rely on technology systems that are decades old and hinder digital interagency collaboration. As a result, government

services are less efficient than they could be, and Americans' personal data is put at higher risk every year that goes by without critical system upgrades. This was the experience for almost 2 million employees of our Federal Government.

I am partnering with the White House and U.S. Chief Information Officer Tony Scott to propose a new way to invest in upgrading the government technology infrastructure that serves the American people and this institution.

My bill authorizes a one-time investment of \$3 billion into a revolving fund that will be overseen by an independent review board. The fund will invest in large-scale, rapid systems upgrades deemed to be in the greatest need and that would provide the greatest impact on serving the American people.

Once an upgrade is completed, the receiving agency will then begin paying back the fund over time, using the savings achieved from greater efficiency. In such a way, this one-time investment of \$3 billion will support at least a minimum of \$12 billion—that is 400 percent more—worth of upgrades in the first 10 years alone, after which it would continue to fund upgrades into the future.

This is a novel approach for government, though it has been employed successfully in the private sector, where it has a proven track record. Tony Scott himself, Mr. Speaker, implemented a similar program when he was the chief information officer at Microsoft, which was successful and resulted in significant long-term savings.

Additionally, the fund will ensure that upgrades make use of the latest and best practices from Silicon Valley, including shared services, cloud hosting, and agile development. This will enable agencies to create new user-friendly apps and services, and facilitate the sharing of data between

agencies to root out fraud and waste. It will promote the use of systems that are secure and prevent cyberattacks.

My bill will also ensure transparency by requiring all upgrade projects to provide regular status updates on a publicly available digital dashboard.

I want to thank all those who signed on as original sponsors, Mr. Speaker, and I want to say that I had discussions last night with Mr. ISSA, the former chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. I think he is going to cosponsor this bill with me, and we want to see this bill be a bipartisan bill.

I have also talked to ranking members on my side of the aisle in each of the relevant committees: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. ROBIN KELLY, and Mr. TED LIEU, all of whom are excited to support this piece of legislation.

Again, this is a totally nonpartisan bill looking for government efficiency and safety and transparency for the American people. I hope that my friends on both sides of the aisle who care deeply about making government as effective and transparent as possible, as well as eliminating fraud and inefficiencies, will partner with us by cosponsoring this bill and helping to bring it to the floor as a bipartisan measure overwhelmingly supported by this House.

I am proud of the bipartisan work we have done together already to encourage innovation in the use of technology in Congress, particularly the hackathons I have hosted with Leader MCCARTHY and his predecessor, Mr. Cantor.

Let's work together. Let me say that again. Let's work together to expand that effort to the executive branch and make sure that the Federal Government can and is serving the American people effectively and transparently.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1639

HONORING FLORIDA HEROINES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the many generations of women who have shaped our Nation and thank them for their invaluable contributions.

As the first Hispanic woman elected to Congress, I am grateful and inspired by their legacy. These women have influenced public policies, built institutions, and contributed to a stronger economy. Without their contributions, our society would be less lively, our culture more impoverished, and peace would be less stable. We need to respect their great achievements by continuing the job.

I share the hopes and aspirations of all women across America who wish to make the lives of our daughters, sisters, aunts, and mothers more equitable. I have always been committed and dedicated to advancing the role of women in our society, and I work toward policies that would assist them and their families. That is why I have joined the bipartisan Congressional Women's Caucus and have supported extensive legislation and programs fighting domestic violence and women's access to a quality education.

Today I would like to pay tribute to some of the more energetic champions of women's rights from my area of south Florida: Roxcy O'Neal Bolton, Helen Aguirre Ferre, Julia Tuttle, Marjory Stoneman Douglas, and Judge Bertila Soto.

Roxcy Bolton has had an impressive career by advocating for equal rights in the workplace and also by creating the first rape treatment center in the country, located in my hometown of Miami. She also founded Women in Distress, the first women's rescue center in Florida. Roxcy has received numerous accolades and is an iconic and loved figure in our community.

Congratulations, Roxcy.

Helen Aguirre Ferre is another pioneer. She is an award-winning journalist and communications consultant who was recently inducted into the Florida Women's Hall of Fame. As the chair of the Board of Trustees of Miami Dade College—my alma mater—Helen is committed to promoting education and establishing policies that would help students across our community.

Congratulations, Helen.

Julia Tuttle, known as the mother of Miami, made history as the only female founder of a major U.S. city when she helped establish the city of Miami many years ago. Julia's vision and perseverance have long been traits that south Floridians have worked to carry on since the founding of our great city of Miami.

Tuttle's mantle of leadership is heavy, but it has been carried on by so many others.

Marjory Stoneman Douglas made another kind of south Florida history

when she worked tirelessly to save her beloved Everglades. Her iconic book, "The Everglades: River of Grass," helped awaken so many to the need of preserving this one-of-a-kind ecological wonder and led the fight to establish the Everglades National Park.

Judge Bertila Soto is a modern-day heroine. She is a fellow graduate of my alma maters, Florida International University and the University of Miami. She was named chief judge of Florida's 11th Judicial Circuit.

Bertila is both the first Cuban American and the first woman to helm the largest judicial circuit in the State. Her energy and understanding of complex legal issues have driven her to success. Every day that Judge Soto is hard at work, she is not only living, but making south Florida history.

Congratulations to Bertila.

I also want to honor our female pilots of World War II, the Women Airforce Service Pilots, also known as the WASPS. They were responsible for removing the barriers for women in the military today. And I know this because my daughter-in-law, Lindsay, was afforded the opportunity to join the Marine Corps and fly combat missions both in Iraq and Afghanistan thanks to these women pioneers.

South Florida has been home to some of these remarkable heroines like Ruth Shafer Fleisher, Shirley Kruse, and Bee Haydu, as well as Frances Rohrer Sargent and Helen Wyatt Snapp, who have passed away.

Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to recognize all of these outstanding women, past and present. May these role models continue to remind girls and young women that nothing can hold them back from realizing their dreams.

HEROIN AND OPIOID OVERDOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, the chart that is being set up next to me here depicts graphically one of the most sickening trends in terms of an increasing cause of death in the United States, which is heroin and opioid overdoses.

On the top, the map shows data from 2004 from the Centers for Disease Control, when 7,500 Americans lost their lives to overdose deaths. In 2014, that number has grown to 27,000.

The red shaded area is high-intensity areas of death of up to 20 per 100,000 in the population. The blue is 10 or less. And in 2014, as you can see, the red is slowly but inexorably taking over the entire country.

This is a crisis which, again, affects every part of our country, whether it is rural, suburban, or urban. It affects Republican districts. It affects Democratic districts. And it is time for our Nation to recognize that this needs to be treated the same way we would any natural disaster or public health emergency in the country.

In 2016, we know these numbers are, in fact, going to get worse.

The Office of Chief Medical Examiner in the State of Connecticut released their 2015 numbers a few weeks ago, and the number grew in the State of Connecticut by 20 percent, to 723 deaths in 2015.

Just this morning in the local press in southeastern Connecticut, a 25-year-old was found dead in a motor vehicle on Route 12 outside the Groton Navy Base, and a young man, an 18-year-old, was found dead in Norwich just a couple of days ago.

It is time for us to listen to the folks who are on the front lines—the police officers, the addiction counselors, and the folks that are dealing with this program bringing people to life with Narcan—and understand that we need a new approach to solving this incredibly dangerous crisis for our Nation.

The good news is that the Senate, a couple of weeks ago, passed the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act 94-1. It is a good bill. It makes some smart changes in terms of the overprescribing of painkillers. It deals with the disposal of the proliferation of painkillers that is far too great in the Nation today. It also talks about changing protocols in the FDA, HHS, DOD, VA, all of the agencies of the Federal Government that deal with folks suffering from pain. Unfortunately, though, the bill does not contain a single penny of emergency assistance which the police departments across the country, the addiction counselors across the country are begging for.

In the House, there is a bill, H.R. 4473, which does provide emergency supplemental appropriations this year to try and get resources so that folks who are dealing with this crisis and families that are dealing with this crisis are actually going to get real help. And this bill has been endorsed by 21 organizations, from the Fraternal Order of Police, the police and the cops and the firefighters who are out there saving people's lives right now with Narcan, and also the addiction counselors who, again, do not have adequate detox facilities and beds to deal with the carnage that is happening all across this country.

The Republican majority leader announced last week that in May, the House will take up the Senate bill. I wish it was this month. I wish we could move with the urgency of a natural disaster like a fire or hurricane or tornado striking parts of our country that causes devastation much less than what these maps depict. However, the fact that there is going to be some movement is some sign of hope.

□ 1015

But it is important to remember it is not enough to just pass authorizing language that is about trying to change policy without funding, because the folks who are dealing with this problem, who are watching us like a

hawk because they are dealing with this problem, like that young man who was found dead last night, understand that resources are needed, just like in any other natural disaster or public health emergency facing this country.

Again, we need to turn this map around. We need to change this so that, again, the devastation that is being caused in families of middle class, upper class, lower income families across the country is going to stop.

There are real-life solutions that the folks who are at the front lines are prepared to move forward. They are on standby. What they are waiting for is this Congress to move forward with the real resources that we would deal with as a great Nation in terms of any other epidemic or any other massive public health or health emergency in this Nation.

We need to include H.R. 4473. We need to listen to the 21 organizations that deal with this problem all across America so that we get real help out on the streets of America and not just give lip service to solving this critical problem.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF CAPTAIN JAMES T. DEAN, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Captain James T. Dean, Jr., an Army veteran from the Vietnam war.

Jim was born in Louisville, Kentucky, in 1944. In 1962, he joined the Army and graduated from Officer Candidate School at Fort Sill, Oklahoma. He served in Korea with a Sergeant missile unit before being deployed to a beautiful place during an ugly time. He served in Vietnam from January 1968 to September 1969, serving with the 2nd Battalion, 40th Field Artillery, of the 199th Light Infantry Brigade.

A proud redleg, Jim received the Bronze Star with "V" device for heroism in ground combat, the Bronze Star with two oak leaf clusters for meritorious achievement in ground operations against hostile forces, the Purple Heart for wounds received in action, along with numerous other awards and decorations for his service.

Following his service, Jim and his wife, Carla, moved to Naples, Florida, where he started several businesses before returning to his true passion, horticulture.

Jim worked for the city of Naples as the assistant parks and parkway supervisor. He was proud to have played a significant role in the Naples-scape project to beautify the city.

He was a civic leader, serving on the board of the Greater Naples Better Government Committee as well as the Marco Island Kiwanis. He was an ordained elder within the Presbyterian Church, and he and Carla were members of the Collier County Republican Executive Committee.

Jim also battled bladder cancer and, with Carla and other friends, formed

the Bladder Cancer Foundation of Florida to raise awareness.

Sadly, Jim succumbed to bladder cancer and passed away last month, on March 23. His name will not appear on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial wall; however, make no mistake about it, like too many other survivors, Jim was a casualty of the war due to his exposure to Agent Orange.

Recently, the National Institute of Medicine forwarded to the VA that "there is limited or suggestive evidence of an association between chemicals of interest and bladder cancer."

Adding bladder cancer to the list of medical conditions that qualify veterans for a presumption of exposure to Agent Orange would allow veterans easier access to critical healthcare benefits.

Unfortunately, it is too late for Jim, but many Vietnam veterans continue to suffer from this disease. I call on VA Secretary McDonald to approve this designation so our Vietnam war veterans can receive the help that they have so solemnly earned.

I know I speak on behalf of the entire Congress and a grateful Nation to express our deepest condolences to his widow, Carla; daughter, Michelle; and his many friends and loved ones. I pray for God's mercies upon them as they cope with their pain.

BUDGET CUTS AT THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this week in 2 days is April 15, the day that our income taxes are due. We have seen that day difficult enough under the best of circumstances, be made even more difficult, purposely, for millions of Americans. My Republican friends have decided to take out their differences with the IRS, their opposition to taxation, by deliberately torturing the American taxpayer.

Ours is the largest tax system in the world that relies primarily on volunteer compliance. Each 1 percent where people decide not to comply costs the Treasury \$30 billion. Now, most, in fact, do comply, but an ever-increasingly complex tax system makes compliance difficult.

It should be noted that it is not the IRS that makes the Tax Code complicated; it is Congress that is constantly changing that Code. Sometimes it is so late in meeting its obligations with tax changes that the Service doesn't even have time to print the forms on time.

In order to help citizens with Congress' complex tax system, the Internal Revenue Service runs the largest consumer service operation in the world. Last year, it was a disaster. Well, this process has been deliberately sabotaged by the Republican approach to the agency budget. It has 30,000 fewer

employees than it had in 1992, down 13,000 from 2010, despite the fact that the Code gets more complex and there are more people filing returns every year.

Congress should have been a constructive partner in streamlining, modernization, with new computers, but the IRS budget prevents it from modernizing information technology. It still uses applications that were running in the early 1960s. And you cannot completely computerize the simple task of answering phone calls and talking to taxpayers.

When you visit the IRS offices, as I have, you find employees who are sad and angry that they are unable to meet the needs of the taxpayers. They don't like getting somebody who has been on hold for 20 or 30 minutes and then not having the time to work with them to answer their questions. It frustrates the taxpayer, and it breaks the heart of our employees.

Now, it is no secret that some people forget or cheat on their taxes, but Congress has not equipped the IRS to do the audits necessary to actually collect the money that is due. This year, when we have a big deficit, there will be \$300 to \$400 billion of taxes that are due and owing but won't be paid. Yet Congress is deliberately trying to make it worse. They have 12,000 fewer enforcement staff, a reduction of 23 percent, and I am going back to a Ways and Means Committee where one of the proposals would cut that budget another \$500 million. It is not fair to the taxpayer, it is not fair to our employees, and it makes it hard to fund the needs of our Nation.

People talk around here about running government like a business. What business undercuts, underfunds, and slashes its accounts receivable department? They may think it is good politics to make the taxpayer experience as miserable as possible, but it is ultimately bad judgment, poor politics, and a disservice to the American people as we undercut the ability to fund essential government services.

Many of my Republican colleagues have been looking for scandal within the IRS. Whatever problems they uncover or imagine, the real scandal is how they are treating the American public and the people who work for them at the vital service of the Internal Revenue Service.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURBELO of Florida). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 195th anniversary of Greek independence.

Citizens of Greece have always been a proud people in body, mind, and spirit. From Pericles, Greek statesman and general, dubbed "the first citizen of

Athens"; to Plato, who laid a groundwork in philosophy so vast that the entirety of European philosophical tradition is said to simply be a footnote to his work; to Count Ioannis Kapodistrias, the first head of state of an independent Greece, Greeks have been exceptional and continue to be exceptional, Mr. Speaker.

I am almost certain that Thomas Jefferson cast an eye across the Atlantic towards Greece when he uttered these words in 1821: "The flames kindled on the Fourth of July 1776 have spread over too much of the globe to be extinguished by the feeble engines of despotism. On the contrary, they will consume these engines and all who work them."

I am blessed to be of two cultures, Mr. Speaker, that have been beacons of liberty for all of civilization: the place of my birth, the land of the free and the home of the brave, the United States of America; and the land of my ancestors, the birthplace of democracy, the Hellenic Republic.

Many Greeks fought for years, holding on to their heritage, their culture, their faith. Bishop Germanos of Patras raised the emblem of freedom for Hellenes, the flag bearing a white cross and nine blue and white stripes representing the nine letters, "Eleftheria," which means freedom.

Eight years of bloodshed and battle led to the Treaty of Adrianople, the formal declaration of a free and independent Greece.

Greece was the world's first advanced civilization, one that provided a cultural heritage that has influenced the world. Firsts in philosophy, mathematics, politics, sports, and art all stemmed from a free Greece.

Liberty and justice, freedom to determine the path of one's own life, these are human desires and were embodied by Greece throughout their fight for independence. Those unyielding Hellenes paid life and limb for those desires, and generations of Greeks for decades to come owe their ancestors thanks.

As George Washington once said: "Liberty, when it begins to take root, is a plant of rapid growth." This held true in Greece in 1821, as it did in America in 1776.

"Freedom or Death," Eleftheria i thanatos, was the battle cry of the revolutionaries nearly 200 years ago. It rings true today.

Freedom is a powerful and beautiful notion. The Greek people achieved that for themselves 195 years ago, and I am proud to celebrate in memory of those who fought bravely to shed the shackles of the Ottoman Empire.

Greece has its own unique challenges today but, also, a history of resilience and ability to climb its way out of turmoil. As centuries-long allies, we must continue to creatively come up with solutions to help Greece control the flow of refugees arriving on its shores.

I am encouraged by the growing cooperation and collaboration that our

closest allies in the Eastern Mediterranean are proving this year. The trilateral agreements between Greece, Cyprus, and Israel are a refreshing reminder that we stand united with our allies in the fight for security, stability, and prosperity in a volatile region.

We celebrate Greek independence to reaffirm the common democratic heritage we share, and, as Americans, we must continue to pursue this spirit of freedom and liberty which characterizes both of our great nations.

Zito I Ellas. God bless America.

□ 1030

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, this morning I intend to comment on middle class budgets. But, before that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to just very briefly reflect on a trip I just took to visit with our troops in the Middle East, in Iraq and elsewhere.

I have been to Iraq about 10 times. I think one of the fundamental responsibilities we have, as Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, is not just to talk about supporting our troops, but to go into the theater, visit with them, and learn firsthand the challenges they face.

Every time I visit with our troops, when I come back, I think the same thing: that we are so blessed to live in a country that gives us the right to agree with the decision to put people in harm's way, we have the right to disagree with that decision, and we have the right to remain silent, but no American has the right to forget even for a day the sacrifices that those men and women are making for us every single day.

We owe them our support and our awareness for the work that they do and, more importantly, supporting their families who are here and supporting our troops when they return as veterans.

Mr. Speaker, Friday, April 15, is a day of two deadlines. That is the deadline most Americans know by which they must pay their Federal income taxes. Everybody understands that deadline, and Americans don't have a choice but to comply with that deadline.

The other deadline is that that is the day by which Congress must pass a budget, and it is up to the Republican majority to produce that budget and bring that budget to the floor for a vote.

Unfortunately, the Republican majority will miss that deadline and fail the American people in our fundamental responsibility to earn our pay by passing budgets.

That is what we are put here to do: to debate priorities and pass budgets; yet,

this deadline will be missed. Failing to pass a budget by the deadline is a fundamental failure to the American people.

I will say, however, that, in this case, a missed budget may be a little better than the bad budget that Republicans have originally proposed. It is a budget that fundamentally fails the middle class.

It is a budget, as proposed, that gets rid of the Medicare guarantee. It is a budget, as proposed, that slashes \$6.5 trillion in fundamentally important priorities to the middle class in making sure that their kids are well educated, making sure that we are rebuilding America with infrastructure and trying to reduce traffic jams, rebuilding our bridges and our tunnels, and modernizing our airports. It is a budget that undermines the middle class. It is a budget that fails the middle class.

Now, I understand the need for us to reduce spending, and I have supported significant reductions in spending in my time in Congress.

But what this budget does is it takes away from the middle class in order to further enrich the most powerful: the special interests.

That is why people are so angry out there. They understand that Washington has to do more with less, but not give more to people who already have the most.

That is what the Republican budget does. That is the architecture of spending tax dollars that must be paid by April 15.

You take away from the middle class and you give more to people who are doing pretty well already, people who are doing so well that they can hire all sorts of friends to do their work here in Washington and maybe even contribute to some super-PACs. I think that is wrong.

People are angry because not only are our priorities wrong, but they see very little evidence of a Congress, under Republican leadership in the Senate and the House, that is doing its job.

They are angry because the Republican Senate won't even debate and vote on a Supreme Court nomination. You can vote for it. You can vote against it. They won't even vote on that nomination.

That is a failure to do the job that they are paid to do. They are angry because the majority here in the House of Representatives won't do their job and pass a budget.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, maybe no budget is better than a bad budget, but both represent failure for the American people.

The Pew Research Center did a study just several weeks ago that said that, for the first time since the Depression, to be in the middle class in America is to be in the minority. About 49 percent of Americans are in the middle class. The rest are either richer or poorer.

An economy grows best when the middle class is strongest. We need to

fulfill our responsibility to that middle class by doing what they will pay us to do on April 15: just do our jobs and pass a budget that invests in their growth, in their families, in their children, and, as I opened, invests in our troops, our national security, and makes sure that every veteran in America is taken care of. Those are the priorities we have in our budgets.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 34 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Stephen Thomlison, St. Stephen's Catholic Church, Exeter, Nebraska, offered the following prayer:

Good and gracious God, we come before You filled with gratitude for the many blessings You have bestowed upon us. Humbly, we ask for Your forgiveness for when we have chosen the wrong path.

We beseech Your mercy, O Lord, upon our Nation. Rain down from heaven Your holy fire—not a fire of wrath or destruction, but a fire of love, a fire of mercy, and a fire of wisdom so that we may love as You love.

Pour into this Chamber today a spirit of civility, a freshness of renewal, and a bountiful grace of new ideas.

Bless these legislators, their families, their staff, and abundantly bless all those they represent. May the work of this Chamber be guided by Your divine hand.

Hear us, O Lord, for I ask this in the name and through the merits of Jesus Christ, Thy Son and our Savior.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Ms. HAHN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HAHN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND STEPHEN THOMLISON

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise to welcome Father Steve Thomlison, and thank him for serving as our guest chaplain today.

Father Thomlison serves as chaplain for both the Nebraska Army National Guard and the Nebraska State Patrol, actually, as well as the FBI, providing support to hundreds of our servicemen and -women, first responders, law enforcement, and their families.

Ordained in the Catholic Diocese of Lincoln, Father Thomlison pastors the parish of St. Stephen's Church in Exeter, Nebraska, and the mission parish of St. Wenceslaus Church in Milligan, Nebraska.

He did not enter the priesthood right away, but by his mid-thirties, a restless heart and a renewed focus on prayer led him to the seminary. He was ordained a priest at age 41.

It is also important to note Father Thomlison is a proud Cornhusker, having attended the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

It is my honor to welcome Father Thomlison to the United States House of Representatives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

BALD EAGLE AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT WINS NUTRITION HABIT CHALLENGE

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend several school districts in the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District for their work in helping promote healthy lifestyles for their students, staff, and residents.

In 2015, more than 2,200 people participated in the Nutrition Habit Challenge, which was established 3 years ago by One on One Fitness, a local fitness consulting company, in order to inspire people across the county to make better choices for their diet and exercise habits.

Each year, the winning school district is picked based on the number of successful participants divided by the district's total number of students. Those who participate must commit to changing a nutritional behavior over the course of 1 month.

This year, the Bald Eagle Area School District, my alma mater, won

\$500 through the competition. District officials say families participating in the challenge cut soda from their diets and increased consumption of water, while others packed salad for lunch instead of opting for fast food.

I commend the students, the staff, and residents of all Centre County's school districts for participating in this unique challenge.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF BILL ROSENDAHL

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of my dear friend and former Los Angeles City Councilman Bill Rosendahl, who lost his battle with cancer on March 30.

In 2005, Bill became the first openly gay man to be elected to the Los Angeles City Council. I remember how brave he was in the face of adversity. He became a fearless supporter of the Los Angeles LGBT community, and he left behind a legacy of fighting for HIV and AIDS research and an end to discrimination.

Bill was one of the most selfless and kindhearted individuals I have ever known. That heart made him an incredible advocate and a beloved champion for the people he represented.

I visited Bill recently in hospice and had a chance to hold his hand and tell him stories about when we served together on the city council in Los Angeles.

I will never forget his joyfulness, his gregarious laugh that never failed to put a smile on my face. I have cherished his friendship, and I will miss him dearly.

May he rest in peace.

MAIN STREET JOBS AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, talk to any small-business owner, and they will tell you how challenging it is to operate in this environment: heavy-handed regulations, confusing paperwork requirements, a complex and unfair Tax Code. I hear it all the time as I travel Michigan's Seventh District, hold listening sessions, and tour local shops and manufacturing facilities. That is why I am introducing the Main Street Jobs and Opportunity Act.

To grow a healthy economy, we need to foster policies that help small businesses do what they do best: bring their products to market and hire new workers in the community.

It is time for Big Government to stop squeezing the small family farmer in Jackson County, the local diner in Eaton County, and the manufacturer in Monroe County. Instead of building up Washington or Wall Street, let's focus on helping Main Street.

HONORING THE 65TH INFANTRY REGIMENT

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of the 65th Infantry Regiment, a segregated Puerto Rican unit known as the Borinqueneers.

The regiment was created in 1917, and it remained segregated throughout World Wars I and II and most of the Korean war, even after President Truman ordered the desegregation of the Armed Forces. These soldiers sacrificed everything for a country that had not yet embraced the rights of Hispanic Americans—a shame for our country, but a show of incredible loyalty and service by those who served.

Today, the House and Senate leaders will present a Congressional Gold Medal in honor of the 65th Infantry Regiment. In attendance will be Cas Rodriguez, Sr., chairman of the Hispanic Heritage Council of Western New York.

I thank Cas and the others who worked so hard to make sure that Americans will never forget the service of the 65th Infantry Regiment.

CONGRESS NEEDS TO DO ITS JOB AND PASS A BUDGET

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, by law, Congress must enact a budget resolution by April 15. That is Friday. Yet, after months of promising to return to so-called regular order, Speaker RYAN has failed to bring a budget to the floor of this House for us to act upon.

I don't know about you, but my constituents, the people I work for, are tired of a do-nothing Congress.

The Republican majority has failed to pass a budget resolution. We need a resolution that supports working families, a budget that supports growing the economy in this country. But instead of that, the Republicans have decided not to pass a budget at all.

Under this Republican majority, rather than working with those of us on this side of the aisle and finding some common ground around a budget resolution, the majority has been held hostage to the most extreme voices within their conference—the Tea Party members. And because they want to cut Medicare, change it in ways that I think would be destructive to our economy, they can't bring a budget to the floor of the House of Representatives.

We need to do our job.

LEAD CONTAMINATION IN GALESBURG, ILLINOIS

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I stand here as a Member of Congress; but

years before that, I was a mother and a grandmother, and I still am. It is from all of these perspectives that I am deeply disturbed by recent tests in Galesburg, Illinois, that show a high contamination of lead. Even more alarming is that 5 percent of our children tested have elevated levels in their small bodies.

If this happened to one of my kids, I can tell you I would ask for immediate answers and immediate action; and these families and these children deserve no less.

Last Friday, I met with Galesburg city officials, and I urged them to apply for the low-interest Federal loans to replace the lead pipes that go to 4,700 homes in Galesburg. In addition to that, I support legislation that would call for improved reporting, testing, and monitoring of lead levels.

As a Congresswoman, as a mom, as a grandma, I say to all responsible here: It is time. It is past time. No more excuses. No more delays. We need a long-term solution to a long-term problem.

CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA MEN'S HOCKEY TEAM ON EIGHTH NCAA CHAM- PIONSHIP WIN

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the University of North Dakota is the State's largest and oldest university, with nearly 15,000 students, 225 fields of study, 3,000 courses, and 84 graduate education programs. UND has a reputation for research and scholarship in the health sciences, in energy and the environment, in aerospace and entrepreneurship—oh, yeah, and in hockey.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, in Tampa, Florida, the University of North Dakota men's hockey team won its eighth NCAA Championship by defeating Quinnipiac five goals to one. UND hockey is legendary in the NCAA, with 22 Frozen Four appearances to go along with their eight national championships.

Congratulations to Coach Brad Berry, to President Ed Schafer, the entire team—outstanding team—of student athletes and, of course, the incoming president and former Member of the House of Representatives, Mark Kennedy—for whom my advice would be, “Don't screw this thing up”—and the entire UND family on their latest accomplishments.

Thank you for a great season and for your tremendous example of excellence. As you raise another NCAA championship trophy, you also raise the bar for all of those who follow. That is a really good thing.

TEAM 26'S FOURTH ANNUAL RIDE ON WASHINGTON

(Ms. ESTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Team 26, some of whom are here in the gallery with us today, for their courageous efforts to continue the call for this House and this body to take responsible action to end the scourge of gun violence in this country.

This courageous group of riders, 26 men and women, mothers and fathers, high school students and veterans, rode to Washington to renew the call for all victims of gun violence. This is their fourth year.

This year, they bring with them petitions signed by nearly 40,000 Americans demanding that we in Congress do our job by ensuring that all our students are safe and that we allow our college campuses to be gun-free zones. It is my privilege to present this petition to the entire House and to thank Team 26 for their courageous efforts and for their relentless efforts to make sure that we in Congress do our job.

Team 26 rides to bring a message of hope and peace and love. It is time for this House to respond to their call for action with action of our own.

□ 1215

RECOGNIZING VETERANS LEGAL INSTITUTE

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Veterans Legal Institute, an organization that resides right in the middle of my district serving our veterans in Orange County, California, since 2014.

It is a nonprofit organization and provides pro bono legal assistance to our veterans on a myriad of issues, for example, on some of the education issues going on using their GI Bill and housing—because we have so many of our veterans, as you know, that are homeless—with respect to health care, getting into those VA hospitals and to the agencies, and, of course, with respect to employment.

The organization's ongoing efforts have become an important factor in helping us to bring veterans along and to ensure that they are an integral part of our community.

Veterans Legal Institute is committed to providing our everyday heroes with the resources and the support that they deserve, and I believe that we must do our part by supporting organizations such as Veterans Legal Institute so that they can effectively serve this community.

HAWAII STATE TEACHER OF THE YEAR

(Mr. TAKAI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize a woman of extraordinary

talent and devotion, Stephanie Mew, the Hawaii State Teacher of the Year.

Stephanie is currently an elementary school teacher at Kapunahala Elementary School, but her career has taken her all across the globe to the U.S. mainland, Thailand, Japan, and India.

She came to teaching because she was touched by the struggles of at-risk youth and wanted a job in which she could plant seeds for a successful, productive, and peaceful life. Through her nearly 20 years as a teacher, she has done just that for her countless students.

Her service doesn't stop there. Stephanie also volunteers to feed the homeless and sings at a local nursing home for the kupuna residents.

Mahalo, Stephanie Mew, for your dedication to such an important occupation and for sharing your knowledge and light with your students and colleagues day in and day out.

Congratulations on this most prestigious award. I wish you the best of luck in the final selection for National Teacher of the Year.

WEAR RED WEDNESDAY: BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today is Wear Something Red Wednesday to bring back our girls.

This week marks the second anniversary of the April 14, 2014, kidnapping of the Nigerian Chibok schoolgirls, 730 days.

This week and next, Members of Congress will join us in commemorating the tragic event that captured the world's attention and calling for increased action to defeat Boko Haram, the world's deadliest terrorist organization.

Members of Congress—Republicans and Democrats, men and women—have all galvanized behind this cause. House leadership, including House Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI and Conference Chair CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, have joined us in wearing something red on Wednesday to bring attention to this cause.

I urge my colleagues and everyone to continue to lend their voices to this cause and join us. We should never forget. We must never forget the Nigerian Chibok girls.

For almost 2 years we have tweeted to raise awareness to this issue in Congress, and we will continue to tweet, tweet, tweet #bringbackourgirls. Tweet every day. Tweet, tweet, tweet #bringbackourgirls.

THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

(Mr. POLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, households across America have budgets. People

sit around the kitchen table trying to make the hard choices, figuring out should they send their kid to summer camp, can they afford to go out to dinner more often, can they afford a family trip.

Businesses have budgets. I was in the private sector before I came here, and we had to have those tough discussions and discuss where we were going to reinvest and where we were going to cut.

But, apparently, for the Republicans, they say that our country shouldn't have a budget. The time is running short in which the Republicans can present and pass a budget for the United States of America.

Shouldn't America have a budget just as it has had in the past, just as families across our country have, and just as businesses have?

What is it that they are trying to hide? Can they not make the numbers match without privatizing Social Security and Medicare? Are they trying to hide huge tax increases for the middle class?

We will never know unless the public pressure is so great that the Republicans feel that they have to present a responsible budget before our body. I hope we see it soon.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 13, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 13, 2016 at 9:20 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2133.
With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,
KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2666, NO RATE REGULATION OF BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 672 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 672

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2666) to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from regulating the rates charged for broadband Internet access service. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of

the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 672 provides for consideration of H.R. 2666, the No Rate Regulation of Broadband Internet Access Act.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided between the majority and the minority of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

The Committee on Rules made in order three amendments that were submitted to the committee, all three of which were submitted by the minority.

Finally, the rule affords the minority the customary motion to recommit, a final opportunity to amend the legislation should the minority choose to exercise that option.

H.R. 2666, the No Rate Regulation of Broadband Internet Access Act, was introduced by Mr. KINZINGER, a member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, to address the issue of an out-of-control independent agency, the Federal Communications Commission, or the FCC.

The bill is targeted and does one thing only. It prohibits the Federal Communications Commission from regulating the rates charged for broadband Internet access.

In February of 2015, the Federal Communications Commission voted on a party-line vote to adopt rules that reclassify broadband Internet access as a title II telecommunications service, reversing their previously stated position that they would not reclassify the Internet under title II, and, in fact, afterwards, the President himself interjected into the debate and demanded that the Commission reconsider and that they do so.

The rules prevent blocking, throttling, and paid prioritization of the Internet. This reclassification poses a serious risk for the regulation of rates charged by providers for the delivery of Internet service, a move that has never before been taken by the government.

Under the Federal Communications Commission's unprecedented use of a 100-year-old statute to regulate the Internet under its net neutrality rule, the Commission gave itself the authority to regulate the rates that Internet service providers charge to consumers for service.

In response to this power grab by the Commission, the Energy and Commerce Committee held oversight hearings. That resulted in the drafting and passage of the legislation before the House this week, which is intended to prevent the Federal Communications Commission from using reclassification of broadband Internet service to engage in rate regulation, whether that be directly through tariffing or indirectly through enforcement actions.

Rate regulation—or even the threat of rate regulation—out of the Federal Communications Commission creates massive uncertainty for Internet service providers. Because of this, Internet service providers could slow or stop altogether the investment and will be less likely to offer specialized or unique pricing offers to their consumers.

As the Federal Communications Commission consolidates more and more power to regulate the Internet—and make no mistake, the Federal Communications Commission is very eager to regulate the Internet—providers will have fewer and fewer avenues for providing consumer service plans and packages.

The chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Tom Wheeler, and President Obama have both stated that net neutrality rules would not result in the FCC regulating rates.

Yet, less than a year after the rules were adopted in March of 2016 during

an Energy and Commerce hearing, Chairman Wheeler admitted that the FCC should and will have the authority to regulate broadband rates under these new rules.

Like all government agencies, the Federal Communications Commission can't help itself. It sees an unregulated space—the Internet—and it just can't allow it to go on without government control.

Under net neutrality, the Federal Government will have the ability to control the Internet. Let me say that again. Under net neutrality, the Federal Government will have the ability to control the Internet.

Even if this current Federal Communications Commission chooses not to regulate the rates charged, the Commission's net neutrality rules permit future FCC commissioners to do exactly that.

These rules from the Federal Communications Commission have the potential to cost well north of 43,000 jobs, according to a recent study commissioned by the United States Telecom Association. The bill before us this week will take a step toward protecting the Internet industry from those job losses.

I urge my colleagues to support today's rule and support the underlying legislation to protect consumers from an out-of-control Federal bureaucracy.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have just days before the legally mandated budget deadline. Yet, instead of debating your budget, Mr. Speaker, my budget, Mr. Speaker, anybody's budget, Mr. Speaker, we are debating whether to codify existing FCC policy.

There is limited time to provide a budget for our country. Households across our country have budgets, and businesses have budgets. Unless there is an announced change to the schedule in bringing Congress to work on Friday and Saturday and Rules Committee convening today or tomorrow, it seems like Congress will miss the deadline for the budget and perhaps never produce a budget.

Now, folks on the other side will say that there have been years Democrats didn't produce a budget, and that is true. But Republicans ran to take over this body, saying: We are going to do better. We are going to produce a budget. Republicans have had the chance, and there is not even a vote on the budget.

I am going to offer later in this debate a motion to defeat the previous question. If that passes, Mr. Speaker, I will be able to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the budget resolution.

I hope it does. I hope there are enough Democrats and Republicans in

this Chamber who are outraged by the failure of the Republican leadership to allow the Republican and Democratic Members of this body to present and vote on their budgets.

□ 1230

We have historically had a very open process around budgets. There is usually five or six budgets that come before the House and we try to get to one that passes. There have been years where I think they have a king of the hill process and whichever one gets the most votes can become the budget.

But it looks like, rather than any of those debates or give Members who have thoughtfully been preparing the budgets from the Republican Study Group or from the progressive Democratic coalition the chance to present their budgets, along with the Republican and Democratic members of the Budget Committee, I think the Republicans are saying: we don't want to have those tough decisions about where to cut or where to tax; we would rather just pretend like our country is in good fiscal order and spend the day discussing codifying FCC policy rather than discussing what the American people sent us here to do—how to balance the budget, restore fiscal stability, and pass a budget.

There is another missed opportunity here today. When talking about broadband—if that is what we are going to talk about—in districts like mine in Colorado, we have communities that simply don't have reasonable access to the Internet. I talk to constituents in Evergreen and Conifer in Grand County every day, rapidly growing communities, where people only have access to speeds that were more relevant to the 20th century rather than the 21st century. I remember I visited a school in Grand County where the district has an initiative to provide every child with a Chromebook computer and the computer science teacher there didn't even have high-speed access from his own home.

Access to broadband is essential for our economy, particularly our rural economy like those in my district. It is essential for the education of our kids, for a vibrant private sector, for civil society, and democracy. While the FCC and the Department of Commerce have some tools in place, there is not nearly the tools they need or the resources to make our Nation competitive coast to coast by making sure that every American has access to broadband.

Bills that try to codify regulations certainly have their place. I would argue it is probably not when we are 48 hours from reaching a budget deadline. But I want to make sure that even if we are going to spend time discussing codifying FCC policy, that we have the more important discussion about how we can make sure that broadband access is available to our rural communities, such as the ones that I represent.

Democrats and Republicans largely agree on some of the goals of this bill.

In fact, I think there is a missed opportunity to have worked on a bipartisan version that likely could have passed on suspension. There are a number of amendments under consideration, and it is my hope that some of the consumer protection issues can be addressed through that.

But I think the big picture here, Mr. Speaker, is we are just 2 days away from Congress' own deadline for passing a budget with no budget in sight. If we can defeat the previous question, we can immediately move to consider the budget. I call upon my Republican and Democratic colleagues to do that. As we look at broadband, which I am hopeful that we can do after this deadline passes—I am happy to revisit this bill if my motion to defeat the previous question passes and we move into the budget debate—I will be happy to resume this debate next week. I haven't seen any particular reason that we have to try to cram in codifying FCC regulations around broadband in the 48 hours before our own budget deadline expires.

So let's get back to talking about the budget. It is never easy. The Republicans have certainly talked about how they wanted the country to have a budget. Well, the country is not going to have a budget unless Congress gets to work debating it and passing it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise to oppose the rule on this legislation, not necessarily because this is a bad bill—I do think it is a vague solution in search of a nonexistent problem—but I oppose the rule for another reason, and that is because I thought that since we were going to bring this bill to the floor anyway, even though it is unnecessary, even though Chairman Wheeler of the FCC has said that the FCC does not intend to regulate rates on broadband, I thought maybe I would at least try to accomplish something productive and offer an amendment to solve a real problem that the American people are seeing in front of them every day right now. That is the problem of television ads, political ads, that do not truly identify their source.

Under section 317 of the Communications Act of 1934, the FCC requires broadcasters to put on the ad the true identity of the people running the ad. This makes a lot of sense. The idea is that when you see somebody trying to influence your vote or to influence your attitude about a particular public issue, that you should understand who is actually trying to influence you.

But because of dramatic changes in the way campaign laws are implemented and because of the Citizens United Supreme Court decision, what has happened is that we now have ads run by organizations like Americans

for Kittens and Puppies, and that doesn't do the American voter, the American consumer, any good. They don't understand who is actually paying.

What my amendment would have done, had it been made in order by the Rules Committee, it would have basically restated the law that exists and say the FCC should regulate these ads by requiring the true identity. Right now they are relying on a 1979 staff interpretation of true identity. They are saying we need to put the sponsor of the ad on the ad, but the sponsor of the ad, again, is a nebulous, vague, title organization that nobody knows who they are.

What we would like to do is say you have to put on the ad who is really paying for it. So instead, for instance, if you had an ad in support of sugared soft drinks and it was being paid for by Coca-Cola, under this interpretation you could put the ad agency that actually put the ad on the air and nobody would know that Coca-Cola was actually paying for it.

The people, again, are seeing this every day on their television screens right now. These laws and interpretations have resulted in endless sums of anonymous money coming into the system trying to influence the outcomes of our elections. That is not what Congress intended. Despite having the authority to do it, the FCC has refused to take action to close this loophole.

My amendment would have restated the original Congressional intent and would send a message to the FCC that it is time to act. This amendment would have been germane, it would have been within the rules of the body, and, most importantly, it would have been supported by the vast majority of Americans: Republicans, Democrats, and Independents who want us to reform our campaign finance system so that it is on the up and up, so people understand who is trying to influence them and also to end the influence of big money in politics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Kentucky an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. YARMUTH. I wish that the Rules Committee had made that amendment in order, but they didn't, so I will oppose the rule and urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Colorado how many additional speakers he has?

Mr. POLIS. I am prepared to close.

Mr. BURGESS. In which case, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the Republican budget resolution and allow for consideration of alternative budget

proposals under a similar process to that which we have used every year in recent history. It is truly time for the Republicans to stop the partisan game and finally consider a budget before this Friday's legally mandated deadline.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, Americans get it. Households have to balance their budget, businesses have to balance their budget. Not talking about it and putting your head in the sand is only a recipe for increased debt and increased liability for future generations of Americans.

The fact that we are spending \$400 billion or \$500 billion more than we are taking in—of course we might not know about that for the next year until after the fact if we don't have a budget—the fact that we have enormous unfunded liabilities in Medicare and Social Security doesn't go away just because Republicans ignore the topic and refuse to have a debate on balancing our budget.

I am proud to sponsor a balanced budget amendment. I think that by working together, Democrats and Republicans can restore fiscal responsibility to our Nation.

How can we do it?

Well, I will tell you how we can't do it. We can't do it by 48 hours from the deadline to pass a budget by discussing obscure bills to codify FCC regulations with our valuable floor time.

It starts with an honest discussion. It starts with Democrats and Republicans offering their budgets. I have been proud in the past to support bipartisan budgets that have come to this body. I have supported and opposed some of the Democratic budgets that my colleagues have offered, but we have to have that discussion on the floor. The work doesn't do itself and the problem doesn't go away when Republicans choose to ignore it.

I wish our budget deficit was as easy to solve as simply ignoring it. Wouldn't that be convenient if we could simply ignore the budget deficit and it would go away? Wouldn't it be convenient if we could just ignore the national debt and it would go away? Wouldn't it be convenient if we could ignore the damage to agencies that an indiscriminate sequester has caused and it would simply go away?

I like that line of thinking, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, it is completely unrealistic. The American people realize it is completely unrealistic. That is why when America looks to Congress and says: we have these discussions in our households about our budget, and businesses have these discussions. Why can't you, Mr. Speaker?

Why can't you? That is the reason the Congressional approval rating is so low.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, back in the late 1990s, in the middle of what was called the dot-com boom, my predecessor, the then-majority leader of the House of Representatives, Richard Arme, came and spoke to the Dallas Chamber of Commerce. The purpose of his discussion that day was to talk about the dot-com boom that the economy was experiencing.

He confessed that the Internet was the gosh darnedest thing, no one had ever seen anything like it, but he cautioned us. As business leaders that day, he cautioned us. He said: Look, when the government doesn't understand something, the first thing it will want to do is regulate it, the next thing it will want to do is tax it, and you have then effectively killed it.

Mr. Speaker, it wasn't an accident that I used in the opening statement the language that under the proposed rules from the FCC, the Federal Government will have the ability to control the Internet. That is a significant and important fact. If you allow the Federal Government to control the Internet, you have effectively damaged the promise of the Internet to the point where it will no longer function for its citizens the way it was intended to function: as a free and open process.

Mr. Speaker, it is pretty simple. Today's rule provides for consideration of a bill to rein in the Federal Government that is all too eager to regulate every aspect of our lives.

H.R. 2666 will protect the Internet from government regulation and allow it to continue to thrive without interference.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. KINZINGER for his work on this legislation, and I want to thank the committee for the work that they did in getting this legislation to the floor.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 672 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 125) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent reso-

lution are waived. General debate shall not exceed four hours, with three hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Tiberi of Ohio and Representative Carolyn Maloney of New York or their respective designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except amendments in the nature of a substitute. Each such amendment shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 7 of rule XVI (germaneness). If more than one such amendment is adopted, then only the one receiving the greater number of affirmative votes shall be considered as finally adopted. In the case of a tie for the greater number of affirmative votes, then only the last amendment to receive that number of affirmative votes shall be considered as finally adopted. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been finally adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a

vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1245

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3340, FINANCIAL STABILITY OVERSIGHT COUNCIL REFORM ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3791, RAISING CONSOLIDATED ASSETS THRESHOLD UNDER SMALL BANK HOLDING COMPANY POLICY STATEMENT

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 671 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 671

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the

House the bill (H.R. 3340) to place the Financial Stability Oversight Council and the Office of Financial Research under the regular appropriations process, to provide for certain quarterly reporting and public notice and comment requirements for the Office of Financial Research, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; (2) the further amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3791) to raise the consolidated assets threshold under the small bank holding company policy statement, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; (2) the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and re-

ported a rule for H.R. 3340, the FSOC Reform Act, and for H.R. 3791, the Raising Consolidated Assets Threshold Under Small Bank Holding Company Policy Statement. House Resolution 671 provides structured rules for both bills. The resolution provides each bill 1 hour of debate that is equally divided between the chair and the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee. Additionally, the resolution provides for the consideration of one amendment to each bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution and the underlying legislation.

The Dodd-Frank Act created the Financial Stability Oversight Council, which is dedicated to identifying threats to the stability of the American financial system. The FSOC is supported in this mission by the Office of Financial Research, which was also created by Dodd-Frank.

The OFR is armed with subpoena power to compel vast amounts of non-public, sensitive information from institutions across the financial system. The OFR feeds this data to the FSOC, which is empowered to designate banks, as well as nonbank institutions, as "systemically important financial institutions," or SIFIs. This designation significantly increases the regulatory burdens that are faced by these institutions, and they have far-reaching effects on the entire financial system. The impact of excessive regulation trickles down to customers, resulting in higher borrowing costs that may stop Americans from realizing their dreams of homeownership, of purchasing cars, of pursuing higher education, or other goals.

Despite the vast power that the FSOC and OFR have, neither organization is subject to the annual appropriations process. The OFR is funded through assessments on banks, and it pays for the FSOC through these funds. As such, the FSOC is insulated from the transparency and accountability that Congress would give to normal organizations by virtue of this self-funding mechanism. This has, effectively, shielded the FSOC from any congressional oversight.

The FSOC Reform Act would, simply, fix those problems. It does not reduce the FSOC's budget or the OFR's, but it would require that they be under annual appropriations. It would also require occasional reports to Congress on their expenses, objectives, and performance measures. Congressional approval of FSOC's budget would encourage transparency with regard to FSOC's methodology for designating SIFIs. It would also make it clear what their objectives are and what they see as concerns for our financial system. I believe this bill will actually increase the transparency of the process, and it will make sure that we look out for the financial security of the American financial system.

The bill also requires the FSOC to engage in a public notice and comment

period before issuing any new rules and regulations. These changes will put the FSOC in line with other agencies that have to engage in public notice and comment periods before they provide new rules and regulations.

I thank the sponsor of H.R. 3340, Representative TOM EMMER of Minnesota, for introducing this important legislation that will increase the oversight and transparency to ensure we have a safe and competitive financial market in the United States.

The other measure for consideration under the rule is H.R. 3791, which is a bill sponsored by Representative MIA LOVE of Utah.

Last year, Congress passed and the President signed legislation providing relief to community banks by increasing the Federal Reserve's Small Bank Holding Company Policy Statement threshold to include small bank holding companies with up to \$1 billion of consolidated assets. This was in response to the small banks' difficulty in accessing capital as a result of significant changes in the regulatory landscape.

This bill provides further relief by expanding the Fed's policy statement to include small bank and savings and loan holding companies with up to \$5 billion of consolidated assets. This will provide needed relief for about 400 small bank and thrift holding companies. The \$5 billion level matches the threshold that was offered in the last Congress by the current ranking member of the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, my fellow Ohioan, Democratic Senator SHERROD BROWN. He did that in S. 798, so this should not be controversial. It is bipartisan. Democrats and Republicans have been for this.

Since the second quarter of 2010, around the time that the Dodd-Frank Act was passed by Congress, the community banks' share of U.S. commercial banking assets has declined at a rate that is almost double that experienced between 2006 and 2010. What is happening in our financial system is that the big are getting bigger, and the small are disappearing. That is why it is important to give regulatory relief to some smaller community banks that are caught in the middle. According to the FDIC, there were more than 18,000 banks in the 1980s as compared to just 6,400 in the first quarter of 2015, and we are currently losing community banks at a rate of one every day.

Increasing the eligibility threshold to \$5 billion will ensure that small bank and savings and loan holding companies will be able to issue debt and raise capital so that the community banks can continue to provide financial services to the customers they serve and increase their involvement in promoting economic growth in their local communities.

It is important to note that this bill maintains the requirements that these

holding companies meet regulations related to nonbanking activities, off-balance sheet activities, and publicly registered debt equity. The legislation also maintains a safeguard that allows the Federal Reserve to deny an increased debt level to any bank holding company it deems at risk of failure.

Together, these bills will help ensure that powerful regulators act in a transparent manner and are accountable to Congress, and they will provide needed relief for community banks that are attempting to survive in a difficult environment.

I look forward to debating these bills with my colleagues, and I urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

I thank my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule that is providing for the consideration of both H.R. 3340, the Financial Stability Oversight Council Reform Act, and H.R. 3791, the Raising Consolidated Assets Threshold Under Small Bank Holding Company Policy Statement, and for other purposes.

These partisan financial services bills, in my opinion, would weaken and politicize the institutions that were created after the financial crisis to identify and guard against systemic risk in our financial system; and they will allow even larger bank holding companies to leverage themselves with debt when financing the purchase of other banks.

In reviewing this legislation, I have to ask myself: Are the memories of my Republican friends really so short that they do not remember the pain that our Nation went through only a few short years ago?

The financial crisis of 2008, by everybody's statement, was the worst economic downturn that this great Nation has faced since the Great Depression. It left millions out of work and millions out of their homes. Yet, instead of supporting efforts to ensure that a collapse of this magnitude never happens again, the majority has chosen to weaken the very protections that are designed to prevent such a crisis. This is even more appalling when you consider that we are still dealing with the fallout from the crisis. Just this week, Goldman Sachs agreed to pay \$5 billion to settle claims that it misled mortgage bond investors during the financial crisis. I was pleased to see that a portion of its repayment is going to go to low-income and moderate-income housing.

Mr. Speaker, I guess we really shouldn't be surprised by the actions of my friends in the majority. With the kinds of bills that have come to the floor under this Republican Congress, whether they be to roll back environmental protections, 60-plus repeals of

the Affordable Care Act, or to deny access to women's health care, I guess it is not a surprise that now my Republican friends are bringing up legislation to help the big banks and strip away the protections to prevent another financial crisis.

I am also left wondering: Why are we debating a rule for these bills today at all? I would like to remind the majority—and I will now and twice again before I yield back my time—that, by law, this body must produce a budget resolution by Friday of this week. Despite this requirement, we still have no budget or a clear path to one. I ask the question: Where is the budget?

I pause here to yield to my friend from Ohio if I could get his attention just for a moment. I know the gentleman is on the Committee on Financial Services. We serve together on Rules, but I am not in the majority and am not privy to what may happen this Friday. I am just curious: Since the gentleman is in the majority, what is the gentleman hearing, if anything, regarding our having a budget by this Friday?

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS).

□ 1300

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

I am hearing that negotiations are ongoing, and I am hopeful that we can have a budget by this Friday. There is a bit of disagreement, even inside our Conference, about how to move forward on the budget as far as the numbers. But there are a lot of discussions ongoing, and I am hopeful.

I support passing a budget. I have voted for a budget since I have been here. We have passed budgets every year since I have been here. We have not passed the deadline yet for this budget. I am hopeful that we can get it done, but it is an ongoing negotiation.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend's response.

I urged that yesterday in the Rules Committee. Aside from your subcommittee holding a hearing this Thursday at 3, we were advised by the chair that there would be no further business of the Rules Committee.

So I assumed, if that is the case, that we won't be going back to the Rules Committee. And I am sure that the budget, if it were to be here by Friday, would require a rule.

Despite all of these things, I empiricize the fact that it doesn't appear that we will have a budget by Friday.

Mr. Speaker, here is how we got to this point: last fall Republicans and Democrats came together to pass a bipartisan budget agreement. Now, however, Republicans are refusing to support their party's own budget proposal.

Now, I understand what my friend said about negotiations going on, and that is good. It would be helpful if those negotiations were going on with Democrats in the room as well.

I was very optimistic, as I am sure all of us were and, to a relative degree, still are, when Speaker RYAN promised to end Republican obstructionism and return to regular order. I felt very optimistic about that.

It seemed that the now-dubbed do-nothing Congress is back and, with it, total dysfunction on the Republican side of the aisle. The dysfunction is so bad that Republicans cannot even agree to a budget number that they have already agreed to.

Now, Democrats don't want to weaken the financial protections keeping our economy stable and strong. Instead, Democrats are ready to pass a budget that creates and helps create jobs and grow the paychecks of hard-working Americans.

We would like to work in a bipartisan way, and we would assuredly like to work in a way that would bring us to the work that is needed to be done in a positive manner.

If only the Republican Conference could stand up to the extreme faction in their own party to work with us, then we could get this business done.

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

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I have no more speakers. If the gentleman from Florida wants to close, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

These financial services bills are not what the American people want. These are bills that big banks want.

Instead of debating and passing a budget, which we are required to do by law by the end of this week, as I have said, the majority has decided that we should spend what precious legislative time we have left debating bills that would roll back vital protections to the systemic health of our financial system.

So now not only is the dysfunction in the Republican Conference putting one of this institution's most basic functions in jeopardy, which is passing a budget to fund the government, but, to add insult to injury, the majority has decided now is the best time to debate putting our entire financial system in jeopardy by rolling back measures designed to protect it.

I might add that there is an appellate decision that is not on this measure, but on another that we dealt with earlier. I don't understand why we are going forward on these measures when we know, in fact, that they aren't going to go anywhere in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the American people deserve better.

So since Congress is required to pass a budget by Friday of this week and there is absolutely little sign that the Republican majority intends to fulfill that responsibility, well, Mr. Speaker, I want to give my friends on the other side of the aisle the opportunity to end the obstructionism and meet their and our obligation to pass a budget.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the Republican budget resolution and allow for the consideration of alternative budget proposals under the same process we use every year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” and defeat the previous question and vote “no” on the rule and the underlying bills.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I appreciate the comments of my colleague. I can assure him we are working hard on a budget resolution. Although we cannot notify the committee of any upcoming meeting because we don't know when it will be because we don't know when the negotiations will be, I am hopeful that that will happen and we will actually end up having a budget that will be passed before the deadline.

So, again, I am hopeful, but none of us can control that ourselves. The negotiations are ongoing.

I would just say that these two bills and the rule don't do anything to undermine our financial stability. The first bill puts the FSOC and the OFR on budget. It requires that they have appropriations every year.

You might be familiar with the appropriations clause of the U.S. Constitution: “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .”

So we just want the normal constitutional checks and balances that exist in every other agency to exist here, to increase the transparency and accountability for what these agencies do.

So the first bill puts FSOC and OFR on budget. It requires appropriations to be passed. It also requires periodic reports on what their goals and objectives are and how their meeting goes. That is kind of a no-brainer.

Again, Senator SHERRON BROWN, the Democrat minority ranking member on the Senate Banking Committee, has a bill that—I'm sorry. It is the second bill. I apologize.

It makes sense to do this, to put them on appropriations.

The second bill is a bill that raises the limit for small financial institutions, community banks, up to \$5 billion. We are talking about 400 banks. It is not the biggest banks.

In fact, the biggest banks in America are almost a trillion dollars. We are talking about \$5 billion in consolidated assets in banks and savings and loans.

These are community-based financial institutions. There are about 400 of

them. They are struggling right now. We are losing a community bank a day in this country. We need to make sure that we do everything that we can to help those community banks continue.

I know that is a bipartisan effort to do that. This may not be the exact way that the other side of the aisle wants to move forward on that.

I offered to the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee yesterday in the Rules Committee that I would be happy to work with her on some other method.

If she thinks she wants to use an activity test, if she wants to require some kind of loans to assets, if she wants to require some kind of capital in this, I would be happy to work with her because we have to help our community banks. I know that is a bipartisan feeling.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Florida that I know that the other side of the aisle feels the same way. We may have a tactical disagreement, but we all feel that way. So I would love to work on that.

In the meantime, I hope my colleagues will support both these bills and the underlying rule. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bills.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 671 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 125) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed four hours, with three hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Tiberi of Ohio and Representative Carolyn Maloney of New York or their respective designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except amendments in the nature of a substitute. Each such amendment shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 7 of rule XVI (germaneness). If more than one such amendment is adopted, then only the one receiving the greater number of affirmative votes shall be considered as finally adopted. In the case of a tie for the greater number of affirmative votes, then only the last amendment to receive that number of affirmative votes shall be considered as finally adopted. After the conclusion

of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been finally adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee

on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 1:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 1 o’clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan) at 1 o’clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 672;

Adopting House Resolution 672, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 671; and

Adopting House Resolution 671, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2666, NO RATE REGULATION OF BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on order-

ing the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 672) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2666) to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from regulating the rates charged for broadband Internet access service, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 182, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

YEAS—243

Abraham	Gosar	Miller (MI)
Aderholt	Gowdy	Moolenaar
Allen	Granger	Mooney (WV)
Amash	Graves (GA)	Mullin
Amodei	Graves (LA)	Mulvaney
Babin	Graves (MO)	Neugebauer
Barletta	Griffith	Newhouse
Barr	Grothman	Noem
Barton	Guinta	Nugent
Benishek	Guthrie	Nunes
Bilirakis	Hanna	Olson
Bishop (MI)	Hardy	Palazzo
Bishop (UT)	Harper	Palmer
Black	Harris	Paulsen
Blackburn	Hartzler	Pearce
Blum	Heck (NV)	Perry
Bost	Hensarling	Pittenger
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Pitts
Brady (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Poe (TX)
Brat	Hill	Poliquin
Brooks (AL)	Holding	Pompeo
Brooks (IN)	Hudson	Posey
Buchanan	Huelskamp	Price, Tom
Buck	Huizenga (MI)	Ratcliffe
Bucshon	Hultgren	Reed
Burgess	Hunter	Reichert
Byrne	Hurd (TX)	Renacci
Calvert	Hurt (VA)	Ribble
Carter (GA)	Issa	Rice (SC)
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Rigell
Chabot	Jenkins (WV)	Roby
Chaffetz	Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)
Clawson (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Coffman	Jolly	Rogers (KY)
Cole	Jones	Rohrabacher
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Rokita
Collins (NY)	Joyce	Rooney (FL)
Comstock	Katko	Ros-Lehtinen
Conaway	Kelly (MS)	Roskam
Cook	Kelly (PA)	Ross
Costello (PA)	King (IA)	Rothfus
Cramer	King (NY)	Rouzer
Crawford	Kinzinger (IL)	Royce
Crenshaw	Kline	Russell
Culberson	Knight	Salmon
Curbelo (FL)	Labrador	Sanford
Davis, Rodney	LaHood	Scalise
Denham	LaMalfa	Schweikert
Dent	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
DeSantis	Lance	Sensenbrenner
DesJarlais	Latta	Sessions
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Dold	Long	Shuster
Donovan	Loudermilk	Simpson
Duffy	Love	Smith (MO)
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Ellmers (NC)	Lummis	Smith (TX)
Emmer (MN)	MacArthur	Stefanik
Farenthold	Marchant	Stewart
Fincher	Marino	Stivers
Fitzpatrick	Massie	Stutzman
Fleischmann	McCarthy	Thompson (PA)
Fleming	McCaul	Thornberry
Flores	McClintock	Tiberi
Forbes	McHenry	Tipton
Fortenberry	McKinley	Trott
Fox	McMorris	Turner
Franks (AZ)	Rodgers	Upton
Frelinghuysen	McSally	Valadao
Garrett	Meadows	Wagner
Gibbs	Meehan	Walberg
Gibson	Messer	Walden
Gohmert	Mica	Walker
Goodlatte	Miller (FL)	Walorski

Walters, Mimi	Williams	Young (AK)
Weber (TX)	Wilson (SC)	Young (IA)
Webster (FL)	Wittman	Young (IN)
Wenstrup	Womack	Zeldin
Westerman	Woodall	Zinke
Westmoreland	Yoder	
Whitfield	Yoho	

NAYS—182

Adams	Fudge	Neal
Aguilar	Gabbard	Nolan
Ashford	Gallego	Norcross
Bass	Garamendi	O’Rourke
Beatty	Graham	Pallone
Becerra	Grayson	Pascrell
Bera	Green, Al	Payne
Beyer	Green, Gene	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Peters
Bonamici	Hahn	Peterson
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Higgins	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Price (NC)
Bustos	Hinojosa	Quigley
Butterfield	Honda	Rangel
Capps	Hoyer	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Huffman	Richmond
Cárdenas	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Jeffries	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Keating	Sánchez, Linda T.
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Schiff
Clay	Kind	Schrader
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kuster	Scott, David
Cohen	Langevin	Serrano
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Cooper	Lawrence	Sinema
Costa	Levin	Sires
Courtney	Lewis	Slattery
Crowley	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Loeb sack	Speier
Cummings	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Takai
Davis, Danny	Lowe y	Takano
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Thompson (MS)
Delaney	Lynch	Titus
DeLauro	Maloney,	Tonko
DelBene	Maloney,	Torres
DeSaulnier	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Dingell	Matsui	Veasey
Doggett	McCollum	Vela
Doyle, Michael F.	McDermott	Velázquez
Duckworth	McGovern	Visclosky
Edwards	McNerney	Walz
Ellison	Meeks	Wasserman
Eshoo	Meng	Schultz
Esty	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Farr	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
	Napolitano	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Bridenstine	Jackson Lee	Murphy (PA)
Engel	Lee	Van Hollen
Fattah	Lieu, Ted	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1352

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Messrs. ASHFORD, AL GREEN of Texas, SCHIFF, and Ms. BONAMICI changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 182, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

AYES—242

- Abraham, Aderholt, Allen, Amash, Amodei, Babin, Barletta, Barr, Barton, Benishkek, Bilirakis, Bishop (MI), Bishop (UT), Black, Blackburn, Blum, Bost, Boustany, Brady (TX), Brat, Brooks (AL), Brooks (IN), Buchanan, Buck, Bucshon, Burgess, Byrne, Calvert, Carter (GA), Carter (TX), Chabot, Chaffetz, Clawson (FL), Coffman, Cole, Collins (GA), Collins (NY), Comstock, Conaway, Cook, Costa, Costello (PA), Cramer, Crenshaw, Culberson, Curbelo (FL), Davis, Rodney, Denham, Dent, DeSantis, DesJarlais, Diaz-Balart, Dold, Donovan, Duffy, Duncan (SC), Duncan (TN), Ellmers (NC), Emmer (MN), Farenthold, Fincher, Fitzpatrick, Fleischmann, Fleming, Flores, Forbes, Fortenberry, Foxx, Franks (AZ), Frelinghuysen, Garrett, Gibbs, Gibson, Gohmert, Goodlatte, Gosar, Gowdy, Granger, Graves (GA), Graves (LA)

- Yoho, Young (AK), Adams, Aguilar, Ashford, Bass, Beatty, Becerra, Bera, Beyer, Bishop (GA), Blumenauer, Bonamici, Boyle, Brendan F., Brady (PA), Brown (FL), Brownley (CA), Bustos, Butterfield, Capps, Capuano, Cárdenas, Carney, Carson (IN), Cartwright, Castor (FL), Castro (TX), Chu, Judy, Cicilline, Clark (MA), Clarke (NY), Clay, Cleaver, Clyburn, Cohen, Connolly, Conyers, Cooper, Courtney, Crowley, Cuellar, Cummings, Davis (CA), Davis, Danny, DeFazio, DeGette, Delaney, DeLauro, DeBene, DeSaulnier, Deutch, Dingell, Doggett, Doyle, Michael F., Duckworth, Edwards, Ellison, Eshoo, Esty, Farr, Foster, Frankel (FL), Fudge, Gabbard, Gallego, Garamendi, Graham, Grayson, Green, Al, Green, Gene, Grijalva, Gutiérrez, Hahn, Hastings, Heck (WA), Higgins, Himes, Hinojosa, Honda, Hoyer, Huffman, Israel, Jackson Lee, Jeffries, Johnson (GA), Johnson, E. B., Kaptur, Keating, Kelly (IL), Kennedy, Kildee, Kilmer, Kind, Kirkpatrick, Kuster, Langevin, Larsen (WA), Larson (CT), Lawrence, Lee, Levin, Lewis, Lipinski, Loebsack, Lofgren, Lowenthal, Lowey, Lujan Grisham (NM), Luján, Ben Ray (NM), Lynch, Maloney, Carolyn, Maloney, Sean, Matsui, McCollum, McDermott, McGovern, Meeks, Meng, Moore, Moulton, Murphy (FL), Nadler, Napolitano

NOES—182

- Zeldin, Zinke, Neal, Nolan, Norcross, O'Rourke, Pallone, Pascrell, Payne, Pelosi, Perlmutter, Peters, Peterson, Pingree, Pocan, Polis, Price (NC), Quigley, Rangel, Rice (NY), Richmond, Roybal-Allard, Ruiz, Ruppertsberger, Rush, Ryan (OH), Sánchez, Linda T., Sanchez, Loretta, Sarbanes, Schakowsky, Schiff, Schrader, Scott (VA), Scott, David, Serrano, Sewell (AL), Sherman, Sinema, Sires, Slaughter, Smith (WA), Speier, Swalwell (CA), Takai, Takano, Thompson (CA), Thompson (MS), Titus, Tonko, Torres, Tsongas, Vargas, Veasey, Vela, Velázquez, Visclosky, Walz, Wasserman, Schultz, Waters, Maxine, Watson Coleman, Welch, Wilson (FL), Yarmuth

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3340, FINANCIAL STABILITY OVERSIGHT COUNCIL REFORM ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3791, RAISING CONSOLIDATED ASSETS THRESHOLD UNDER SMALL BANK HOLDING COMPANY POLICY STATEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 671) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3340) to place the Financial Stability Oversight Council and the Office of Financial Research under the regular appropriations process, to provide for certain quarterly reporting and public notice and comment requirements for the Office of Financial Research, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3791) to raise the consolidated assets threshold under the small bank holding company policy statement, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 182, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

YEAS—243

- Abraham, Aderholt, Allen, Amash, Amodei, Babin, Barletta, Barr, Barton, Benishkek, Bilirakis, Bishop (MI), Bishop (UT), Black, Blackburn, Blum, Bost, Boustany, Brady (TX), Brat, Brooks (AL), Brooks (IN), Buchanan, Buck, Bucshon, Burgess, Byrne, Calvert, Carter (GA), Carter (TX), Chabot, Chaffetz, Clawson (FL), Coffman, Cole, Collins (GA), Collins (NY), Comstock, Conaway, Cook, Costello (PA), Cramer, Crawford, Crenshaw, Culberson, Curbelo (FL), Davis, Rodney, Denham, Dent, DeSantis, DesJarlais, Diaz-Balart, Dold, Donovan, Duffy, Duncan (SC), Duncan (TN), Ellmers (NC), Emmer (MN), Farenthold, Fincher, Fitzpatrick, Fleischmann, Fleming, Flores, Forbes, Fortenberry, Foxx, Franks (AZ), Frelinghuysen, Garrett, Gibbs, Gibson, Gohmert, Goodlatte, Gosar, Gowdy, Granger, Graves (GA), Graves (LA), Graves (MO), Griffith, Grothman, Guinta, Guthrie, Hanna, Hardt, Harper, Harris, Hartzler, Heck (NV), Hensarling, Herrera Beutler, Hice, Jody B., Hill, Holding, Hudson, Huelskamp, Huizenga (MI), Hultgren, Hunter, Hurd (TX), Hurt (VA), Issa, Jenkins (KS), Jenkins (WV), Johnson (OH), Johnson, Sam, Jolly, Jones, Jordan, Joyce, Katko, Kelly (MS), Kelly (PA), King (IA), King (NY), Kinzinger (IL), Kline, Knight, Labrador, LaHood, LaMalfa, Lamborn, Lance, Latta, LoBiondo, Long, Loudermilk, Love, Lucas, Luetkemeyer, Lummis, MacArthur, Marchant, Marino, Massie, McCarthy, McCaul, McClintock, McHenry, McKinley, McMorris, Rodgers, Ross, Stutzman, Thompson (PA), Thornberry, Tiberi, Tipton, Trott, Turner, Upton, Valadao, Wagner, Walberg, Walden, Walker, Walorski, Walters, Mimi, Weber (TX), Webster (FL), Wenstrup, Westerman, Westmoreland, Whitfield, Williams, Wilson (SC), Wittman, Womack, Woodall, Yoder

NOT VOTING—9

- Bridenstine, Crawford, Engel, Fattah, Lieu, Ted, McMerney, Ribble, Sanford, Van Hollen

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1359

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messner
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci

NAYS—182

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman

Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—8
Grijalva
Lieu, Ted
McNerney
Stewart
Van Hollen

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1406

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 182, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

AYES—242

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishke
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher

Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden

NOES—182

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Lieu, Ted
Love
McNerney

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1412

So the resolution was agreed to.

Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

□ 1415

BORDER AND MARITIME COORDINATION IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3586) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve border and maritime security coordination in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3586

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Border and Maritime Coordination Improvement Act”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; Table of contents.
- Sec. 2. U.S. Customs and Border Protection coordination.
- Sec. 3. Border and maritime security efficiencies.
- Sec. 4. Public-private partnerships.
- Sec. 5. Establishment of the Office of Biometric Identity Management.
- Sec. 6. Cost-benefit analysis of co-locating operational entities.
- Sec. 7. Strategic personnel plan for U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel deployed abroad.
- Sec. 8. Threat assessment for United States-bound international mail.
- Sec. 9. Evaluation of Coast Guard Deployable Specialized Forces.
- Sec. 10. Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism improvement.
- Sec. 11. Strategic plan to enhance the security of the international supply chain.
- Sec. 12. Container Security Initiative.
- Sec. 13. Transportation Worker Identification Credential waiver and appeals process.
- Sec. 14. Repeals.

SEC. 2. U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION COORDINATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle B of title IV of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 211 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 420. IMMIGRATION COOPERATION PROGRAM.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established within U.S. Customs and Border Protection a program to be known as the Immigration Co-

operation Program. Under the Program, U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers, pursuant to an arrangement with the government of a foreign country, may cooperate with authorities of that government, air carriers, and security employees at airports located in that country, to identify persons who may be inadmissible to the United States or otherwise pose a risk to border security.

“(b) **ACTIVITIES.**—In carrying out the program, U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers posted in a foreign country under subsection (a) may—

- “(1) be stationed at airports in that country, including for purposes of conducting risk assessments and enhancing border security;
- “(2) assist authorities of that government, air carriers, and security employees with document examination and traveler security assessments;
- “(3) provide relevant training to air carriers, their security staff, and such authorities;
- “(4) exchange information with, and provide technical assistance, equipment, and training to, such authorities to facilitate risk assessments of travelers and appropriate enforcement activities related to such assessments;
- “(5) make recommendations to air carriers to deny boarding to potentially inadmissible travelers bound for the United States; and
- “(6) conduct other activities, as appropriate, to protect the international borders of the United States and facilitate the enforcement of United States laws, as directed by the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“SEC. 420A. AIR CARGO ADVANCE SCREENING.

“The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall—

- “(1) consistent with the requirements enacted by the Trade Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-210)—
 - “(A) establish a program for the collection by U.S. Customs and Border Protection of advance electronic information from air carriers and other persons and governments within the supply chain regarding cargo being transported to the United States by air; and
 - “(B) under such program, require that such information be transmitted by such persons and governments at the earliest point practicable prior to loading of such cargo onto an aircraft destined to or transiting through the United States; and
- “(2) coordinate with the Administrator for the Transportation Security Administration to identify opportunities where the information furnished in compliance with the program established under this section can be used to meet the requirements of a program administered by the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration.

“SEC. 420B. U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION OFFICE OF AIR AND MARINE OPERATIONS ASSET DEPLOYMENT.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Any deployment of new assets by U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s Office of Air and Marine Operations following the date of the enactment of this section, shall, to the greatest extent practicable, occur in accordance with a risk-based assessment that considers mission needs, validated requirements, performance results, threats, costs, and any other relevant factors identified by the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection. Specific factors to be included in such assessment shall include, at a minimum, the following:

- “(1) Mission requirements that prioritize the operational needs of field commanders to secure the United States border and ports.

“(2) Other Department assets available to help address any unmet border and port security mission requirements, in accordance with paragraph (1).

“(3) Risk analysis showing positioning of the asset at issue to respond to intelligence on emerging terrorist or other threats.

“(4) Cost-benefit analysis showing the relative ability to use the asset at issue in the most cost-effective way to reduce risk and achieve mission success.

“(b) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—An assessment required under subsection (a) shall consider applicable Federal guidance, standards, and agency strategic and performance plans, including the following:

- “(1) The most recent departmental Quadrennial Homeland Security Review under section 707, and any follow-up guidance related to such Review.
- “(2) The Department’s Annual Performance Plans.
- “(3) Department policy guiding use of integrated risk management in resource allocation decisions.
- “(4) Department and U.S. Customs and Border Protection Strategic Plans and Resource Deployment Plans.
- “(5) Applicable aviation guidance from the Department, including the DHS Aviation Concept of Operations.
- “(6) Other strategic and acquisition guidance promulgated by the Federal Government as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(c) **AUDIT AND REPORT.**—The Inspector General of the Department shall biennially audit the deployment of new assets by U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s Office of Air and Marine Operations and submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the compliance of the Department with the requirements of this section.

“(d) **MARINE INTERDICTION STATIONS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate an identification of facilities owned by the Federal Government in strategic locations along the maritime border of California that may be suitable for establishing additional Office of Air and Marine Operations marine interdiction stations.

“SEC. 420C. INTEGRATED BORDER ENFORCEMENT TEAMS.

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary shall establish within the Department a program to be known as the Integrated Border Enforcement Team program (referred to in this section as “IBET”).

“(b) **PURPOSE.**—The Secretary shall administer the IBET program in a manner that results in a cooperative approach between the United States and Canada to—

- “(1) strengthen security between designated ports of entry;
- “(2) detect, prevent, investigate, and respond to terrorism and violations of law related to border security;
- “(3) facilitate collaboration among components and offices within the Department and international partners;
- “(4) execute coordinated activities in furtherance of border security and homeland security; and
- “(5) enhance information-sharing, including the dissemination of homeland security information among such components and offices.

“(c) **COMPOSITION AND LOCATION OF IBETS.**—

“(1) COMPOSITION.—IBETs shall be led by the United States Border Patrol and may be comprised of personnel from the following:

“(A) Other subcomponents of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(B) U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, led by Homeland Security Investigations.

“(C) The Coast Guard, for the purpose of securing the maritime borders of the United States.

“(D) Other Department personnel, as appropriate.

“(E) Other Federal departments and agencies, as appropriate.

“(F) Appropriate State law enforcement agencies.

“(G) Foreign law enforcement partners.

“(H) Local law enforcement agencies from affected border cities and communities.

“(I) Appropriate tribal law enforcement agencies.

“(2) LOCATION.—The Secretary is authorized to establish IBETs in regions in which such teams can contribute to IBET missions, as appropriate. When establishing an IBET, the Secretary shall consider the following:

“(A) Whether the region in which the IBET would be established is significantly impacted by cross-border threats.

“(B) The availability of Federal, State, local, tribal, and foreign law enforcement resources to participate in an IBET.

“(C) Whether, in accordance with paragraph (3), other joint cross-border initiatives already take place within the region in which the IBET would be established, including other Department cross-border programs such as the Integrated Cross-Border Maritime Law Enforcement Operation Program established under section 711 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2012 (46 U.S.C. 70101 note) or the Border Enforcement Security Task Force established under section 432.

“(3) DUPLICATION OF EFFORTS.—In determining whether to establish a new IBET or to expand an existing IBET in a given region, the Secretary shall ensure that the IBET under consideration does not duplicate the efforts of other existing interagency task forces or centers within such region, including the Integrated Cross-Border Maritime Law Enforcement Operation Program established under section 711 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2012 (46 U.S.C. 70101 note) or the Border Enforcement Security Task Force established under section 432.

“(d) OPERATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—After determining the regions in which to establish IBETs, the Secretary may—

“(A) direct the assignment of Federal personnel to such IBETs; and

“(B) take other actions to assist Federal, State, local, and tribal entities to participate in such IBETs, including providing financial assistance, as appropriate, for operational, administrative, and technological costs associated with such participation.

“(2) LIMITATION.—Coast Guard personnel assigned under paragraph (1) may be assigned only for the purposes of securing the maritime borders of the United States, in accordance with subsection (c)(1)(C).

“(e) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate the IBET program with other similar border security and antiterrorism programs within the Department in accordance with the strategic objectives of the Cross-Border Law Enforcement Advisory Committee.

“(f) MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING.—The Secretary may enter into memoranda of understanding with appropriate representatives of the entities specified in subsection (c)(1) necessary to carry out the IBET program.

“(g) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which an IBET is established and biannually thereafter for the following six years, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, including the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and in the case of Coast Guard personnel used to secure the maritime borders of the United States, additionally to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, a report that—

“(1) describes the effectiveness of IBETs in fulfilling the purposes specified in subsection (b);

“(2) assess the impact of certain challenges on the sustainment of cross-border IBET operations, including challenges faced by international partners;

“(3) addresses ways to support joint training for IBET stakeholder agencies and radio interoperability to allow for secure cross-border radio communications; and

“(4) assesses how IBETs, Border Enforcement Security Task Forces, and the Integrated Cross-Border Maritime Law Enforcement Operation Program can better align operations, including interdiction and investigation activities.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by adding after the item relating to section 419 the following new item:

“Sec. 420. Immigration cooperation program.

“Sec. 420A. Air cargo advance screening.

“Sec. 420B. U.S. Customs and Border Protection Office of Air and Marine Operations asset deployment.

“Sec. 420C. Integrated Border Enforcement Teams.”

(c) DEADLINE FOR AIR CARGO ADVANCE SCREENING.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall implement section 420A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by this section, by not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. BORDER AND MARITIME SECURITY EFFICIENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title IV of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 231 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

“SEC. 434. BORDER SECURITY JOINT TASK FORCES.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish and operate the following departmental Joint Task Forces (in this section referred to as ‘Joint Task Force’) to conduct joint operations using Department component and office personnel and capabilities to secure the land and maritime borders of the United States:

“(1) JOINT TASK FORCE—EAST.—Joint Task Force—East shall, at the direction of the Secretary and in coordination with Joint Task Force West, create and execute a strategic plan to secure the land and maritime borders of the United States and shall operate and be located in a place or region determined by the Secretary.

“(2) JOINT TASK FORCE—WEST.—Joint Task Force—West shall, at the direction of the Secretary and in coordination with Joint Task Force East, create and execute a strategic plan to secure the land and maritime borders of the United States and shall operate and be located in a place or region determined by the Secretary.

“(3) JOINT TASK FORCE—INVESTIGATIONS.—Joint Task Force—Investigations shall, at the direction of the Secretary, be responsible for coordinating criminal investigations sup-

porting Joint Task Force—West and Joint Task Force—East.

“(b) JOINT TASK FORCE DIRECTORS.—The Secretary shall appoint a Director to head each Joint Task Force. Each Director shall be senior official selected from a relevant component or office of the Department, rotating between relevant components and offices every two years. The Secretary may extend the appointment of a Director for up to two additional years, if the Secretary determines that such an extension is in the best interest of the Department.

“(c) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.—The Secretary shall make the following appointments to the following Joint Task Forces:

“(1) The initial Director of Joint Task Force—East shall be a senior officer of the Coast Guard.

“(2) The initial Director of Joint Task Force—West shall be a senior official of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(3) The initial Director of Joint Task Force—Investigations shall be a senior official of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

“(d) JOINT TASK FORCE DEPUTY DIRECTORS.—The Secretary shall appoint a Deputy Director for each Joint Task Force. The Deputy Director of a Joint Task Force shall, to the greatest extent practicable, be an official of a different component or office than the Director of each Joint Task Force.

“(e) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Each Joint Task Force Director shall—

“(1) identify and prioritize border and maritime security threats to the homeland;

“(2) maintain situational awareness within their areas of responsibility, as determined by the Secretary;

“(3) provide operational plans and requirements for standard operating procedures and contingency operations;

“(4) plan and execute joint task force activities within their areas of responsibility, as determined by the Secretary;

“(5) set and accomplish strategic objectives through integrated operational planning and execution;

“(6) exercise operational direction over personnel and equipment from Department components and offices allocated to the respective Joint Task Force to accomplish task force objectives;

“(7) establish operational and investigative priorities within the Director’s operating areas;

“(8) coordinate with foreign governments and other Federal, State, and local agencies, where appropriate, to carry out the mission of the Director’s Joint Task Force;

“(9) identify and provide to the Secretary the joint mission requirements necessary to secure the land and maritime borders of the United States; and

“(10) carry out other duties and powers the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(f) PERSONNEL AND RESOURCES OF JOINT TASK FORCES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, upon request of the Director of a Joint Task Force, allocate on a temporary basis component and office personnel and equipment to the requesting Joint Task Force, with appropriate consideration of risk given to the other primary missions of the Department.

“(2) CONSIDERATION OF IMPACT.—When reviewing requests for allocation of component personnel and equipment under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider the impact of such allocation on the ability of the donating component to carry out the primary missions of the Department, and in the case of the Coast Guard, the missions specified in section 888.

“(3) LIMITATION.—Personnel and equipment of the Coast Guard allocated under this subsection may only be used to carry out operations and investigations related to securing the maritime borders of the United States.

“(g) COMPONENT RESOURCE AUTHORITY.—As directed by the Secretary—

“(1) each Director of a Joint Task Force shall be provided sufficient resources from relevant components and offices of the Department and the authority necessary to carry out the missions and responsibilities required under this section;

“(2) the resources referred to in paragraph (1) shall be under the operational authority, direction, and control of the Director of the Joint Task Force to which such resources were assigned; and

“(3) the personnel and equipment of the Joint Task Forces shall remain under the administrative direction of its primary component or office.

“(h) JOINT TASK FORCE STAFF.—Each Joint Task Force shall have a staff to assist the Directors in carrying out the mission and responsibilities of the Joint Task Forces. Such staff shall be filled by officials from relevant components and offices of the Department.

“(i) ESTABLISHMENT OF PERFORMANCE METRICS.—The Secretary shall—

“(1) establish performance metrics to evaluate the effectiveness of the Joint Task Forces in securing the land and maritime borders of the United States;

“(2) submit such metrics to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and in the case of metrics related to securing the maritime borders of the United States, additionally to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, by the date that is not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this section; and

“(3) submit to such Committees—
“(A) an initial report that contains the evaluation described in paragraph (1) by not later than January 31, 2017; and

“(B) a second report that contains such evaluation by not later than January 31, 2018.

“(j) JOINT DUTY TRAINING PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a Department joint duty training program for the purposes of enhancing departmental unity of efforts and promoting workforce professional development. Such training shall be tailored to improve joint operations as part of the Joint Task Forces established under subsection (a).

“(2) ELEMENTS.—The joint duty training program established under paragraph (1) shall address, at minimum, the following topics:

- “(A) National strategy.
- “(B) Strategic and contingency planning.
- “(C) Command and control of operations under joint command.
- “(D) International engagement.
- “(E) The Homeland Security Enterprise.
- “(F) Border security.
- “(G) Interagency collaboration.
- “(H) Leadership.

“(3) OFFICERS AND OFFICIALS.—The joint duty training program established under paragraph (1) shall consist of—

“(A) one course intended for mid-level officers and officials of the Department assigned to or working with the Joint Task Forces, and

“(B) one course intended for senior officers and officials of the Department assigned to or working with the Joint Task Forces, to ensure a systematic, progressive, and career-long development of such officers and officials in coordinating and executing De-

partment-wide joint planning and operations.

“(4) TRAINING REQUIRED.—

“(A) DIRECTORS AND DEPUTY DIRECTORS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), each Joint Task Force Director and Deputy Director of a Joint Task Force shall complete relevant parts of the joint duty training program under this subsection prior to assignment to a Joint Task Force.

“(B) JOINT TASK FORCE STAFF.—All senior and mid-level officers and officials serving on the staff of a Joint Task Force shall complete relevant parts of the joint duty training program under this subsection within the first year of assignment to a Joint Task Force.

“(C) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) does not apply in the case of the initial Directors and Deputy Directors of a Joint Task Force.

“(k) ESTABLISHING ADDITIONAL JOINT TASK FORCES.—The Secretary may establish additional Joint Task Forces for the purposes of—

“(1) coordinating operations along the northern border of the United States;

“(2) homeland security crises, subject to subsection (1);

“(3) establishing other regionally-based operations; or

“(4) cybersecurity.

“(l) LIMITATION ON ADDITIONAL JOINT TASK FORCES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not establish a Joint Task Force for any major disaster or emergency declared under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) or an incident for which the Federal Emergency Management Agency has primary responsibility for management of the response under title V of this Act, including section 504(a)(3)(A), unless the responsibilities of the Joint Task Force—

“(A) do not include operational functions related to incident management, including coordination of operations; and

“(B) are consistent with the requirements of sections 509(c), 503(c)(3), and 503(c)(4)(A) of this Act and section 302 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5143).

“(2) RESPONSIBILITIES AND FUNCTIONS NOT REDUCED.—Nothing in this section reduces the responsibilities or functions of the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency under title V of this Act, provisions of law enacted by the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-295), and other laws, including the diversion of any asset, function, or mission from the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency pursuant to section 506.

“(m) NOTIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit a notification to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and in the case of a Joint Task Force in which the Coast Guard will participate or a Joint Task Force established under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (k) to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, 90 days prior to the establishment of the Joint Task Force.

“(2) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may waive the requirement of paragraph (1) in the event of an emergency circumstance that imminently threatens the protection of human life or the protection of property.

“(n) REVIEW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Department shall conduct a review of the

Joint Task Forces established under this section.

“(2) CONTENTS.—The review required under paragraph (1) shall include an assessment of the effectiveness of the Joint Task Force structure in securing the land and maritime borders of the United States, together with recommendations for enhancements to such structure to further strengthen border security.

“(3) SUBMISSION.—The Inspector General of the Department shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report that contains the review required under paragraph (1) by not later than January 31, 2018.

“(o) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘situational awareness’ means a knowledge and unified understanding of unlawful cross-border activity, including threats and trends concerning illicit trafficking and unlawful crossings, and the ability to forecast future shifts in such threats and trends, the ability to evaluate such threats and trends at a level sufficient to create actionable plans, and the operational capability to conduct continuous and integrated surveillance of the land and maritime borders of the United States.

“(p) SUNSET.—This section expires on September 30, 2018.

“SEC. 435. UPDATES OF MARITIME OPERATIONS COORDINATION PLAN.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a maritime operations coordination plan for the coordination and cooperation of maritime operations undertaken by components and offices of the Department with responsibility for maritime security missions. Such plan shall update the maritime operations coordination plan released by the Department in July 2011, and shall address the following:

“(1) Coordination of planning, integration of maritime operations, and development of joint maritime domain awareness efforts of any component or office of the Department with responsibility for maritime homeland security missions.

“(2) Maintaining effective information sharing and, as appropriate, intelligence integration, with Federal, State, and local officials and the private sector, regarding threats to maritime security.

“(3) Leveraging existing departmental coordination mechanisms, including the interagency operational centers as authorized under section 70107A of title 46, United States Code, Coast Guard’s Regional Coordinating Mechanisms, the U.S. Customs and Border Protection Air and Marine Operations Center, the U.S. Customs and Border Protection Operational Integration Center, and other regional maritime operational command centers.

“(4) Cooperation and coordination with other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and State and local agencies, in the maritime environment, in support of maritime homeland security missions.

“(5) Work conducted within the context of other national and Department maritime security strategic guidance.

“(b) ADDITIONAL UPDATES.—Not later than July 1, 2020, the Secretary, acting through the Department’s Office of Operations Coordination and Planning, shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate an update to the maritime operations coordination plan required under subsection (a).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by adding after the item relating to section 433 the following new items:

“Sec. 434. Border Security Joint Task Forces.

“Sec. 435. Updates of maritime operations coordination plan.”.

SEC. 4. PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title IV of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle:

“Subtitle G—U.S. Customs and Border Protection Public Private Partnerships

“SEC. 481. FEE AGREEMENTS FOR CERTAIN SERVICES AT PORTS OF ENTRY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 13031(e) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(e)) and section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1451), the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection may, upon the request of any entity, enter into a fee agreement with such entity under which—

“(1) U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall provide services described in subsection (c) at a United States port of entry or any other facility at which U.S. Customs and Border Protection provides or will provide such services;

“(2) such entity shall remit to U.S. Customs and Border Protection a fee imposed under subsection (e) in an amount equal to the full costs that are incurred or will be incurred in providing such services; and

“(3) if space is provided by such entity, each facility at which U.S. Customs and Border Protection services are performed shall be maintained and equipped by such entity, without cost to the Federal Government, in accordance with U.S. Customs and Border Protection specifications.

“(b) SERVICES DESCRIBED.—The services described in this section are any activities of any employee or contractor of U.S. Customs and Border Protection pertaining to, or in support of, customs, agricultural processing, border security, or immigration inspection-related matters at a port of entry or any other facility at which U.S. Customs and Border Protection provides or will provide services.

“(c) LIMITATIONS.—

“(1) IMPACTS OF SERVICES.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

“(A) may enter into fee agreements under this section only for services that will increase or enhance the operational capacity of U.S. Customs and Border Protection based on available staffing and workload and that will not shift the cost of services funded in any appropriations Act, or provided from any account in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees, to entities under this Act; and

“(B) may not enter into a fee agreement under this section if such agreement would unduly and permanently impact services funded in any appropriations Act, or provided from any account in the Treasury of the United States, derived by the collection of fees.

“(2) NUMBER.—There shall be no limit to the number of fee agreements that the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection may enter into under this section.

“(d) FEE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of the fee to be charged pursuant to an agreement author-

ized under subsection (a) shall be paid by each entity requesting U.S. Customs and Border Protection services, and shall be for the full cost of providing such services, including the salaries and expenses of employees and contractors of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, to provide such services and other costs incurred by U.S. Customs and Border Protection relating to such services, such as temporary placement or permanent relocation of such employees and contractors.

“(2) TIMING.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection may require that the fee referred to in paragraph (1) be paid by each entity that has entered into a fee agreement under subsection (a) with U.S. Customs and Border Protection in advance of the performance of U.S. Customs and Border Protection services.

“(3) OVERSIGHT OF FEES.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall develop a process to oversee the services for which fees are charged pursuant to an agreement under subsection (a), including the following:

“(A) A determination and report on the full costs of providing such services, as well as a process for increasing such fees, as necessary.

“(B) Establishment of a periodic remittance schedule to replenish appropriations, accounts, or funds, as necessary.

“(C) Identification of costs paid by such fees.

“(e) DEPOSIT OF FUNDS.—

“(1) ACCOUNT.—Funds collected pursuant to any agreement entered into under subsection (a) shall be deposited as offsetting collections, shall remain available until expended without fiscal year limitation, and shall be credited to the applicable appropriation, account, or fund for the amount paid out of such appropriation, account, or fund for any expenses incurred or to be incurred by U.S. Customs and Border Protection in providing U.S. Customs and Border Protection services under any such agreement and any other costs incurred or to be incurred by U.S. Customs and Border Protection relating to such services.

“(2) RETURN OF UNUSED FUNDS.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall return any unused funds collected and deposited into the account described in paragraph (1) in the event that a fee agreement entered into under subsection (a) is terminated for any reason, or in the event that the terms of such fee agreement change by mutual agreement to cause a reduction of U.S. Customs and Border Protection services. No interest shall be owed upon the return of any such unused funds.

“(f) TERMINATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall terminate the provision of services pursuant to a fee agreement entered into under subsection (a) with an entity that, after receiving notice from the Commissioner that a fee under subsection (d) is due, fails to pay such fee in a timely manner. In the event of such termination, all costs incurred by U.S. Customs and Border Protection which have not been paid shall become immediately due and payable. Interest on unpaid fees shall accrue based on the rate and amount established under sections 6621 and 6622 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(2) PENALTY.—Any entity that, after notice and demand for payment of any fee under subsection (d), fails to pay such fee in a timely manner shall be liable for a penalty or liquidated damage equal to two times the amount of such fee. Any such amount collected pursuant to this paragraph shall be deposited into the appropriate account speci-

fied under subsection (e) and shall be available as described in such subsection.

“(g) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate an annual report identifying the activities undertaken and the agreements entered into pursuant to this section.

“(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed as imposing in any manner on U.S. Customs and Border Protection any responsibilities, duties, or authorities relating to real property.

“SEC. 482. PORT OF ENTRY DONATION AUTHORITY.

“(a) PERSONAL PROPERTY DONATION AUTHORITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, in consultation with the Administrator of General Services, may enter into an agreement with any entity to accept a donation of personal property, money, or nonpersonal services for uses described in paragraph (3) only with respect to the following locations at which U.S. Customs and Border Protection performs or will be performing inspection services:

“(A) A new or existing sea or air port of entry.

“(B) An existing Federal Government-owned land port of entry.

“(C) A new Federal Government-owned land port of entry if—

“(i) the fair market value of the donation is \$50,000,000 or less; and

“(ii) the fair market value, including any personal and real property donations in total, of such port of entry when completed, is \$50,000,000 or less.

“(2) LIMITATION ON MONETARY DONATIONS.—Any monetary donation accepted pursuant to this subsection may not be used to pay the salaries of U.S. Customs and Border Protection employees performing inspection services.

“(3) USE.—Donations accepted pursuant to this subsection may be used for activities related to a new or existing sea or air port of entry or a new or existing Federal Government-owned land port of entry described in paragraph (1), including expenses related to—

“(A) furniture, fixtures, equipment, or technology, including installation or the deployment thereof; and

“(B) operation and maintenance of such furniture, fixtures, equipment, or technology.

“(b) REAL PROPERTY DONATION AUTHORITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and the Administrator of the General Services Administration, as applicable, may enter into an agreement with any entity to accept a donation of real property or money for uses described in paragraph (2) only with respect to the following locations at which U.S. Customs and Border Protection performs or will be performing inspection services:

“(A) A new or existing sea or air port of entry.

“(B) An existing Federal Government-owned land port of entry.

“(C) A new Federal Government-owned land port of entry if—

“(i) the fair market value of the donation is \$50,000,000 or less; and

“(ii) the fair market value, including any personal and real property donations in

total, of such port of entry when completed, is \$50,000,000 or less.

“(2) USE.—Donations accepted pursuant to this subsection may be used for activities related to construction, alteration, operation, or maintenance of a new or existing sea or air port of entry or a new or existing a Federal Government-owned land port of entry described in paragraph (1), including expenses related to—

“(A) land acquisition, design, construction, repair, or alteration; and

“(B) operation and maintenance of such port of entry facility.

“(3) LIMITATION ON REAL PROPERTY DONATIONS.—A donation of real property under this subsection at an existing land port of entry owned by the General Services Administration may only be accepted by the Administrator of General Services.

“(4) SUNSET.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The authority to enter into an agreement under this subsection shall terminate on the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of this subsection.

“(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The termination date referred to in subparagraph (A) shall not apply to carrying out the terms of an agreement under this subsection if such agreement is entered into before such termination date.

“(c) GENERAL PROVISIONS.—

“(1) DURATION.—An agreement entered into under subsection (a) or (b) (and, in the case of such subsection (b), in accordance with paragraph (4) of such subsection) may last as long as required to meet the terms of such agreement.

“(2) CRITERIA.—In carrying out agreements entered into under subsection (a) or (b), the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, in consultation with the Administrator of General Services, shall establish criteria that includes the following:

“(A) Selection and evaluation of donors.

“(B) Identification of roles and responsibilities between U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the General Services Administration, as applicable, and donors.

“(C) Identification, allocation, and management of explicit and implicit risks of partnering between the Federal Government and donors.

“(C) Decision-making and dispute resolution processes.

“(D) Processes for U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and the General Services Administration, as applicable, to terminate agreements if selected donors are not meeting the terms of any such agreement, including the security standards established by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(3) EVALUATION PROCEDURES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, in consultation with the Administrator of General Services, as applicable, shall—

“(i) establish criteria for evaluating a proposal to enter into an agreement under subsection (a) or (b); and

“(ii) make such criteria publicly available.

“(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—Criteria established pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall consider the following:

“(i) The impact of a proposal referred to in such subparagraph on the land, sea, or air port of entry at issue and other ports of entry or similar facilities or other infrastructure near the location of the proposed donation.

“(ii) Such proposal’s potential to increase trade and travel efficiency through added capacity.

“(iii) Such proposal’s potential to enhance the security of the port of entry at issue.

“(iv) For a donation under subsection (b)—

“(I) whether such donation satisfies the requirements of such proposal, or whether additional real property would be required; and

“(II) an explanation of how such donation was acquired, including if eminent domain was used.

“(v) The funding available to complete the intended use of such donation.

“(iv) The costs of maintaining and operating such donation.

“(v) The impact of such proposal on U.S. Customs and Border Protection staffing requirements.

“(vi) Other factors that the Commissioner or Administrator determines to be relevant.

“(C) DETERMINATION AND NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 180 days after receiving a proposal to enter into an agreement under subsection (a) or (b), the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, with the concurrence of the Administrator of General Services, as applicable, shall make a determination to deny or approve such proposal, and shall notify the entity that submitted such proposal of such determination.

“(4) SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING.—Except as required under section 3307 of title 40, United States Code, for real property donations to the Administrator of General Services at a GSA-owned land port of entry, donations made pursuant to subsection (a) and (b) may be used in addition to any other funding for such purpose, including appropriated funds, property, or services.

“(5) RETURN OF DONATIONS.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, or the Administrator of General Services, as applicable, may return any donation made pursuant to subsection (a) or (b). No interest shall be owed to the donor with respect to any donation provided under such subsections that is returned pursuant to this subsection.

“(6) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN FUNDING.—Except as provided in subsections (a) and (b) regarding the acceptance of donations, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and the Administrator of General Services, as applicable, may not, with respect to an agreement entered into under either of such subsections, obligate or expend amounts in excess of amounts that have been appropriated pursuant to any appropriations Act for purposes specified in either of such subsections or otherwise made available for any of such purposes.

“(7) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, in collaboration with the Administrator of General Services, as applicable, shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Environment and Public Works, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate an annual report identifying the activities undertaken and agreements entered into pursuant to subsections (a) and (b).

“(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, nothing in this section may be construed as affecting in any manner the responsibilities, duties, or authorities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection or the General Services Administration.

“SEC. 483. CURRENT AND PROPOSED AGREEMENTS.

“Nothing in this subtitle may be construed as affecting in any manner—

“(1) any agreement entered into pursuant to section 560 of division D of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6) or section 559 of title V of division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (6 U.S.C. 211

note; Public Law 113-76), as in existence on the day before the date of the enactment of this subtitle, and any such agreement shall continue to have full force and effect on and after such date; or

“(2) a proposal accepted for consideration by U.S. Customs and Border Protection pursuant to such section 559, as in existence on the day before such date of enactment.

“SEC. 484. DEFINITIONS.

“In this subtitle:

“(1) DONOR.—The term ‘donor’ means any entity that is proposing to make a donation under this Act.

“(2) ENTITY.—The term ‘entity’ means any—

“(A) person;

“(B) partnership, corporation, trust, estate, cooperative, association, or any other organized group of persons;

“(C) Federal, State or local government (including any subdivision, agency or instrumentality thereof); or

“(D) any other private or governmental entity.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by adding at the end of the list of items relating to title IV the following new items:

“Subtitle G—U.S. Customs and Border Protection Public Private Partnerships

“Sec. 481. Fee agreements for certain services at ports of entry.

“Sec. 482. Port of entry donation authority.

“Sec. 483. Current and proposed agreements.

“Sec. 484. Definitions.”

(c) REPEALS.—Section 560 of division D of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6) and section 559 of title V of division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (6 U.S.C. 211 note; Public Law 113-76) are repealed.

SEC. 5. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OFFICE OF BIOMETRIC IDENTITY MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341, et. seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 708. OFFICE OF BIOMETRIC IDENTITY MANAGEMENT.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Office of Biometric Identity Management is established within the Department.

“(b) DIRECTOR.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Office of Biometric Identity Management shall be administered by the Director of the Office of Biometric Identity Management (in this section referred to as the ‘Director’) who shall report to the Secretary, or to another official of the Department, as the Secretary may direct.

“(2) QUALIFICATIONS AND DUTIES.—The Director shall—

“(A) have significant professional management experience, as well as experience in the field of biometrics and identity management;

“(B) lead the Department’s biometric identity services to support anti-terrorism, counter-terrorism, border security, credentialing, national security, and public safety and enable operational missions across the Department by matching, storing, sharing, and analyzing biometric data;

“(C) deliver biometric identity information and analysis capabilities to—

“(i) the Department and its components;

“(ii) appropriate Federal, State, local, and tribal agencies;

“(iii) appropriate foreign governments; and

“(iv) appropriate private sector entities;

“(D) support the law enforcement, public safety, national security, and homeland security missions of other Federal, State, local and tribal agencies, as appropriate;

“(E) establish and manage the operation and maintenance of the Department’s sole biometric repository;

“(F) establish, manage, and operate Biometric Support Centers to provide biometric identification and verification analysis and services to the Department, appropriate Federal, State, local, and tribal agencies, appropriate foreign governments, and appropriate private sector entities;

“(G) in collaboration with the Undersecretary for Science and Technology, establish a Department-wide research and development program to support efforts in assessment, development, and exploration of biometric advancements and emerging technologies;

“(H) oversee Department-wide standards for biometric conformity, and work to make such standards Government-wide;

“(I) in coordination with the Department’s Office of Policy, and in consultation with relevant component offices and headquarters offices, enter into data sharing agreements with appropriate Federal agencies to support immigration, law enforcement, national security, and public safety missions;

“(J) maximize interoperability with other Federal, State, local, and international biometric systems, as appropriate; and

“(K) carry out the duties and powers prescribed by law or delegated by the Secretary.

“(c) DEPUTY DIRECTOR.—There shall be in the Office of Biometric Identity Management a Deputy Director, who shall assist the Director in the management of the Office.

“(d) CHIEF TECHNOLOGY OFFICER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be in the Office of Biometric Identity Management a Chief Technology Officer.

“(2) DUTIES.—The Chief Technology Officer shall—

“(A) ensure compliance with policies, processes, standards, guidelines, and procedures related to information technology systems management, enterprise architecture, and data management;

“(B) provide engineering and enterprise architecture guidance and direction to the Office of Biometric Identity Management; and

“(C) leverage emerging biometric technologies to recommend improvements to major enterprise applications, identify tools to optimize information technology systems performance, and develop and promote joint technology solutions to improve services to enhance mission effectiveness.

“(e) OTHER AUTHORITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director may establish such other offices within the Office of Biometric Identity Management as the Director determines necessary to carry out the missions, duties, functions, and authorities of the Office.

“(2) NOTIFICATION.—If the Director exercises the authority provided by paragraph (1), the Director shall notify the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate not later than 30 days before exercising such authority.”.

(b) TRANSFER LIMITATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may not transfer the location or reporting structure of the Office of Biometric Identity Management (established by section 708 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by subsection (a) of this section) to any component of the Department of Homeland Security.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by adding after the item relating to section 707 the following new item:

“Sec. 708. Office of Biometric Identity Management.”.

SEC. 6. COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF CO-LOCATING OPERATIONAL ENTITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For any location in which U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s Office of Air and Marine Operations is based within 45 miles of locations where any other Department of Homeland Security agency also operates air and marine assets, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall conduct a cost-benefit analysis to consider the potential cost of and savings derived from co-locating aviation and maritime operational assets of the respective agencies of the Department. In analyzing such potential cost savings achieved by sharing aviation and maritime facilities, such analysis shall consider, at a minimum, the following factors:

(1) Potential enhanced cooperation derived from Department personnel being co-located.

(2) Potential costs of, and savings derived through, shared maintenance and logistics facilities and activities.

(3) Joint use of base and facility infrastructure, such as runways, hangars, control towers, operations centers, piers and docks, boathouses, and fuel depots.

(4) Potential operational costs of co-locating aviation and maritime assets and personnel.

(5) Short term moving costs required in order to co-locate facilities.

(6) Acquisition and infrastructure costs for enlarging current facilities, as needed.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report summarizing the results of the cost-benefit analysis required under subsection (a) and any planned actions based upon such results.

SEC. 7. STRATEGIC PERSONNEL PLAN FOR U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION PERSONNEL DEPLOYED ABROAD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days of after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall provide to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a three year strategic plan for deployment of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (in this section referred to as “CBP”) personnel to locations outside the United States.

(b) CONTENTS.—The plan required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A risk-based method for determining expansion of CBP international programs to new locations, given resource constraints.

(2) A plan to ensure CBP personnel deployed at locations outside the United States have appropriate oversight and support to ensure performance in support of program goals.

(3) Information on planned future deployments of CBP personnel for a three year period, together with corresponding information on locations for such deployments outside the United States.

(c) CONSIDERATIONS.—In preparing the plan required under subsection (a), the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall consider, and include information on, the following:

(1) Existing CBP programs in operation outside of the United States, together with specific information on locations outside the United States in which each such program operates.

(2) The number of CBP personnel deployed at each location outside the United States during the preceding fiscal year.

SEC. 8. THREAT ASSESSMENT FOR UNITED STATES-BOUND INTERNATIONAL MAIL.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate an assessment of the security threats posed by United States-bound international mail.

SEC. 9. EVALUATION OF COAST GUARD DEPLOYABLE SPECIALIZED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report that describes and assesses the state of the Coast Guard’s Deployable Specialized Forces (in this section referred to as the “DSF”). Such report shall include, at a minimum, the following elements:

(1) For each of the past three fiscal years, and for each type of DSF, the following:

(A) A cost analysis, including training, operating, and travel costs.

(B) The number of personnel assigned.

(C) The total number of units.

(D) The total number of operations conducted.

(E) The number of operations requested by each of the following:

(i) The Coast Guard.

(ii) Other components or offices of the Department of Homeland Security.

(iii) Other Federal departments or agencies.

(iv) State agencies.

(v) Local agencies.

(F) The number of operations fulfilled by the entities specified in subparagraph (E).

(2) Mission impact, feasibility, and cost, including potential cost savings, of locating DSF capabilities, including the following scenarios:

(A) Combining DSFs, primarily focused on counterdrug operations, under one centralized command.

(B) Distributing counter-terrorism and anti-terrorism capabilities to DSFs in each major United States port.

(b) DEPLOYABLE SPECIALIZED FORCE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Deployable Specialized Force” means a unit of the Coast Guard that serves as a quick reaction force designed to be deployed to handle counter-drug, counter-terrorism, and anti-terrorism operations or other maritime threats to the United States.

SEC. 10. CUSTOMS-TRADE PARTNERSHIP AGAINST TERRORISM IMPROVEMENT.

(a) C-TPAT EXPORTERS.—Section 212 of the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 962) is amended by inserting “exporters,” after “Importers.”.

(b) RECOGNITION OF OTHER COUNTRIES’ TRUSTED SHIPPER PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 218 of the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 968) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 218. RECOGNITION OF OTHER COUNTRIES’ TRUSTED SHIPPER PROGRAMS.

“Not later than 30 days before signing an arrangement between the United States and a foreign government providing for mutual recognition of supply chain security practices which might result in the utilization of benefits described in section 214, 215, or 216, the Secretary shall—

“(1) notify the appropriate congressional committees of the proposed terms of such arrangement; and

“(2) determine, in consultation with the Commissioner, that such foreign government’s supply chain security program provides comparable security as that provided by C-TPAT.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 is amended by amending the item relating to section 218 to read as follows:

“Sec. 218. Recognition of other countries’ trusted shipper programs.”.

SEC. 11. STRATEGIC PLAN TO ENHANCE THE SECURITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL SUPPLY CHAIN.

Paragraph (2) of section 201(g) of the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 941) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) UPDATES.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph and every three years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains an update of the strategic plan described in paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 12. CONTAINER SECURITY INITIATIVE.

Subsection (1) of section 205 of the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 945) is amended—

(1) by striking “(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30, 2007,” and inserting “Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of the Border and Maritime Security Coordination Improvement Act,”;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (H) as paragraphs (1) through (8), respectively (and by moving the margins of such paragraphs 2 ems to the left); and

(3) by striking paragraph (2).

SEC. 13. TRANSPORTATION WORKER IDENTIFICATION CREDENTIAL WAIVER AND APPEALS PROCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 70105 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“(r) SECURING THE TRANSPORTATION WORKER IDENTIFICATION CREDENTIAL AGAINST USE BY UNAUTHORIZED ALIENS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration, shall seek to strengthen the integrity of transportation security cards issued under this section against improper access by an individual who is not lawfully present in the United States.

“(2) COMPONENTS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall—

“(A) publish a list of documents that will identify non-United States citizen transportation security card applicants and verify the immigration statuses of such applicants by requiring each such applicant to produce a document or documents that demonstrate—

“(i) identity; and

“(ii) proof of lawful presence in the United States; and

“(B) enhance training requirements to ensure that trusted agents at transportation security card enrollment centers receive training to identify fraudulent documents.

“(3) EXPIRATION.—A transportation security card issued under this section expires on the date of its expiration or on the date on which the individual to whom such card is issued is no longer lawfully entitled to be present in the United States, whichever is earlier.”.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall pro-

vide to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate information on the following:

(1) The average time for the completion of an appeal under the appeals process established pursuant to paragraph (4) of subsection (c) of section 70105 of title 46, United States Code.

(2) The most common reasons for any delays at each step in such process.

(3) Recommendations on how to resolve any such delays as expeditiously as possible.

SEC. 14. REPEALS.

The following provisions of the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-347) are repealed:

(1) Section 105 (and the item relating to such section in the table of contents of such Act).

(2) Subsection (c) of section 108.

(3) Subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 121 (6 U.S.C. 921).

(4) Section 122 (6 U.S.C. 922) (and the item relating to such section in the table of contents of such Act).

(5) Section 127 (and the item relating to such section in the table of contents of such Act).

(6) Subsection (c) of section 233 (6 U.S.C. 983).

(7) Section 235 (6 U.S.C. 984) (and the item relating to such section in the table of contents of such Act).

(8) Section 701 (and the item relating to such section in the table of contents of such Act).

(9) Section 708 (and the item relating to such section in the table of contents of such Act).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DONOVAN). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3586, the Border and Maritime Coordination Improvement Act. I believe that this bill will provide the Department of Homeland Security the tools and the authority to find efficiencies to improve operations amongst all of its various components.

In 2003, the Department of Homeland Security was cobbled together from 22 different offices and agencies—a very huge logistical and management challenge. We knew that there would be significant growing pains before that agency would function well and as a unified department.

Each component of the Department, be it Customs and Border Protection or

Immigration and Customs Enforcement or the U.S. Coast Guard, has a tendency to sort of operate in their own silo, without the coordination required to make border and maritime security efforts as successful as they should be and can be.

This has had a negative effect, actually, on logistics, on communications, and, most importantly, on operations. In an attempt to adopt a better structure with a goal of enhancing border security and maritime security operations, this legislation, Mr. Speaker, authorizes joint task forces on border security.

The goal of these task forces is to improve border security outcomes, and this legislation provides explicit authority to guide the task force operations and to allow this pilot concept to be utilized to secure our borders.

While this concept is not unique, we intentionally provided a sunset date for the joint task force authority to give the next administration the opportunity to come back to the Homeland Security Committee and to the next Congress to demonstrate that this organizational structure has really contributed to border security, and it is not just simply another layer of bureaucracy.

The second part of this bill, Mr. Speaker, requires the Department to take a very hard look at potential efficiencies in its maritime security efforts. During my time as the chair of the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, we held hearings with CBP that address some of the overlap and the redundancies in the maritime environment, particularly with the units of the Coast Guard and the CBP Air and Marine Operations that, in many cases, are in very close geographic proximity.

This bill also requires CBP’s Office of Field Operations, the Air and Marine Operations, and the Coast Guard to evaluate their role in the maritime and supply chain security to ensure that their missions are consistent with our current threats and to find ways to consolidate operations, where possible. We think these steps are commonsense, and I certainly think that they will help save our taxpayers a number of dollars, and, most importantly, improve operations and coordinations for our homeland security.

Again, finding creative ways to fund the staffing and infrastructure needs at our Nation’s aging ports of entry was really the driving force behind another piece of this legislation, which is the permanent authorization of CBP’s Public-Private Partnership program, which is also included in this legislation.

Allowing public and private sector port of entry operators and others to enter into agreements with CBP to fund small-scale infrastructure expansion or to fund overtime needs will improve security and, as well, increase the flow of commerce that is so vital to our economy.

I want to specifically thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), who

will be speaking in just a moment, for offering the amendment, Mr. Speaker, during the markup regarding the authorization of public-private partnerships. His leadership on this issue has been absolutely vital to bringing this legislation to the floor today.

I certainly also want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Representative BARLETTA from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for working so diligently with us on this particular provision.

Lastly, this bill authorizes the Department's Office of Biometric Identity Management, or OBIM as we call it, for the first time. Since 2003, biometrics have been a very important part of the Nation's border security efforts.

The biometric service OBIM provides is not limited to any one component. It is a department and a government-wide asset. For that reason, we believe that it should not be located in a single component, like the CBP, where the information could, again, be siloed to the detriment of other Department of Homeland Security components. In order for biometrics to be used to their very fullest potential, we think we need to appropriately fund and modernize the data systems that power the matching and the collection of biometric information.

Mr. Speaker, our borders can and should be secured. We believe that this bill provides a framework to really help organize the Department for success and to improve the coordination of border and maritime security components whose job it is to secure our great Nation.

Lastly, I would like to also thank the ranking member of our committee, Mr. THOMPSON, and the ranking member on our subcommittee, Mr. VELA, as well as all of their staffs, for working with us in the spirit of bipartisanship to strengthen our security.

I ask our colleagues to support this commonsense bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 3586, the Border and Maritime Coordination Improvement Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation aims to improve the unity of effort between the various DHS components charged with securing our land and maritime borders. H.R. 3586 also seeks to push out border security to mitigate threats at the earliest possible point. Collaboration and cooperation are vital to ensuring our efforts are efficient and effective.

H.R. 3586 allows the Department to leverage the capabilities of its components, such as Customs and Border Protection and the U.S. Coast Guard, to improve its approach to our border and maritime security.

The bill requires the Department to assess the use of its resources, air and marine assets, and personnel deployed both domestically and abroad in order to identify opportunities to better co-

ordinate and streamline its operations and ensure the success of its border and maritime security missions.

H.R. 3586 also formally authorizes the DHS Secretary's Border Security Joint Task Forces, which utilize Department component personnel and capabilities, to secure the land and maritime borders of the United States.

These tasks were launched in May of 2014 through the Secretary's Southern Border and Approaches Campaign and represents a more collaborative approach to border security missions than we have previously seen.

H.R. 3586 also authorizes two programs specifically intended to bolster the Department's ability to identify and prevent threats from entering the United States via commercial aircraft—the Air Cargo Advance Screening pilot and the Immigration Advisory Program. Through these two programs, DHS is able to thoroughly screen and vet cargo and passengers coming to the United States from abroad on commercial airplanes and share information with international partners prior to departure.

There is strong bipartisan support and interest in strengthening and improving our border and maritime security efforts among my colleagues on the Committee on Homeland Security. I urge my colleagues in the House to support H.R. 3586 as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), from the 23rd Congressional District, who actually has 800 miles of the southwest border in his district.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the representative of dozens of border communities in Texas, I take the obligation to stand up for them seriously. Improvements to security are a key portion of this bill. However, I have long maintained that they are not enough and they are not the only part of a successful border strategy.

Trade is the lifeblood of many of these communities. Yet, far too often they find themselves relying on ports of entry that are understaffed and out of date. This limits growth and strains the ties of the local communities. In many cases, they want to do more to expand on the Federal resources that currently exist. Public-private partnerships are key to enabling this.

Let me be clear: port of entry infrastructure is a Federal responsibility, but that doesn't mean that local communities and businesses shouldn't be able to pitch in.

Since January 2014, the Public-Private Partnership pilot program run through the Customs and Border Protection has made a difference. It has enhanced the ability of CBP to increase resources and decrease wait times at ports of entry. This program provides guidance for reimbursable services and allows CBP to tailor its services to the needs of the stakeholders while meet-

ing the demands associated with decreasing budgets.

Both CBP and stakeholders have been exceedingly pleased with the results of this pilot program. Unfortunately, it could come to an end.

In an effort to ensure the longevity of this program, language in the bill permanently authorizes portions of the Public-Private Partnership program for reimbursable services and donation authority and it establishes a framework to guide its implementation in a responsible manner.

Public-private partnership authority for CBP is a critical issue for border communities like mine and has proven to be an essential tool to reduce wait times at the border and enhance the security of the homeland. I believe that we can secure our border and facilitate the flow of goods and services at the same time. The public-private partnerships that would be codified by this law will ensure just that.

I would like to thank Representative MILLER for her leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

□ 1430

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

H.R. 3586 helps enhance the coordination and cooperation among DHS' border security components, and it authorizes integral border security programs that enhance homeland security. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

When we think about some of the remunerative responsibilities that Members of Congress have, certainly, securing our border is one of the most important. As we can see by what is happening this year throughout the country, there is an enormous amount of interest in making sure that we do secure our border. I feel that this piece of legislation is a critical component but that it is not nearly what we need to be doing to secure our border. We would like to see a border security bill come to the floor. At any rate, I think this is a very, very important piece of legislation.

Again, it is important to note that this has been a bipartisan effort on this legislation, and I certainly appreciate the consideration and the work that we have achieved together, both Democrats and Republicans, as we have worked to secure our borders. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3586.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, and former ranking member of its Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee, I rise in support of H.R. 3586, the "Border and Maritime Coordination Improvement Act."

Our Nation has thousands of miles of coastlines, lakes, and rivers and hundreds of ports

that provide opportunities for legitimate travel, trade, and recreation.

There are currently 328 ports of entry to the U.S., including 167 land ports of entry with Canada and Mexico, staffed by approximately 21,000 CBP officers in the U.S. and abroad.

There are more people and goods coming through our ports of entry than ever before.

Last fiscal year, CBP inspected more than 360 million travelers at our air, land, and sea ports of entry.

Since 2009, we have seen growth in both trade and travel.

In Fiscal Year 2013, total passenger volume was 6.4% higher and total import value was nearly 40% higher than in Fiscal Year 2011.

Houston's George Bush International and the William P. Hobby Airports are vital hubs for domestic and international air travel:

1. Nearly 40 million passengers traveled through Bush International Airport (IAH) and an additional 10 million traveled through William P. Hobby (HOU);

2. More than 650 daily departures occur at IAH;

3. IAH is the 11th busiest airport in the U.S. for total passenger traffic; and

4. IAH has 12 all-cargo airlines that handled more than 419,205 metric tons of cargo in 2012.

It was reported in October 2015 that the William P. Hobby Airport has opened a new 280,000 ft complex that includes 5 gates for its international concourse in an effort to re-establish the airport's daily international air service.

The addition is expected to support travel service for nearly 7,500 international passengers and 25 departing flights a day.

At the same time, these waterways offer opportunities for terrorists and their instruments, drug smugglers, and undocumented persons to enter our country.

Protecting the nation's border—land, air, and sea—from illegal entry of people, weapons, drugs, and contraband is vital to our homeland security, as well as economic prosperity.

The Border and Maritime Coordination Improvement Act:

Creates an office of Biometric Identity Management;

Establishes the Border Security Joint Task Forces in the East, West and for investigations;

Updates the Maritime Operations Coordination Plan;

Establishes an Asset Development for the U.S. Customs and Border Protection Office of Air and Marine;

Secures the Transportation Worker Identification credential against use by unauthorized aliens;

Creates a cost-benefit analysis of co-located operational entities;

Evaluates the Coast Guard Deployable Specialized Forces;

Constructs an evaluation of Coast Guard Deployable Specialized Forces; and

Establishes a Customs-Trade Partnership against Terrorism Improvement among other important changes.

I support this legislation because it will help protect the integrity of our borders and the security of our homeland.

H.R. 3586 provides specific responsibilities for the Undersecretary to establish and operate the newly implemented departmental Joint

Task Forces and appointing the directors to those joint task forces.

Under H.R. 3586, the Joint Task Force—East and Joint Task Force—West is to execute a strategic plan to secure the land and maritime borders, which will coordinate criminal investigations supporting such task forces.

The bill also directs the the DHS to establish additional Joint Task Forces to:

1. coordinate operations along the northern border;

2. prevent and respond to homeland security crises;

3. establish other regionally based operations; and

4. combat cybersecurity.

The smuggling of illicit drugs, illegal immigrants, and contraband weapons over the Texas border is a major problem that needs to be addressed.

Approximately 1 million passengers and pedestrians cross the Texas border on a daily basis; of these, on average 23 of these persons are wanted for arrest.

H.R. 3586 is a positive step in the right direction and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting its passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3586, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOUTHWEST BORDER SECURITY THREAT ASSESSMENT ACT OF 2016

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4482) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prepare a southwest border threat analysis, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4482

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Southwest Border Security Threat Assessment Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. SOUTHWEST BORDER THREAT ANALYSIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a southwest border threat analysis that includes the following:

(1) An assessment of current and potential terrorism and criminal threats posed by individuals and organized groups seeking to—

(A) unlawfully enter the United States through the southwest border; or

(B) exploit security vulnerabilities along the southwest border.

(2) An assessment of improvements needed at and between ports of entry along the southwest border to prevent terrorists and instruments of terror from entering the United States.

(3) An assessment of gaps in law, policy, and coordination between State, local, or tribal law enforcement, international agreements, or tribal agreements that hinder effective and efficient border security, counterterrorism, and anti-human smuggling and trafficking efforts.

(4) An assessment of the flow of legitimate trade along the southwest border.

(5) An assessment of the current percentage of situational awareness achieved by the Department of Homeland Security along the southwest border.

(6) An assessment of the current percentage of operational control (as such term is defined in section 2 of the Secure Fence Act of 2006 (8 U.S.C. 1701 note; Public Law 109-367)) achieved by the Department of Homeland Security of the southwest.

(7) An assessment of impact of trusted traveler programs on border wait times and border security.

(8) An assessment of traveler crossing times and any potential security vulnerability associated with prolonged wait times.

(b) ANALYSIS REQUIREMENTS.—For the southwest border threat analysis required under subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall consider and examine the following:

(1) Technology needs and challenges, including such needs and challenges identified as a result of previous investments that have not fully realized the security and operational benefits that were sought.

(2) Personnel needs and challenges, including such needs and challenges associated with recruitment and hiring.

(3) Infrastructure needs and challenges.

(4) The roles and authorities of State, local, and tribal law enforcement in general border security activities.

(5) The status of coordination among Federal, State, local, tribal, and Mexican law enforcement entities relating to border security.

(6) The terrain, population density, and climate along the southwest border.

(7) International agreements between the United States and Mexico related to border security.

(c) CLASSIFIED THREAT ANALYSIS.—To the extent possible, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit the southwest border threat analysis required under subsection (a) in unclassified form. The Secretary may submit a portion of such threat analysis in classified form if the Secretary determines such is appropriate.

SEC. 3. BORDER PATROL STRATEGIC PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the submission of the threat analysis required under section 2 but not later than June 30, 2017, and every five years thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Chief of U.S. Border Patrol, shall, in consultation with the Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties of the Department of Homeland Security, issue a Border Patrol Strategic Plan.

(b) CONTENTS.—The Border Patrol Strategic Plan required under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, a consideration of the following:

(1) The southwest border threat analysis required under section 2, with an emphasis on efforts to mitigate threats identified in such threat analysis.

(2) Efforts to analyze and disseminate border security and border threat information between Department of Homeland Security border security components and with other appropriate Federal departments and agencies with missions associated with the border.

(3) Efforts to increase situational awareness, including the following:

(A) Surveillance capabilities, including capabilities developed or utilized by the Department of Defense, and any appropriate technology determined to be excess by the Department of Defense.

(B) Use of manned aircraft and unmanned aerial systems, including camera and sensor technology deployed on such assets.

(4) Efforts to detect and prevent terrorists and instruments of terrorism from entering the United States.

(5) Efforts to detect, interdict, and disrupt aliens and illicit drugs at the earliest possible point.

(6) Efforts to focus intelligence collection to disrupt transnational criminal organizations outside of the international and maritime borders of the United States.

(7) Efforts to ensure that any new border security technology can be operationally integrated with existing technologies in use by the Department of Homeland Security.

(8) Technology required to maintain, support, and enhance security and facilitate trade at ports of entry, including nonintrusive detection equipment, radiation detection equipment, biometric technology, surveillance systems, and other sensors and technology that the Secretary of Homeland Security determines necessary.

(9) Operational coordination unity of effort initiatives of the border security components of the Department of Homeland Security, including any relevant task forces of the Department.

(10) Lessons learned from Operation Jumpstart and Operation Phalanx.

(11) Cooperative agreements and information sharing with State, local, tribal, territorial, and other Federal law enforcement agencies that have jurisdiction on the northern or southern border.

(12) Border security information received from consultation with State, local, tribal, territorial, and Federal law enforcement agencies that have jurisdiction on the northern or southern border, or in the maritime environment, and from border community stakeholders (including through public meetings with such stakeholders), including representatives from border agricultural and ranching organizations and representatives from business and civic organizations along the northern or southern border.

(13) Staffing requirements for all departmental border security functions.

(14) A prioritized list of departmental research and development objectives to enhance the security of the southwest border.

(15) An assessment of training programs, including training programs regarding the following:

(A) Identifying and detecting fraudulent documents.

(B) Understanding the scope of enforcement authorities and the use of force policies.

(C) Screening, identifying, and addressing vulnerable populations, such as children and victims of human trafficking.

(16) An assessment of how border security operations affect crossing times.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **SITUATIONAL AWARENESS.**—The term “situational awareness” means a knowledge and unified understanding of unlawful cross-border activity, including threats and trends concerning illicit trafficking and unlawful crossings (which may be used to forecast future shifts in such threats and trends), and the operational capability to conduct continuous and integrated surveillance of the international borders of the United States.

(2) **SOUTHWEST BORDER.**—The term “southwest border” means the land and maritime borders between the United States and Mexico.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

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

Today, we are considering a critical piece of legislation that would require the Department of Homeland Security to conduct a full assessment of the threats that are coming across our southern border.

Evaluating our border threats regularly seems like common sense, especially given the ever-evolving nature of cartel and smuggling activity; yet DHS has not conducted a systematic threat assessment of our southern border in over 20 years. A lot has changed since then.

Southern Arizonans know well that our border is not secure. Transnational criminal organizations are trafficking drugs, money, people, and weapons into and through our communities. This poses a significant public safety risk and national security threat. For my constituents, this is not just an abstract issue but is something that is a part of their everyday lives.

The brave men and women of the Border Patrol do all they can with the tools they are provided, but they are restricted by outdated strategies and political leadership that does not have the resolve to let agents do what they do best—secure the border. In addition, not only is our strategy based off of outdated information, but the metrics used to measure that strategy are inconsistent and incomplete.

The last time DHS measured security along the border, which was in 2010, a mere 44 percent of it was under operational control. Recently, DHS claimed they have been over 80 percent effective along the border; yet the best analytical research, using all available data, puts the true probability of apprehension much closer to 50 percent. Likewise, a month ago, in a hearing I led as the chairwoman of the Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee, the Border Patrol confirmed they have only a little over 50 percent situational awareness of the border. That means, of illicit activity coming across our, roughly, 2,000-mile southern border, we only know of a little over half of it. We will never secure the border unless we have a full awareness of where we are getting beat by the cartels.

The first step to fixing something is actually understanding the problem.

My bill requires a full assessment of the threats along our southern border, including where we have vulnerabilities, where we can better leverage technology, and what percentage of situational awareness and operational control we have. Once we understand and identify the gaps in our defenses, then we can develop a better plan to address those shortfalls through a change of strategy that modifies how we deploy agents, technology, and infrastructure. That is why my bill also requires the U.S. Border Patrol to design a new strategic plan that is based on a new threat analysis required by this bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is always a lot of talk about securing the border here in Washington, D.C. It is time to actually take some action. This bill is a critical first step in building trust in our system and in our ability to accurately measure illicit activity along the border and respond to it. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 4482, the Southwest Border Security Threat Assessment Act of 2016.

H.R. 4482 would help enhance the Department of Homeland Security's border security efforts by enhancing DHS' understanding of the relevant vulnerabilities and capabilities and by requiring a strategic plan to ensure border security personnel, technology, and infrastructure resources are being used to their fullest.

Specifically, the bill would require the Secretary of Homeland Security to assess vulnerabilities and capabilities on the southwest border to help counter threats and illegal activities. The assessment is to include an analysis of the improvements needed at and between the ports of entry; gaps in law and policy between State, local, and tribal law enforcement and international agreements that hinder border security efforts; the flow of legitimate trade along the southwest border; and the percentage of situational awareness and operational control achieved by DHS in the region. The bill also requires the Chief of the Border Patrol to issue a Border Patrol Strategic Plan every 5 years based on this assessment.

Last month, the bill was reported to the House by the Committee on Homeland Security after the inclusion of provisions that were offered by the ranking member, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), in order to strengthen an already good, common-sense bill.

H.R. 4482 would help the DHS and the Border Patrol, in particular, to understand and to mitigate border security threats, to improve coordination and cooperation between DHS' border security components and partners, and to increase situational awareness along the border.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4482.

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

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, once again, I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 4482.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4482, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE AND HIGH-RISK URBAN AREA WORKING GROUP ACT

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4509) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to clarify membership of State planning committees or urban area working groups for the Homeland Security Grant Program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4509

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “State and High-Risk Urban Area Working Group Act”.

SEC. 2. ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION OF CERTAIN DHS GRANTS.

Subsection (b) of section 2021 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 611) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) PLANNING COMMITTEES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any State or high-risk urban area receiving a grant under section 2003 or 2004 shall establish a State planning committee or urban area working group to assist in preparation and revision of the State, regional, or local homeland security plan or the threat and hazard identification and risk assessment, as the case may be, and to assist in determining effective funding priorities for grants under such sections.

“(2) COMPOSITION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The State planning committees and urban area working groups referred to in paragraph (1) shall include at least one representative from each of the following significant stakeholders:

- “(i) Local or tribal government officials.
- “(ii) Emergency response providers, which shall include representatives of the fire service, law enforcement, emergency medical services, and emergency managers.
- “(iii) Public health officials and other appropriate medical practitioners.
- “(iv) Individuals representing educational institutions, including elementary schools, community colleges, and other institutions of higher education.
- “(v) State and regional interoperable communications coordinators, as appropriate.
- “(vi) State and major urban area fusion centers, as appropriate.

“(B) GEOGRAPHIC REPRESENTATION.—The members of the State planning committee or urban area working group, as the case may be, shall be a representative group of individuals from the counties, cities, towns, and In-

dian tribes within the State or high-risk urban area, including, as appropriate, representatives of rural, high-population, and high-threat jurisdictions.

“(3) EXISTING PLANNING COMMITTEES.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to require that any State or high-risk urban area create a State planning committee or urban area working group, as the case may be, if that State or high-risk urban area has established and uses a multijurisdictional planning committee or commission that meets the requirements of this subsection.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. DONOVAN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

As the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security’s Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, I rise in support of H.R. 4509, the State and High-Risk Urban Area Working Group Act, which was introduced by the subcommittee’s ranking member, Congressman PAYNE.

The Homeland Security Act requires States and urban areas that are receiving State Homeland Security Grant Program and Urban Areas Security Initiative funds to have planning committees to determine how to efficiently and effectively expend these funds. H.R. 4509 expands the stakeholders who are required to be involved in these committees to include representatives from public health, educational institutions, fusion centers, and interoperability coordinators, as appropriate.

In New York City, the New York City Police Department, the FDNY, emergency management, and public health, along with other partners, work together to ensure that these grant funds provide the biggest return on investment for the city’s security. Time and again, these officials have told me how important these funds are to their ability to ensure the security of millions of residents, commuters, and visitors in the city each day. They have used these funds to train personnel, to conduct exercises, and to procure helicopters, fireboats, cameras, and radiation detection equipment.

This funding is vital now more than ever. Securing high-risk urban areas, like New York City, becomes more challenging every day considering the fact that we are at our highest threat level since the September 11 terrorist attacks. That is why it is so outrageous that the President’s fiscal year 2017 budget proposes to cut more than

\$500 million from grants to support States, localities, ports, and transit systems.

The Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications held a hearing last month on the proposed cuts. We heard from representatives of emergency management, law enforcement, the fire service, and fusion centers. They all had the same message: these grants have made a difference, and cutting them now would have disastrous effects on their ability to prevent, to prepare for, and to respond to terrorist attacks. Not only would they be unable to make new security investments, but the investments they have made since 9/11 would be eroded. In this threat environment, this is not the time to back away from our support of our Nation’s first responders.

Mr. Speaker, the States and urban areas that are receiving Homeland Security grant funding take their responsibilities to secure their areas very seriously. They diligently work through the planning committees that are discussed in this bill in order to make sure they make sound investments to secure their jurisdictions. The President must take the security of these jurisdictions equally as seriously and fund these programs accordingly.

I support the passage of H.R. 4509.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 4509, the State and High-Risk Urban Area Working Group Act.

Before I begin my statement, I would like to support the comments made by my chairman in his being very concerned about the cuts to the grant that have been proposed.

□ 1630

Mr. Speaker, I represent the 10th Congressional District of the State of New Jersey. Communities throughout my district from Newark to Jersey City have built robust capabilities to prevent, protect against, and respond to terrorist attacks and natural disasters with State Homeland Security grants and the Urban Areas Security Initiative funding.

I am proud of the progress New Jersey has made in preparing and protecting against terrorist attacks with these important grant dollars. I cannot stress enough the critical role these funds play in my district’s ability to protect itself from terrorist attacks and natural disasters.

Over the past 3½ years, I have served as the ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security’s Emergency Preparedness Subcommittee. In this capacity, I have seen the benefits realized across the Nation from DHS’ Homeland Security Grant Program.

With this funding, State and local governments equip first responders with the much-needed protective equipment and emergency communications technologies as well. These

grants also help jurisdictions develop and exercise disaster response plans. These activities facilitate important relationships among the individuals and entities that play critical roles in disaster prevention and response.

As successful as DHS' Homeland Security Grant Programs have been, however, more needs to be done to ensure those who are responsible for the various aspects of the disaster response plan, train, and exercise together before a disaster strikes.

Indeed, Save the Children testified before my subcommittee about the disconnect in some communities between emergency planners and school districts and childcare facilities.

A GAO report I requested with former subcommittee chair SUSAN BROOKS released earlier this week revealed that about 68 percent of school districts surveyed incorporate the district emergency management plans into the broader community's emergency management plan. That is good progress, but we must do better.

The State and High-Risk Urban Area Working Group Act seeks to build upon the relationships that the State Homeland Security Grant Programs and the Urban Areas Security Initiative facilitate and to ensure decisionmakers have a complete understanding of a community's vulnerabilities so that investments can be prioritized appropriately.

H.R. 4509 would facilitate the whole community approach to disaster planning by identifying key players to be included in the State planning committee's Urban Area Working Groups.

From firefighters and police to medical community and school officials, H.R. 4509 would ensure that the right people are at the table when decisions are made about how Federal Homeland Security Grant funds are to be spent at the State and local levels.

H.R. 4509 was approved by the Committee on Homeland Security by voice vote, and similar language was approved in a larger package late last year.

The legislation also has the support of the Security Industry Association, and I include in the RECORD a letter from the Association.

SECURITY INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION,
March 22, 2016.

Hon. DONALD PAYNE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PAYNE: On behalf of the Security Industry Association (SIA), and its more than 600 corporate members, I would like to express our strong support for H.R. 4509, the State and High-Risk Urban Area Working Group Act, which clarifies the roles and responsibilities of state planning committees and urban area working groups under the Homeland Security Grant Program.

H.R. 4509 amends Title 6 U.S.C. 611 to include additional stakeholder representation in committees and working groups that set local priorities for grants awarded through the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) and the State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP). We believe this is critical in light of recent attacks and broader terrorist

threats against vulnerable targets such as schools and workplaces, and the desire of state and local governments to provide additional protections and response capabilities.

SIA and its members believe that the inclusion of educational facilities, emergency communications coordinators and fusion centers will help improve state and local homeland security grant planning processes as they are aligned with evolving threats.

SIA members have assisted many homeland security grantees with technology solutions essential to securing critical infrastructure such as maritime ports and airports, schools, power generation and transmission systems, hospitals, factories, transit systems, and governmental buildings.

SIA urges swift consideration of H.R. 4509 by the House Homeland Security Committee, and on the House floor. We stand ready to provide any further information you may need. Thank you for your time and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

DON ERICKSON,
CEO, Security Industry Association.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4509, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers. If the gentleman from New Jersey has no other speakers, I am prepared to close once the gentleman does.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4509. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his astuteness, along with Mr. WALDEN, for a very important initiative.

Having been on the Homeland Security Committee since the tragic terrorist attack against the United States, I have watched the formation of this department and the issues that are important to secure America.

I have lived through various processes and various disasters that are not terrorist related to know how important these grants overall are.

The grants, in particular, that are dealing with this bill in planning committee are extremely important to add to the planning committee those individuals who are beyond the very able work of our firefighters and police officers. Those are first responders. But it is very important to engage the community, such as schools, medical professions, and beyond.

I hope, as this legislation passes, we will also look to having on the planning committee some of the leaders on Homeland Security issues that are in our community.

For example, I have an individual by the name of Charles X. White who has led issues on homeland security for a very long time. His activism created an opportunity for there to be a homeland security specialty and discipline at Texas Southern University because the community is involved, involved on issues of evacuation, involved on issues of restoration, involved on issues of making sure funding gets to those necessary entities that may not be known on a global sense and, when I say that, in a countywide, city-wide, or statewide sense.

They provide the insight into neighborhoods. I think it is important that, as this bill makes its way, its interpretation will be that we add community leaders who are the kind of persons who are engaged with the day-to-day goings-on of neighborhoods, knowing how important it is for them to be heard during times of a terrorist act or any other disaster to be restored.

Again, I am grateful for this legislation and the leadership of Mr. PAYNE and Mr. WALDEN. I ask my colleagues to enthusiastically support this legislation.

To those who may be engaged all around America with preparedness, it is important, of course, to have every aspect of our community involved in these planning committees so that their voices can be heard on how best to heal, to solve, and to restore after a tragedy has occurred in our local communities.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4482, a legislation that will require an analysis of the Southwest Border Threat from the Secretary of Homeland Security and a Border Patrol Strategic Plan from the Chief of the Border Patrol.

I support this legislation as a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security and the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security and Investigations; I believe that Congress can and should do more to ensure the safety of our southern border from terrorism and criminal threats.

My service in the House of Representatives has focused on making sure that our nation is secure and prosperous.

The U.S. has thousands of miles of coastlines, lakes, and rivers and hundreds of ports that provide opportunities for legitimate travel, trade, and recreation.

Ports serve as America's gateway to the global economy since the nation's economic prosperity rests on the ability of containerized and bulk cargo arriving unimpeded at U.S. ports to support the rapid delivery system that underpins the manufacturing and retail sectors.

A central component of national security is the ability of our international ports to move goods in and out of the country.

According to the Department of Commerce in 2012, Texas exports totaled \$265 billion.

In 2012, ship channel-related businesses contributed 1,026,820 jobs and generated more than \$178.5 billion in statewide economic activity.

The Port of Houston is a 25-mile-long complex of diversified public and private facilities located just a few hours' sailing time from the Gulf of Mexico.

In 2014, the Port of Houston was ranked among U.S. ports:

1st in foreign tonnage;
1st among Texas ports with 46% of market share by tonnage and 95% market share in containers by total TEUS in 2014;
1st among Gulf Coast container ports, handling 67% of U.S. Gulf Coast container traffic in 2014; and

2nd in U.S. ports in terms of total foreign cargo value (based on U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Census).

The Government Accountability Office (GAO), reports that the Port of Houston and

its waterways and vessels, are part of an economic engine handling more than \$700 billion in cargo annually.

The Port of Houston houses approximately 100 steamship lines offering services that link Houston with 1,053 ports in 203 countries.

The Port of Houston is home to a \$15 billion petrochemical complex, the largest in the nation and second largest in the world.

With the nation's largest petrochemical complex supplying over 40 percent of the nation's base petrochemical manufacturing capacity, what happens at the Port of Houston affects the entire nation.

At the same time, these waterways offer opportunities for terrorists and their instruments, drug smugglers, and undocumented persons to enter our country.

U.S. seaports, like the Port of Houston, are vulnerable to terrorist attacks.

H.R. 4482 will require the Secretary of Homeland Security to analyze and assess the southwest border threat:

Terrorism and criminal threats seeking unlawful entrance to the U.S. through the southwest border or exploiting border vulnerabilities;

Improvements needed in border ports to prevent the entrance of terrorism into the U.S.;

Law, policy, cooperation between state, local or tribal law enforcement, international or tribal agreements that hinder effective and efficient border security, counterterrorism, anti-human smuggling and trafficking efforts and legitimate trade along the southwest border;

Current percentage of situational awareness and operational control of U.S. borders achieved by DHS of international land and maritime borders of the U.S.

H.R. 4482 will require the Chief of the Border Patrol to issue by March 1, 2017, and every five years after, a Border Patrol Strategic Plan:

Evaluation of southwest border threat analysis;

Assessment of principal border security threats;

Efforts to focus intelligence collection to disrupt transnational criminal organizations outside of U.S. borders;

Ensure new border security technology can be operationally integrated with existing DHS technologies;

Technology required to maintain, support, and enhance security and facilitate trade at ports of entry;

Cooperative agreements and information sharing with state, local, and federal law enforcement agencies that have jurisdiction on the northern and southern borders;

Prioritized list of research and development objective to enhance the security of borders;

Assessment of training programs for detecting fraudulent documents, understanding scope of enforcement authorities and the use of force policies, and screening, identifying, and addressing vulnerable populations;

Assessment of how border security operations affect crossing times.

Let me close by reminding my colleagues that earlier this year we passed the Northern Border Security Act, which secured our border with Canada.

Now it is time to protect our Southern Border, therefore I urge all Members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 4482.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Time and time again, we have learned the true value of Homeland Security grant dollars comes from the relationships built through planning, training, and exercises that are done in these communities.

H.R. 4509 would facilitate the whole community approach to disaster response and planning by adopting a more inclusive definition of emergency response.

I would like to thank my colleagues on the Committee on Homeland Security as well as the Security Industry Association for their support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4509.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. DONOVAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4509, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TREATING SMALL AIRPORTS WITH FAIRNESS ACT OF 2016

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4549) to require the Transportation Security Administration to conduct security screening at certain airports, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4549

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Treating Small Airports with Fairness Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. CONDUCT OF SECURITY SCREENING BY THE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION AT CERTAIN AIRPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall provide for security screening to be conducted by the Transportation Security Administration at, and provide all necessary staff and equipment to, any airport—

(1) that lost commercial air service on or after January 1, 2013; and

(2) the operator of which, following the loss described in paragraph (1), submits to the Administrator—

(A) a request for security screening to be conducted at such airport by the Transportation Security Administration; and

(B) written confirmation of a commitment from a commercial air carrier—

(i) that such air carrier intends to resume commercial air service at such airport; and

(ii) to resume such service not later than the date that is one year after the date of the submission of the request under subparagraph (A).

(b) DEADLINE.—Subject to the one-year limitation described in subsection

(a)(2)(B)(ii), the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall ensure that the process of implementing security screening by the Transportation Security Administration at an airport described in subsection (a) is complete not later than the later of—

(1) the date that is 90 days after the date on which the operator of such airport submits to the Administrator a request for such screening under paragraph (2)(A) of such subsection; or

(2) the date on which the commercial air carrier that is the subject of such a request intends to resume commercial air service at such airport.

(c) EFFECTS ON OTHER AIRPORTS.—The Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall carry out this section in a manner that does not negatively affect operations at airports not described in this section that are otherwise provided security screening conducted by the Transportation Security Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a Representative, I love fighting for the little guy, battling the bureaucracy on behalf of those who can't. Today I am fighting for the little airports.

I think that the people who are dependent on small airports in order to travel and conduct business deserve the same security that those at larger airports get. And this isn't just about security. It is about jobs and the economy.

In the past 3 years, nearly 30 airports across the country have lost commercial service. This wreaks havoc on the local economy and, ultimately, the community. In at least six of these cases, airlines have reevaluated and sought to return at a later date.

Unfortunately, in many cases, even if it has only been several months, TSA has already removed their resources from the airports and have refused to return. The irony is that many of these airports have simultaneously been awarded funding by the U.S. Department of Transportation in order to regain and promote commercial air service.

While one Federal agency agrees to invest in getting the airport up and going, another Federal agency is refusing to provide security screening. This makes no sense from a budgetary standpoint and is simply unfair.

These airports are located in important cities. For example, Del Rio is home to Laughlin Air Force Base, numerous DHS facilities, and a growing community that facilitates international trade between the U.S. and Mexico.

Given the national and homeland security-related institutions serviced directly by the Del Rio airport and the potential boost to the economy, it only makes sense to provide basic screening.

Del Rio, Texas, is not alone. This is playing out across the country from New Jersey to California. By screening these passengers at the point of origin, we are further decreasing wait times at our larger hub airports.

The bill is a bipartisan effort and has passed out of the Homeland Security Committee with unanimous support. Equally bipartisan companion legislation with the exact same language has been included in the Senate's FAA reauthorization, which passed out of committee unanimously as well.

We are all in agreement that this is an important step towards achieving economic and national security. I want to thank my fellow Members, Representatives WALDEN, DEFAZIO, LUMMIS, KILMER, and DAVIS, who cosponsored this piece of legislation.

I urge all Members to join me in supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4549, the Treating Small Airports with Fairness Act of 2016.

Under this act, TSA would be required to provide staffing and screening equipment to any airport that lost commercial air service on or after January 1, 2013, if the operator submits a request to TSA together with a written commitment from a commercial air carrier that such carrier intends to resume service at such airport not later than 1 year after the date on which the request is submitted.

It is my understanding that, without this legislation or alternative measures, should commercial service return to the affected airports, the passengers who depart the airport would fly unscreened to their destination and be subject to security screening upon arrival if they have to connect to another destination via commercial air flight.

The potential universe of airports that are believed to be implicated by this legislation is over 20, but there are at least 6 airports that are expected to pursue Federal screening operations.

□ 1500

As a member of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, I believe that it is important that passengers undergo a security screening before boarding commercial flights.

As we have heard from TSA and various media reports, this travel season is expected to be the busiest in many years. One of the factors contributing to the long wait times at airports

across the Nation is the lack of adequate staffing.

During consideration of this measure in committee, the committee approved an amendment offered by the ranking member, Mr. THOMPSON, to ensure that when TSA acts to implement this law and provides screening services to new airports, they do not do so at the expense of other airports in the system.

If TSA does this right and manages its staffing resources in a thoughtful and holistic manner, there is no reason for other airports to be negatively impacted.

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

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the principal author of this legislation, a gentleman who has been fighting for small communities and communities all over the country.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman HURD for his leadership on this issue. I want to thank as well the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for helping us out on this, and certainly Chairman MICHAEL MCCAUL.

This answer by the TSA makes no sense from a security standpoint and hurts our smaller communities that may go from time to time without air service but clamor for air service. If you are a big airport and you lose a carrier, you probably have several others there serving the people of that area.

If you are a small airport and you have one carrier, as is the case in Klamath Falls, Oregon, in June of 2014, when SkyWest pulled out, they had no other carriers, so they immediately began to seek additional air service. The city of Klamath Falls acted diligently. They recruited a new partner, Peninsula Airways, in July of 2015, so like a year later they had somebody in line and everything was working out.

They go to TSA, and TSA says: No, we are not coming back.

Their answer was to reverse screen.

I said: Well, what is that?

Well, that means you board the 28- or 30-passenger airplane with all your luggage, everything else, and then you fly—in this case 236 miles north to Portland, Oregon, Oregon's largest city—then you deplane on the tarmac, and you come back through like you had just driven up.

Well, that is an interesting way to provide security for the Nation's communities and airplanes because that means you have flown right up the entire length of Oregon, from the California border down here in Klamath Falls all the way to Portland.

Now, let me put that in an East Coast perspective for you. That would be like boarding a plane in Raleigh-Durham International Airport down in Raleigh, North Carolina, and then you would fly all the way up to Reagan

Washington National Airport, up to DCA here. Actually, we go 4 miles farther in Oregon, but we will leave that aside for the moment, 232 miles versus 236. Then you get off the airplane here at Reagan National, and then we will screen you. We will find out what you are carrying, what is in your bags, and then we will put you on a connecting flight.

Does anybody think that is good security? Does anybody think that people who want to do us harm aren't going to figure that gaping hole out?

Portland International Airport was willing to work with us, but it made no sense. So we pleaded with TSA: Can't you come back? You were here before. It won't take much.

And they basically said no. And that is what brings us here today. For our Nation's security, for the economic security of our small communities, we need to pass this bipartisan legislation.

On a side note, the Nation's only F-15 training unit is in Klamath Falls at Kingsley Airfield. So our F-15 pilots have to come out now, and rather than fly into Klamath Falls, they have to fly into an airport that is at least, well, on a bad day probably 2 hours over the mountains, and then come over. So we are paying all that extra transportation cost, we are paying hotels, everything else, delaying their access to training, and that doesn't make sense, either.

So let's be safe and secure. Let's be smart and prudent. Let's pass this legislation and allow our communities to have the air service they need and our country to have the security that we demand. This is commonsense legislation that we need to pass. I thank both sides of the aisle for their great work on this with us. Together, we are going to do the right policy even when TSA wouldn't.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me the time and for his support of the bill. I thank the majority side also.

I don't represent the area where this airport is located, but GREG WALDEN and I represent two of the largest districts, geographically speaking, in Congress. The problems that are created by the lack of air service to Klamath Falls, the gentleman has already well documented. It is about a 4-hour drive to Portland, which is the nearest place where you can get a variety of hubbed destinations out of there. Flying a plane into the Portland metropolitan area, twin-engine, fairly heavy plane with no screening and no security, defies common sense.

Now, unfortunately, I was principal, after 9/11, with JOHN MICA in creating TSA, and there are days when we have concerns and regrets, and this is certainly one of them. It was not our intent to create an agency that could dictate who could and couldn't have air service. That is not within TSA's scope

of jurisdiction. This is outrageous that they would try to deny this.

Remember, TSA, you can't lobby Congress. But I hear they have been lobbying in some phone calls, saying: this will cost \$50 million; it will take away service from your airport, which is why the committee said they can't take it away.

No, these are going to be part-time screeners. Klamath Falls has even offered to hire private screeners. TSA says no. TSA is giving away equipment, surplus equipment that is still perfectly functional for an airport like Klamath Falls, so there is no cost involved there. At worst, they are going to have a few part-time screeners and they are going to have to move the surplus equipment there and plug it back in. This isn't going to cost millions of dollars.

This is, plain and simple, a common-sense approach to how we will make our entire system safer and also provide what small cities need. Airports are a critical, critical factor in economic development and recruitment for small cities across the western United States. When you have a willing partner, a growing airline, PenAir, that has signed a commitment to come back in and provide service, as they do for some communities in my district, then it is not the place of the TSA to say, oh, no, hold it up, sorry, can't do that. PenAir probably wouldn't even be willing to provide the service without screening because what would their liability be if they are flying unscreened passengers on a commercial airline? I am not even sure what the FAA would have to say about that.

This is absolutely outrageous, and it is just absurd that Congress has to step in and act to rectify this misguided step by the TSA, but by passing this bill, we will. I recommend this bill to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleagues from Texas and across the Nation who, as I have discovered with this bill, have similar problems. In my particular case, it is the city of Salina, Kansas, which is located only 100 miles from the closest hub, and it has long provided valuable air service either to Kansas City or a little bit farther to Denver. Due to circumstances beyond Salina's control, just in January their air carrier stopped providing flights from Salina, and TSA obviously withdrew screening services.

However, just a few weeks later—just a few weeks later—the airport and Great Lakes Airlines reached an exciting agreement to restore air service to and from Salina. As we have heard the same story, the airport sent a request to TSA asking them to reinstate screening services—again, this is just a few weeks after they had ended the

services—to begin these much-needed flights.

Shortly thereafter, without adequate explanation, TSA, of course as we have heard, denied the request. I soon learned from other airports, other communities across America that I wasn't alone. Other airports located predominantly in rural communities, in nearly identical situations, were also being denied screening services.

Perhaps most troubling to me—and I heard a lot of troubling testimony here—was that no credible reason was given for declining the screening services, again, just a few weeks after they were still screening flights in Salina, Kansas, saying we can't do it now.

I believe our rural communities in Kansas and others across the Nation are tired of being left with the short end of the stick and Washington bureaucrats thinking they can get away with it.

In response to these lame excuses, I urge passage of our TSA Fairness Act today. This legislation will reverse the denial by TSA and ensure they stop discriminating against rural communities like Salina, Kansas. The service agreement they have reached with Great Lakes Airlines will support our region's continued economic growth. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax and Capital Access, I understand how important reliable air service is for Salina, Kansas, and our region. It is a simple fix with this bill.

I appreciate my colleague from Texas carrying this on the floor. It will ensure TSA continues to fulfill its mission, which is to ensure freedom of movement for people and commerce, and again for Salina and other rural communities across Kansas.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the sponsor of this bill, as well as the numbers of individuals who came to the floor.

I chaired the Subcommittee on Transportation Security of the Committee on Homeland Security some years ago and happily remain on that committee because I do think it has a crucial and important role. I do believe in your cause and in this legislation.

We like to think of rural America as being tranquil areas. But in light of the recent incident in Brussels, many of us who are students of aviation security are well aware of a number of elements of weakness, period. Whether or not it is the perimeters of the airports or ingress and egress of airports, whether or not it is the access of employees, of which we make no general indictment of the hardworking individuals who work at airports, but we know that the ingress and egress in many of our large airports still gives us pause, and now, obviously, the conspicuous utilization of the open space where the terrorists did their havoc in Brussels.

We would hope that would not be the case in America, and as well in rural airports. But certainly if a commercial airline comes back to a rural community, they need appropriate security. As we grow in developing our security matrix, they may need security that expands into the outer areas, depending upon risks. But the one thing we know is that they need to fall in the category of what we said after 9/11: a professional, well-trained security team, the Transportation Security Administration and TSO.

I have a lot of confidence, as I have had in previous TSA Administrators, in their understanding of the seriousness of their responsibilities. I have the same kind of confidence in the admiral, along with Secretary Johnson, that they understand that we are the front line on securing this Nation. So the airports that have a commercial airline signed, agreed, and sealed need that kind of security. We must leave no stone unturned as it relates to airport security.

Now, obviously, with no security mechanism, it makes it difficult to have a commercial structure, but more importantly, it opens up the airport system to get into, if you will, the system of travel and, not knowing how terrorists think, to start at one point that is more vulnerable than others and wind up in the Nation's busiest airports.

□ 1515

So I support this legislation. I look forward to determining and encouraging funding for this expansion. Obviously, that would be the concern—certainly, in the appropriations process—and I can only imagine that there are those of us who are committed in a bipartisan way to making sure that every aspect of the Nation's travel system, whether you are going from rail to bus to plane or in any other manner, is, of course, protected.

I ask my colleagues to support this legislation, and I thank Mr. PAYNE and Mr. HURD for their leadership.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Homeland Security Committee and a former chair of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection, I rise in support of H.R. 4549, "Treating Small Airports with Fairness Act of 2016" which requires the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to restore security and screening services to any airport that lost air services after January 1, 2013 but has a guarantee from a commercial airline to resume service.

A number of airports in rural parts of the United States have lost commercial air service in the past years.

Those living in rural areas without easy access by highway to other airports have lost a vital travel option.

Once an airport receives a commitment from an airline to begin or re-establish service it at an airport, it also must get TSA to re-establish passenger and baggage screening, but in some cases TSA denies the airport's request to re-establish security screening.

For example, TSA at Crater Lake-Klamath Regional Airport in southern Oregon denied

the airport's request to restore security screening, citing the unpredictability of air service in the region and the inability to maintain consistent passenger loads.

Without TSA security screenings, airports must make alternative security arrangements, such as having security screening of passengers and baggage occur once the flight arrives at a large connection airport.

Under H.R. 4549, TSA must begin security screenings at an airport either 90 days after a request for screening is made by the airport or when commercial air service commences, whichever is later.

This requirement would apply only to airports where the airline has said it will resume services within a year of when the airport has requested the restoration of TSA screening.

Small cities in 25 States have lost commercial air service and the local economy of the cities involved suffers.

The loss of airports in these small communities results in using small propeller-powered planes that charge fares much higher proportionately than those of conventional airlines.

Closing airports in these cities results in lost tourist dollars and airport revenue which benefits the community tremendously.

H.R. 4549 directs TSA to restore security and screening services to airports that lost air service and have a guarantee from a commercial airline to resume service.

H.R. 4549 requires restoration of TSA screening to a limited number of airports that have a guarantee from a commercial airline including: Klamath Falls, Oregon; Del Rio, Texas; Sheridan, Wyoming; and Salina, Kansas.

I urge all Members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 4549.

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

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to note the bipartisan nature in which this measure comes to the floor today. I thank Members for their support of this measure, and I encourage support for this legislation. Enactment will contribute to strengthening the aviation security system by ensuring that passengers undergo screening before boarding commercial flights.

I had the pleasure of being in south Texas in the last week, and I flew out of McAllen, Texas. I see the nature and size of these airports; but, nevertheless, they should have the same support as the larger airports.

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

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today is a good day. Despite the circus atmosphere that we often see in Washington, D.C., we are strengthening national security and improving the communities across our Nation, and we are doing this in a bipartisan effort.

I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and, again, urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 4549.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4549, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENHANCING OVERSEAS TRAVELER VETTING ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4403) to authorize the development of open-source software based on certain systems of the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of State to facilitate the vetting of travelers against terrorist watchlists and law enforcement databases, enhance border management, and improve targeting and analysis, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4403

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Enhancing Overseas Traveler Vetting Act".

SEC. 2. OPEN-SOURCE SCREENING SOFTWARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State—

(1) are authorized to develop open-source software based on U.S. Customs and Border Protection's global travel targeting and analysis systems and the Department of State's watchlisting, identification, and screening systems in order to facilitate the vetting of travelers against terrorist watchlists and law enforcement databases, enhance border management, and improve targeting and analysis; and

(2) may make such software and any related technical assistance or training available to foreign governments or multilateral organizations for such purposes.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security and Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a plan to implement subsection (a).

(c) PROVISION OF SOFTWARE AND CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 15 days before the open-source software described in subsection (a) is made available to foreign governments or multilateral organizations pursuant to such subsection, the Secretary of Homeland Security and Secretary of State, with the concurrence of the Director of National Intelligence, shall—

(1) certify to the appropriate congressional committees that such availability is in the national security interests of the United States; and

(2) provide to such committees information on how such software or any related technical assistance or training will be made available.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The authority provided under this section shall be exercised in accordance with applicable provisions of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.), the Export Administration Regulations, or any other similar provision of law.

(e) PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) in the House of Representatives—

(i) the Committee on Homeland Security; and

(ii) the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and

(B) in the Senate—

(i) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; and

(ii) the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(2) EXPORT ADMINISTRATION REGULATIONS.—The term "Export Administration Regulations" means—

(A) the Export Administration Regulations as maintained and amended under the authority of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and codified in subchapter C of chapter VII of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(B) any successor regulations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

I just want to begin by thanking our colleague, Mr. HURD from Texas, for his work here on behalf of the safety and security of the American people. He is a former CIA undercover officer. As a result of that, I think he had some unique insights here in moving this legislation. The name of this bill is Enhancing Overseas Traveler Vetting Act.

I would also like to thank one other Member, and that is the Homeland Security chairman, Mr. MCCAUL. He is also on the committee that Mr. SHERMAN and I serve on, but I thank him for his leadership on the bipartisan Task Force on Combating Terrorist and Foreign Fighter Travel. That task force made recommendations, with the help of Mr. HURD, and it led to the introduction of this important piece of legislation. It was passed out of the committee I chair, the Foreign Affairs Committee, back in February. I also want to recognize Mr. ELIOT ENGEL and Mr. SHERMAN for their assistance and support on this as well.

I think the reason this has such resonance with the Members in the House is because the global threat of terrorism has never been as high as it is today. In just the last 12 months, we have seen terrorists strike in my home State of California; we have seen it in France, Belgium, Turkey, India, Tunisia—where I just was a few days ago—the Ivory Coast, Nigeria, Pakistan, and Iraq. We were up in Erbil and Baghdad.

And I have got to tell you, this is a situation that is compounding. No

country is immune. This radical ideology that is now on the Internet—a virtual caliphate on the Internet, we should call it—knows no boundaries. It is pulling individuals from all over the globe. It is radicalizing them and, increasingly, doing it without them even having to leave their neighborhood.

I just returned, as I mentioned, from Iraq, Tunisia, and Jordan, and I heard firsthand there about the foreign fighter threat. You have got 35,000 foreigners right now, and 3,600 of them were from Europe. They are actually from a total of 120 countries. They have traveled to the Middle East to join ISIS. Many of these fighters are now looking to return to their homes back in Brussels, back in Paris and the capitals of Europe—even here in the United States.

Bazi was the name of a young girl who testified before our committee. Mr. SHERMAN and I remember some of the things she told us. She was taken captive by an American who had been recruited over the Internet to join ISIS. She became his concubine, and he felt compelled to tell her this was part of his ideology. He had converted to this. As a result of her being an apostate, she had to go through what other Yazidis and Christians and other faiths had to go through, which was to submit to him and to the will of his particular code.

Eventually, she got loose. She got free of him and told us that tale of how, ultimately, she lost every male in the village—all her brothers—and how her sisters are now concubines. Many of them were foreign fighters, and that is why information sharing between countries is more critical now than ever, because this thing is everywhere now.

The bipartisan task force's report highlighted the lack of any comprehensive global database of foreign fighters and suspected terrorists. In its absence, the U.S. and other countries rely on a patchwork system for exchanging extremist identities, which is weak and increases the odds that foreign fighters and suspected terrorists will be able to cross borders undetected.

So this bill, thanks to Mr. HURD's expertise, will authorize the Secretaries of the Department of State and Homeland Security to develop open-source software platforms to vet travelers against terrorist watch lists and against law enforcement databases. It permits the open-source software to be shared with foreign governments and multilateral organizations for police purposes, like INTERPOL.

This bill reflects the recommendations made by, as I said, our colleagues on the task force, which we have worked together on. I thank Mr. HURD and Chairman MCCAUL for their leadership working to make our Nation safer against terrorist threats.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 4403, the Enhancing Overseas Traveler Vetting Act.

I want to associate myself with the comments of our committee chair, particularly his praise for the hard work of Mr. HURD and the involvement of Chairman MCCAUL of the Homeland Security Committee.

I am a cosponsor of this legislation, and I supported it in the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which considered the bill on February 24, and voted it out by voice unanimously, with no opposition. It is also my understanding that the bill also passed unanimously in the Committee on Homeland Security.

As the chairman of our committee explained, this legislation authorizes the State Department and the Department of Homeland Security to develop open-source versions of software that vets travelers against terrorist watch lists and law enforcement databases. Once the software is developed, we will be able to share it with our allies and multilateral organizations involved in police work, such as INTERPOL. That means that we will have better software in the hands of worldwide law enforcement sooner and it will be interoperable.

As things stand now, we do not have a comprehensive global database for identifying and tracking terrorists. As the bipartisan Task Force on Combating Terrorist and Foreign Fighter Travel, which was established by Chairman MCCAUL and the Committee on Homeland Security, highlighted in its September 2015 report, "countries, including the United States, rely on a patchwork system for swapping extremist identities, increasing the odds foreign fighters will slip through the cracks."

The Paris and Brussels terrorist attacks demonstrate the need for a global system. Since those tragedies, there has been finger pointing about missed intelligence and criticism over the lack of information sharing across borders.

Just in February, Europol warned that more than 5,000 Europeans with European passports had traveled to ISIS and Syria to become ISIS fighters. In late March, European security officials told the Associated Press that the Islamic State group had trained at least 400 attackers and sent them to Europe to carry out specific attacks.

Of course, we have a visa waiver relationship with most of Europe, and that means these European passport holders will be able to visit the United States without special vetting by our officials. There is an exception to that for those European passports that have been stamped indicating they visited Syria or Iraq.

This should not give us a whole lot of false security because, typically, foreign fighters who want to join ISIS travel to Turkey, where their passport is stamped with a Turkish stamp and then they sneak into ISIS-controlled areas. ISIS does not stamp their passport entry into the Islamic State, so the passports of these Europeans that have gone to fight for ISIS in Iraq and

Syria do not bear a Syrian or Iraqi stamp.

□ 1530

In addition, if, for some reason, they did bear such a stamp, any European can simply go and ask for a replacement passport and, in most cases, there will be no record available to the United States that this person had ever visited Syria or Iraq.

So we need a system that gives us the best possible opportunity to identify foreign fighters, but especially those who hold European passports.

If we are going to fight and prevent global terrorism in tandem with other countries, the United States and our allies must be on the same page when it comes to vetting travelers and tracking would-be terrorists. This legislation helps us do just that.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4403.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), who is a member of the Committee on Homeland Security, and he is also the author of this bill.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SHERMAN for his support of this bill; and I would like to thank Chairman ROYCE, not only for his support of this bill, but for everything that he does on his committee to make sure that our allies know that they can trust us and that our enemies know they should fear us.

Last month, terrorists struck again in the heart of Europe. Their attack in Brussels was part of a wider ISIS campaign to ramp up external operations. Already, the group has been tied to more than 80 terrorist plots or attacks against the West. This is an unprecedented figure.

We have been sounding the alarm here in Congress about the rising tide of terror, as well as the global security gaps being exploited by extremists. My bill, H.R. 4403, would help close one of those major loopholes to make it harder for terrorists to cross borders.

This bill was a recommendation of the bipartisan Task Force on Combating Terrorist and Foreign Fighter Travel, on which I served.

In our final report in September, we found that "gaping security weaknesses overseas—especially in Europe—are putting the U.S. homeland in danger by making it easier for aspiring foreign fighters to migrate to terrorist hotspots and for jihadists to return to the West."

I saw firsthand that our partners are in a pre-9/11 mindset, and that many of them have failed to conduct adequate counterterrorism screening. For instance, key operatives behind the Paris and Brussels attacks managed to travel back and forth to Syria and throughout Europe, undetected, even though some were on terrorist watch lists. This should not just be a wake-up call, it should be a call to action.

My bill would allow the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of State to develop specially tailored, open-source watch-listing and screening systems to help our foreign partners disrupt terrorist travel. We have an interest in providing it to several foreign countries, and we should do that.

However, as a matter of overarching Federal policy, this bill does not choose open-source over proprietary. Indeed, the Federal Government should consider proprietary and open-source software and make an educated choice on which one fits the need the best. In this case, providing our partners with software they trust simply makes sense.

Thousands of ISIS fighters have Western passports, and if our overseas partners don't stop them first, we might have to confront them here at home. Yet many governments lack the capacity to properly vet travelers and weed out known or suspected jihadists. That is why we must act today on this legislation and send a clear signal to our allies that America is ready to lead this fight.

I want to thank my fellow members on the task force for their hard work, and I want to particularly thank Mr. VELA and Mr. KEATING, on the Democratic side, for their leadership and support for this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this measure.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, seeing as I have no additional speakers, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4403, the Enhancing Overseas Traveler Vetting Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would just say this for the Members. The 9/11 Commission Report was pretty prescient on this point. It said: "The U.S. Government cannot meet its own obligations to the American people to prevent the entry of terrorists without a major effort to collaborate with other governments."

The report said further: "We should do more to exchange terrorist information with trusted allies and raise U.S. and global borders security standards for travel and border crossing, over the medium and long term, through extensive international cooperation."

This is what the bill does. And, frankly, the Department of State here and the Department of Homeland Security, giving them this authorization to develop this open-source software, to vet those travelers against terrorist watch lists and against those law enforcement databases, is absolutely vital.

I will just mention that the so-called Islamic State—we call it Daesh or ISIS—has already threatened to send hundreds of its European fighters back to the continent to carry out attacks like those attacks that they have already carried out in Paris and Brussels and, frankly, attacks like the one they carried out in San Bernardino, Cali-

fornia. So I think this measure really deserves our unanimous support.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HURD of Texas). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4403, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE FUTURE FORUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Future Forum to provide an update on our past year's work and activity and to discuss the work we must still do to move America's millennials forward.

Yesterday, April 12, marked the 1-year anniversary of Future Forum, and what a year it has been. I encourage everyone at home to follow along as we talk about these issues this afternoon at #futureforum on Twitter or Instagram and Facebook. Send us your questions. I will look at them live here on the floor and talk about them and continue the dialog beyond today's conversation.

Our membership has grown from 14 members a year ago when we started, to 18 of the House's youngest Members. We have traveled to 14 cities now across this great Nation, from San Diego, California, to Manchester, New Hampshire, and to, most recently, last week, hosted by Representatives DEGETTE, POLIS, and PERLMUTTER, Denver. We were even joined there in Denver by our House Minority whip, STENY HOYER.

On each visit we talk to young people at universities, community colleges, coworking spaces, and startup companies, to learn about the issues most important to them, the issues that they are finding as their own personal barriers to success.

Overwhelmingly, we have heard millennials across the Nation share that they are most concerned about issues relating to student loan debt, college affordability, climate change, and campaign finance reform. I want to talk about a few of these issues, and I first start with student loan debt.

At many of these sites with a polling app we ask people: What issue is most important to you? Across the country, the issue that we have seen most often, regardless of what part of the country we are in, what crowd we are in front of, has been student loan debt.

Now, this is an issue that is very personal to me. I just brought my own stu-

dent loan debt just under \$100,000 within the last few months; and I have seen, in my own life, in my constituents' lives in California's East Bay and with the people we have talked to at these Future Forum discussions, that student loan debt has put an entire generation into financial quicksand, and it affects almost every life decision that young people are making.

The biggest decisions you will make in your life: the decision to start a family, we are delaying that decision by about 5 years later than the generation before us; the ability to buy a house, we are perhaps the least home-owning generation America has ever known; the decision and the ability to go out on your own and start your own business—well, actually, millennial entrepreneurship is on the decline. From 2014 to 2015, 5 percent fewer millennials started a business.

How is that?

You look at Silicon Valley, you look at Silicon Alley, you look at Silicon Beach, you look up in the Northwest at Silicon Forest, you see all of these startups across our country and you think, well, this is the startup generation.

In fact, we are more risk averse than you would think. It is because of the student loan debt that we carry that makes it so hard to go out on your own to find that capital you need to take that risk to start a business to create jobs that will help grow our economy.

These are the four issues we are seeing that student loan debt is affecting: starting a family, buying a home, starting a business, and then, finally, being able to save.

We are also the generation that has saved the least of any generation that has ever come before us. And it makes sense, right?

Every month, you have approximately 40 million young people, with \$1.3 trillion in student loan debt, hundreds of dollars each month going out the window, going to pay off this debt, making it very hard for you to rent near where you work, let alone even realize that American Dream of homeownership.

Now, while higher education also remains a worthwhile investment, we have found on our tour that, by 2018, 63 percent of new jobs will require a college education. But here is the problem. The cost of college continues to go up.

One of our biggest challenges, perhaps, is making and having generations that have come before us understand that what they experienced 30, 40 years ago, is just not what young people are going through today. It is apples and oranges in terms of experiences. In fact, the cost of college tuition has gone up higher and faster than any other good or service that Americans consume.

In California, for example, in the sixties and seventies, if you were qualified and you were able, you could go to a UC—University of California—school

and walk away with, essentially, a debt-free education.

The return on that investment, when Californians and the Federal Government valued public education as a public good, was a workforce that built the greatest tech and biotech economy that the world has ever seen. The tech economy that drives northern California, the biotech economy that is thriving down in San Diego, the minds that are powering the inventive forces in the entertainment industry down in Los Angeles, that is the return on investment that we received when we treated education as a public good in California, and you could have an UC degree and walk away with a debt-free education.

Now, an issue that is also important to millennials and new to Future Forum and affecting young Americans is the issue of diversity in the tech industry.

□ 1545

We love the tech industry in California. It has created so many new jobs and a lot of traffic to go with it, but people who are driving to good-paying jobs.

Silicon Valley in the bay area is at the helm of America's burgeoning tech industry, which is constantly developing innovative ways to interact within a global environment and compete in the 21st century. These cutting-edge companies are creating new ways to communicate, travel, buy, sell, and listen.

The tech industry is led by some of the best and the brightest our Nation has to offer. But there are some statistics about the tech industry I want to share with you that are quite disturbing. The tech industry is not as diverse as California or our country is.

Millennials are at the center of this industry. They are the largest generation in the U.S. workforce. By 2020, millennials will make up 50 percent of the global workforce.

However, over the past 2 to 3 years, major concerns have been raised that tech lacks one major component. We are the largest workforce America has ever known, and we are the largest and most diverse generation America has ever known, but the tech industry is missing a diverse workforce.

Despite making up significant portions of the U.S. population, women and minorities are drastically underrepresented in this industry. Let me give you an example.

In the United States, women compose 50.8 percent of our population. However, women only make up about one-third of the tech workforce.

Ethnic diversity in tech tells a similar story. Eight percent of the tech workforce is Hispanic, 7 percent is African American, 23 percent is Asian, and 60 percent is White.

How can we resolve this? Many tech firms have made great strides toward improving workforce gender and ethnic diversity by releasing workforce data

and creating internal programs to address this disparity.

However, action must continue to be taken every single day to address the root of the problem, like improving access to STEM education. The tech industry also needs to seriously examine recruitment measures in order to encourage a more diverse workforce.

I recently introduced the STEM K to Career Act. This bill would provide Federal loan forgiveness for STEM teachers in low-income schools, create a tax credit for paid STEM internships and apprenticeships, and ensure that 7 percent of Federal Work Study funds are used for STEM jobs.

This would help make sure that every corner in America, every classroom across our country, is treated equally and receives the same amount of funding for STEM and make sure that every child has that freedom to dream.

I am also a cosponsor of Representative RICK LARSEN of Washington's Youth Access to American Jobs Act, which will connect students to training in STEM skill positions to prepare them for well-paying jobs. Just last month I signed a letter urging for an increase in Federal support of Hispanic-serving institutions.

Someone in the House who has worked on this issue who is my neighbor in the east bay and someone I have been proud to serve with is Congresswoman BARBARA LEE. I would like to welcome my distinguished colleague to add to this discussion.

I will start, Congresswoman, by asking: This is an industry that has expanded beyond just San Francisco and Silicon Valley. We are seeing major investments put into Oakland and also out in the tri-valley.

What are you hearing back in the bay at home, outside of that Warriors fever—because tonight they are going to set the NBA's single-season wins record—but outside of that fever, what are we hearing at home about the tech industry and what we can do better?

Ms. LEE. First of all, I thank the gentleman so much for his tremendous leadership in Future Forum. I want to thank him also for really stepping up since he has been here in Congress not only in showing dedication and phenomenal representation for his constituents, but, also, he has shown such a tremendous ability to organize his peers and to really focus on the issues that really give our young people, the millennials, a hope that they can actually achieve the American Dream. So I thank the gentleman very much.

I am really proud to share our region with Congressman SWALWELL. I want to first congratulate him also because I think today is the anniversary of Future Forum. One year?

Mr. SWALWELL of California. That is right. One year.

Ms. LEE. The gentleman is doing such critical work to make college affordable and debt free and to really provide opportunities for our young

people and our millennials. So I thank the gentleman.

We represent the east bay, as we have said. For years now, this is nothing new to us. I have my office full of cases that go back, actually, 10 years of qualified people of color who wanted to work in the tech sector and never could get in the door.

Let me also say that 40, 50 percent of the jobs in the tech sector are non-tech-related. They are human resources attorneys, lawyers, jobs that many people of color qualify for and still they have been shut out from these opportunities. So this is an important issue to talk about.

Tech is making a home for itself in my district and your district, and it is creating new jobs.

Unfortunately, too many of my African American and Latino constituents have been locked out of these opportunities for years, which have been created by the region's booming sector.

Believe you me, it is not unique to your district or my district. It is a systemic problem that we need to address across the country.

When major tech firms have released workforce data—and, mind you, many have not—we have seen that, at some firms, employees that are African American can make up as much as 7 percent of the workforce. At other firms, this can be below zero percent.

I don't know how you get below zero percent, but some don't even think about it, despite the fact that African Americans, for example, make up 14 percent of the American population.

So that is why I am really honored to serve with our Congressional Black Caucus chair, Chairman BUTTERFIELD, as his co-chair of the CBC Diversity Task Force.

In May of last year, our task force launched the TECH 2020 initiative to increase diversity and inclusion in the tech sector by 2020, specifically as it relates to African American diversity.

Let me just take a moment to thank Reverend Jesse Jackson and Rainbow PUSH because they have been for several years now really making sure these companies commit to releasing their data and coming up with a plan to address inclusion and diversity.

The core principles of TECH 2020 initiative let me lay out very quickly. T, transparency; education and training; corporate responsibility and investment; hiring and retention.

Transparency means ensuring that companies set and achieve inclusion goals, release their data annually, and put this information in a central location for the public to access.

Education and training, STEM education, commitment to long-term STEM investments, working with minority-serving institutions, Hispanic-serving institutions, HBCUs, and advancing public and private investment in education.

Corporate responsibility and investment means working to increase board of director diversity. When you look at

the boards, you don't see much inclusion at all in diversity.

We have to target philanthropic investments, expand venture capital to diverse ideas, to new, young ideas, seek out diversity in the supplier area and helping young, millennial small businesses grow.

The last principle, hiring and retention, means encouraging companies to provide specific programs, goals, and timetables focused on inclusion and recruit from minority-serving institutions and invest in African American and Latino employees.

The TECH 2020 initiative—we have taken these principles on the road to the boardrooms of some of the biggest names in the tech sector.

So I am pleased that we are continuing this conversation tonight with the head of Future Forum because this really is about the future.

In our district, we have many, many young people, many young African American young men and women, who are working on coding, BlackGirlsCode.

When you look at some of the investments that the Kapor Institute, Mitch and Freeda Kapor, have made in terms of investments in firms that require inclusion in STEM education, it is really phenomenal.

We have seen companies add highly qualified people of color, business leaders, to their board of directors, not enough, only a couple, but we are going to continue to work to develop and implement and, most importantly, disclose their diversity and their inclusion plans.

We have also made progress in gaining commitments to investments in science, technology, engineering, and math—of course, the STEM pipeline—to help educate and create the next generation of coders, innovators, and tech leaders.

Last year I was proud to lead a letter—and it was cosigned by 67 of our colleagues—to support the President's Computer Science for All Initiative, which will ensure that every student from preschool to grade 12 will be able to learn how to code.

This initiative specifically focuses on girls and students of color and will help us close the achievement gap in STEM education.

These are all steps in the right direction, but we can and we must do more. America has become more and more diverse. Increasing diversity and inclusion within the tech sector really is not only a moral imperative, it is an economic imperative.

As a former businessowner myself, I can tell you that diversity is really good for business. It is good for the bottom line. When you have a diverse and dynamic employee base, new doors of opportunity open.

So I am very pleased to be helping to lead this effort with our chair of the Black Caucus, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and other colleagues and yourself to achieve parity in the tech sector.

I also look forward to working with Future Forum in addressing these crit-

ical issues as we move forward with Future Forum in terms of the next generation of leaders.

Young people are concerned about student loan debt, college affordability, and climate change, all the issues that really create a planet worthy of the future of our young people.

As future members of the modern workforce, they are also concerned about equity. So I have to commend the gentleman once again in Future Forum for his vision and his efforts to engage and empower our future leaders.

I know that together we can and we will achieve a future where people of color, African Americans and Latinos, are fully represented within every level of the tech sector, from entry-level coders and H.R. representatives, legal professionals, C-suite officers, and corporate directors.

Finally, let me say that one effort that some of the companies are mounting, which I think you know about, which we need to talk a little bit more about in the future and Future Forum should look at, are the unconscious bias studies that these companies are undertaking.

Because oftentimes it is the culture of the organization and unconscious biases that translate into policies and programs that create a discriminatory effect which, in fact, need to be addressed and dealt with, and they are so unconscious that people don't even realize that this is the ultimate outcome of those unconscious biases.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Do you think that shining a light on workforce data is probably one of the best ways to kind of reverse an unconscious bias, that unless you are forced to look at the numbers and the behaviors of your company, you are not going to make a change that results in having a diverse workforce?

Ms. LEE. Yes. Absolutely. If you don't have the facts, if you don't have the data, how do you know, first of all, that there is an issue and a problem of exclusion?

Secondly, oftentimes people hire people and work with people whom they are familiar with. There are some systemic issues that, unless you have the data, you don't know what these systemic issues are.

So that is absolutely essential. That is why we continue to ask tech companies to release their data and to really be transparent.

So you have to know what the issues are and what the problem is before you can look at how to rectify it and how to move forward.

So I think that many employees and many corporate officials want to do the right thing. They just have not done the right thing, and they are trying to begin to understand what to do next.

So Future Forum, the Congressional Black Caucus, our Tri-Caucus, all of us here, our Dem Caucus, have really been working hard to try to get this movement forward.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. In your district, you have one of the best universities in the world, UC-Berkeley, and we have heard on our Future Forum's tour from young students who are either right out of college or about to be out of college that the amount of debt they have is driving the decision about where to work, that a lot of times their choices are limited to where their parents live because they know they can't afford to live in the bay area. So they are going to have to boomerang back home with their parents who have just gotten used to their being out of the house.

So what have you heard from the students or the recent graduates in your area about how student loan debt is affecting major life decisions?

Ms. LEE. Student loan debt really is hampering our young people from moving forward. They are concerned mainly about how to get a job that is going to pay enough money to pay down their debt when, really, they should be looking at how to move forward and get the type of job they want, buy a home if they want, have a family or do some of the things that their dreams have been in their minds, in their vision, and in their heart for years. Now their dreams are deferred because they have to just hang on with their families and pay student loan debt.

Secondly, in our area, the cost of housing is outrageous. We met with the Secretary of HUD last week to try to determine what the Federal Government could do to help with, first, displacement and, secondly, to help develop more affordable housing, which, of course, will help young people because they can't afford to live now in the east bay or in the bay area, really.

Our region is just excessively expensive, and we have to figure out how young people can stay where they want to stay and how they can have the type of life they deserve.

They have gotten a degree. I went to UC-Berkeley. That is my alma mater—go Bears—and I know what a phenomenal education it is.

But I also know, when you get out, you think that that degree, that piece of paper, is a ticket to something better, and here you end up having to go back home, live with your parents, and pay down your student debt. That is outrageous. It doesn't make any sense. Our young people deserve more.

□ 1600

Mr. SWALWELL of California. That is right. A lot of times I have told young people our generation is the least home-owning generation America has ever known. In the bay area and the L.A. area, they say: Forget home owning. We just want to be able to rent near where we live.

Right now, rents are so expensive. Oakland now ranks in the top five most expensive rent cities.

Ms. LEE. I think it is the fourth in the country.

It is outrageous. Homeownership is not even a dream anymore that young people have.

How do you acquire wealth in this country?

When you look at what happened to African Americans, for example, and Latinos during the subprime meltdown and crisis, our net worth is gone. Most of that was equity in our home.

Young people deserve to be able to buy a house so they can begin to acquire some wealth, so they can begin to do what they want to do with their lives. Until we get this housing piece right, we are not going to get anything else right in terms of inequality and equity for our young people or for people of color.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. That is right. As we talk to young people and we listen to these stories across the country, it is heartening, though, to offer solutions. I know you are a part of many of the solutions that the Future Forum has been promoting.

One of them is the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing bill—it is JOE COURTNEY's bill, our colleague—which says that if the banks can refinance at the lowest rate, if a homeowner can refinance at the lowest rate, and an auto loan can be refinanced at the lowest rate, why can't our students refinance at the lowest rate? Why should they have to pay so much money in interest and not get more competitive rates?

Ms. LEE. There is no reason why. Here you have young people starting out making a life for themselves. They should be able to do the same thing. The banking institutions should allow young people the same opportunities as they do other people who own mortgages and who own cars. This, to me, is discriminatory.

I am really pleased to be a cosponsor of the bill. I hope we can pass this on a bipartisan basis. I would give young people just a bit of hope that it can be done, that they can be made whole, and that their college education, the sacrifices that they made, was worth it because now they are going to the next step.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. That is right. In the bay area, young people are so collaborative and inventive that they have powered this innovative innovation economy. Then they look at Washington and they wonder, why isn't the majority party in the House collaborating on these student loan bills?

If you look at every student loan bill that is out there right now, I think 9 out of 10 of them have been offered by our side. This is an issue that should not be owned by a political party. People are hurting out there.

Ms. LEE. Republican young people are hurting also. I would think that the majority party would want to help their young people also find a path to the American Dream. Certainly refinancing student loan debt is a major step. It should be bipartisan, it should be nonpartisan, and we should be working together to get this passed.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I don't know if you have any constitu-

ents who are in bankruptcy because of student loan debt, but we found that three things in this country will follow you to your grave and have no statute of limitations: murder, treason, and student loan debt.

We have constituents who have had their Social Security garnished because of outstanding student loan debt and people who cannot discharge as they get that second chance in life, that jubilee that bankruptcy is, they can't discharge their student loan debt. It hangs over them until they go to the grave.

Ms. LEE. Many constituents are in very similar circumstances, Congressman SWALWELL. On top of that, their credit score goes down, so then they can't even buy a car, even if they wanted to. They are not able to do anything else because they are delayed on their payments. They are behind because they can't afford it. They get dings on their credit score, and then they can't buy anything else on credit. It is a vicious cycle. They end up in debt and out there not being able to participate in the mainstream economic fabric of our society because of that.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. That is right. Another bill we have to support that is the Private Student Loan Bankruptcy Fairness Act, offered by Congressman COHEN of Tennessee, who seeks to address this issue and relieve young people from having to have this follow them for a lifetime.

Congresswoman, I am glad you came to join us to talk about diversity in tech and about larger Future Forum goals. I look forward to continuing to work with you in the east bay and across our country to take as many young people as we can out of financial quicksand.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SWALWELL, and I thank him for his leadership. I am confident we can with his leadership and with all of us working together.

I know that both Democrats and Republicans want the same thing, I am confident of that, but we are just not matching our rhetoric with reality. Hopefully they will begin to understand, the majority will, that this is good for America, not just for Democrats and not just for our young people.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. That is right. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. LEE.

I also see in the House with us this afternoon is another California colleague, someone who I was hoping maybe could talk a little bit about what students in her part of California are going through, one of the youngest Members of the House as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES).

Congresswoman, we are just talking about student loan debt. In California, we have got the greatest education system in the world, but because of the amount of student loan debt young people are facing, it is just putting them, as I said, in financial quicksand. We have got a lot of solutions here in the House.

Is there anything you are hearing in your Congressional District from young people and what they want to see from their leaders?

Mrs. TORRES. Absolutely. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SWALWELL for bringing this topic to the forefront.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. We are celebrating a year of the Future Forum tonight.

Mrs. TORRES. One year. That is wonderful.

This issue is not limited to the students. At a Congress in Your Corner last November, I heard from parents of a constituent who were nearly in bankruptcy because the student loan from not one child, but two, was so much that it was actually more than their mortgage payment. So here they are working in their late 60s to try to help make payments for their students.

This is a critical issue. They are not able to purchase a vehicle and they are not able to purchase a home. I bought my home in my early 20s. I know that 20-year-olds today, or 23-year-olds today, could not do that because of the high student loan ratios that they have.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. That is right. I call it getting lapped, which is we are seeing parents today who are still paying off their student loans, then their kids are going off to college, and now they are doubling down. It has become a family matter.

We talked on a Future Forum tour to a mother who showed up to an event that had 200 millennials in Boston. She kind of sheepishly raised her hand and said: I know I am not supposed to be here, but I am here because I am worried about my daughter. She was the first in our family to go to college. We were really excited. We sent her off and we missed her dearly for that first year she was gone. We got used to her being gone in years two, three, and four. We never expected that she would boomerang back home because she couldn't afford to live near where she works.

This was at the same time that this mother's own mother was going into a costly assisted living facility. It is a family matter. It is squeezing baby boomers right now because their kids are incurring student loan debt and their parents are taking on costly assisted living. So you are right.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. TORRES for sharing what is going on in her area.

Maybe my other colleague, another one of California's millennial-minded Members down in the L.A. area, TONY CÁRDENAS, what is he hearing as we celebrate a year of being on the road with Future Forum and talking to thousands of young people? What is he hearing about student loan debt or any issues that are important to millennials?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SWALWELL for bringing this issue to the floor. It is incredibly important not just for millennials, but as

our colleague, NORMA TORRES, pointed out, for people who are at retirement age, people who want to retire but can't because they have these generational issues that are costly and they can't move on and then follow through with their version of the American Dream in different phases of their life.

What I am hearing is that this is not just an issue of young people who are in college. This is an issue of entire families wondering whether or not their children can afford to do that and whether the family can come together for that bright individual who wants to succeed and wants to get that education, and yet they are doubting themselves as to whether or not that is the path for them.

That is unfortunate because the fact of the matter is that the United States of America for many, many generations has been the place for hope and expectation of a brighter future for generations. Yet, at the same time, because, in my opinion, Congress is not doing enough to make sure that we can right the situation, we can make sure that we can right size the environment of making sure that when a young bright person in America wants to get an education, that there are ways in which they can afford to do that, regardless of where they come from, regardless of whether their parents are farm workers, like my parents, or whether their parents live on the other side of town where they can afford to do that.

Our environments and the universities shouldn't be left only to the individuals who have the affluency to be able to be in that environment. One of the reasons why we have created these wonderful universities that have 5,000, 10,000, 20,000, and 30,000 people there is so that they can be an eclectic environment, so people can learn to become friends with people that otherwise they might not have rubbed elbows with.

What I am hearing is that people are afraid. Too many Americans are afraid. I am hearing that too many bright individuals are doubting whether or not they can afford to get that degree, not that they can't do it, not that they are not bright enough.

The problem that I am hearing from my constituents and people around America is that it is tough to make that decision because too many young people now have examples that they are in debt \$100,000, \$200,000, \$300,000. And then on top of that, they can't find a right size job to fit their skill set. And then on top of that, they have got this mounting debt. That is something that too many people are afraid to enter into. That is unfortunate. It shouldn't happen in our country.

I am glad that Mr. SWALWELL is bringing this issue up. Let's continue to try to do many, many things about righting the ship that we have about our young people being too afraid to incur the kind of debt that they are forced to do in order to get an education.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Amen. Well said.

I think young Californians, in my experience, want us to be as collaborative in solving this problem as they are in charting the innovation economy. You are right. Out of those environments in our UC and Cal State systems and our community colleges, we are creating minds and experiences that are building this new economy. So they look to us and say: Why aren't Democrats and Republicans working together?

Right now, I see our caucus is the only one that is offering solutions. I think we are putting our hands out there saying: Work with us, we are ready to talk about this, but you have got to come to the table because Republican and Democratic kids across this country are in financial quicksand and are counting on us.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mrs. TORRES.

That will conclude our one-year celebration of Future Forum. We are certainly not looking backwards. We are looking to the future. We have more visits ahead across the country, across California, and, of course, with my colleagues who have participated already.

Continue this conversation with us at #FutureForum or, of course, follow @RepSwalwell on Twitter, Snapchat, and Facebook.

This generation is aspirational and optimistic. It just needs its leaders here in this House and the majority party, I think, to join with the Democrats to put forward solutions that can move our generation forward.

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

NATIONAL PUBLIC SAFETY TELECOMMUNICATORS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) for 30 minutes.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, California is a much warmer State and much more beautiful, if I may add that.

I rise today to recognize National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week.

After 17½ years as a 911 dispatcher, I know firsthand the challenges our public safety dispatchers face, the stress they are put under, and the critical importance of their work. That is why I am proud to introduce a resolution commemorating National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week.

I remember working the graveyard shift at the LAPD, sitting four floors below ground, taking calls from people from all walks of life, often during their most vulnerable time in their lives.

□ 1615

In fact, it was my work as a 911 dispatcher that got me involved in politics.

When I was working for the LAPD, I took a call from a little girl who ended up being murdered at the hands of her uncle. When I answered that 911 call, all I could hear was thumping. Later, I learned that that thumping noise was her head being bashed against the wall. Soon after, five shots were fired, and she was murdered—11 years old, murdered at the hands of her uncle.

I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from the San Fernando Valley, Congressional District 29, TONY CÁRDENAS, to share with us some information about how he supports 911 dispatchers in his district.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. I thank the gentlewoman.

To my colleague, NORMA TORRES, thank you for bringing up this very, very important opportunity for awareness of this issue on the floor of the House of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, yes, it is National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week, but it is really important for us to understand that, in America, everything starts with us—the individuals.

I will just add to this dialogue that it is up to all of us to keep our communities safe. If we do that well, maybe we won't need so many 911 operators. We have heard so many times and too often of those frantic calls when someone is calling 911 because the action has already started, because the atrocity has already begun. As Americans, we should be vigilant and understand that we all have a collective responsibility to be the safe keepers of our communities so that we minimize the number of 911 calls any one individual in our neighborhoods or in our communities across America would ever have to make.

I take this opportunity to mention someone, Krystal Blackburn, who is the assistant supervisor at the Harrodsburg Police Department. She has been a 911 operator for some time now, and I quote one portion of what was mentioned on the House floor this afternoon:

911 has changed my life. It has shaped me, and I have grown into a role that I wasn't even sure I wanted in the beginning. It has become a way of life that I wouldn't change for any reason. I am 911.

Once again, ladies and gentlemen, I think it is important for us to take the opportunity to recognize and appreciate the eclectic responsibilities that friends and neighbors have in every community across America. In every situation, let people take on that professionalism so as to be the solution—to be the go-to person—when we need them most. It is important for people to understand that our dispatchers at 911 and that our safety community around America deserve our support and deserve our recognition. Most importantly, they deserve our thanks.

I thank the gentlewoman for giving me the opportunity to express my thoughts on this very important issue.

Mrs. TORRES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, so few people know what it is like to be an emergency dispatcher and don't truly understand how crucial our role is. They don't get that without us. They don't get that without you. First responders wouldn't be able to do their jobs without someone's answering that 911 call.

Back when I served in the California State Assembly, the State budget crisis meant that 911 dispatchers were furloughed because they weren't exempt as public safety professionals. Hundreds of calls went unanswered. Who knows how many lives were put at risk? I spent months badgering Governor Schwarzenegger until he realized the catastrophic effect the policy was having on our State. God forbid there had been an event like San Bernardino during that time and calls couldn't get through or first responders didn't know where to go.

Sadly, too many people think of dispatchers as a little more than glorified receptionists. This means that they don't often get the resources, the training, and the support they need and deserve in order to do their jobs. Dispatchers are the first points of contact in the event of an emergency, and they are the sole link between those in trouble and the personnel who can help them. Better training and more support would go a long way toward improving service and increasing staff retention.

During this year's State of the Union, I had the honor of inviting as my guest the dispatch supervisor who directed radio and call traffic during the San Bernardino attack. While the police, fire, and EMS responders definitely deserve a lot of credit, there had been very little mention in the media about the key role the public safety telecommunicators played.

Annemarie Teall and her team were the ones behind the scene, making sure the first responders were deployed efficiently and effectively. They fielded calls from the community, from law enforcement agencies, and from callers from all over the country and the world. During a situation that can quickly become pure chaos, they stayed calm, took action, and helped save lives.

When she was here, Annemarie discussed the training she had received in dealing with these types of situations and how grateful she was for that training. Unfortunately, this kind of training isn't a regular occurrence.

Without public safety telecommunicators, our first responders can't do their jobs. The response of police, firefighters, and paramedics is dependent upon the quality and accuracy of the information the dispatcher is able to provide. Public safety telecommunicators don't just take calls and relay information; they also play a key role in coordinating multiple teams of first responders from multiple agencies during times of crisis. They are a vital link for police, fire, and EMS as they monitor their activities by radio and provide

them with information that can ensure their safety and an efficient, effective response.

911 dispatchers have also helped in the apprehension of criminals and have helped bring them to justice because, in many cases, they are witnesses to the crimes as they occur. In the case that I stated earlier, I was the only witness. It was that recorded call that brought justice to that little girl.

Public Safety Telecommunicators Week not only provides us with the opportunity to recognize the hard work of our dispatchers, but it is also a reminder to our constituents of the importance of maintaining emergency lines free for just that—emergencies. There is no excuse for 911 abuse. Some estimates indicate that 15 to 20 percent of incoming calls are nonemergencies. These calls could prevent legitimate emergency calls from getting through and being answered. For example, as a 911 dispatcher, I remember receiving calls from those who were asking for directions to Disneyland, who were asking if an earthquake had just occurred, or who were asking for the time of day. Those are not emergencies. Dispatchers can't send for assistance if they never receive the call.

911 is not an information line. Local governments have limited resources and few dispatchers. Many localities have info lines—for example, 311 or 511. I encourage individuals to look up their local police departments and have their nonemergency police numbers on hand. I also encourage them to add that information to their cell phones so that the number is readily available when they have emergencies.

I can give you many examples of when people have dialed 911 from a cell phone and the dispatcher does not have the accurate location. Imagine if you were in the middle of having a heart attack and if you were not able to voice your location. Having that local telephone number is important because your call would be expedited to the local paramedic or to the local police department that has jurisdiction over where you may be.

It is never too early to teach kids about the proper uses of 911. You never know when an emergency will happen, and your child may be the only one who is able to get help. Teach children how to dial the number and stay on the line and when they should and shouldn't dial 911. One bad example is when my children were looking for me. They knew at the time that I worked at the 911 center. They dialed 911 and asked for their mom. That is not a true, good 911 call. Discourage your children from making inquiries to that emergency line.

Every day, public safety dispatchers help save lives, provide comfort and reassurance, and are a critical part of our law enforcement teams, but, too often, their work goes unrecognized. When you need a calming voice to guide you through a crisis, when law enforcement, fire safety, and rescue personnel

are in need of seamless coordination at a moment's notice, when every second counts, they are on the other line. 911 dispatchers are the unsung heroes of the first responder community.

I want to share with you another story of a 911 dispatcher:

I had to make sacrifices as a soldier to serve my country, and I have to make sacrifices as a dispatcher to serve my community. I knew this when I chose this profession—we have to be on call; we have to work overtime; we have to work holidays; we have to work nights; we have to work weekends; and we have to be reachable 24/7, and it is tough.

I spent most of my life in the service of others—22 years in the military, 8 years with the Texas Youth Commission, over 2 years in Iraq assisting military forces, and nearly 8 years as a 911 dispatcher. I can't remember how many life events I have not been a part of because I was working, sacrificing, in order to help others. It is only tolerable and manageable with the assistance of my fellow team and family members helping me when I just couldn't get through it without their help.

We have committed ourselves to this calling, and we are very good at it. We have sacrificed ourselves in the service of others because someone had to do it.

That came from Richard Dulin of the Coleman Police Department.

The first thing he said when I answered the phone was: "I just shot myself in the heart." Given that he was still speaking, I figured he probably didn't hit his heart, but the point was pretty clear. I established that he had, in fact, shot himself in the chest about 30 minutes before he had dialed 911. He waited to call because he was not sure if he wanted to live.

Unfortunately, we don't tend to get a lot of closure, so I have no idea if he lived or died.

Kyle from Kitsap County, Washington.

The stories go on and on, and I could go on and on for the rest of the time and share with you about the wonderful work that these committed people do each and every single day for our communities.

I close, Mr. Speaker, by thanking the 911 dispatchers and recognizing the hard work they do for our communities every single day.

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

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 192. An act to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 14, 2016, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5013. A letter from the Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter reporting a violation of the Antideficiency Act, Department of Defense Office of the Inspector General case number 15-01, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; Public Law 97-258, Sec. 1351; (96 Stat. 926); to the Committee on Appropriations.

5014. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General David D. Halverson, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5015. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army, Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting the Report on Use of Authority for Army Industrial Facilities to Engage in Cooperative Activities with Non-Army Entities, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4544 note; Public Law 110-181, Sec. 328(b) (as amended by Public Law 112-81, Sec. 323(b)) (125 Stat. 1362); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5016. A letter from the Law Enforcement Policy Analyst, Office of the Provost Marshal General, Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Law Enforcement Reporting [Docket No.: USA-2010-0020] (RIN: 0702-AA62) received April 11, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5017. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Mark S. Bowman, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5018. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility; Alabama: Arton, Town of, Dale County [Docket ID: FEMA-2016-0002; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8427] received April 11, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5019. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council 2015 Annual Report, pursuant to Sec. 1006(f) of the Financial Regulatory and Interest Rate Control Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3305); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5020. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Office of Regulations and Interpretations; Office of Exemption Determinations, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Definition of the Term "Fiduciary"; Conflict of Interest Rule-Retirement Investment Advice (RIN: 1210-AB32) (ZRIN: 1210-ZA25) received April 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5021. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and

Human Services, transmitting the Food and Drug Administration's FY 2015 Performance Report to Congress, pursuant to the Generic Drug User Fee Amendments of 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5022. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Regulatory Affairs Division, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Safety Standard for Architectural Glazing Materials [CPSC Docket No.: CPSC-2012-0049] received April 11, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5023. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2015 Medical Device User Fee Financial Report required by the Medical Device User Fee Amendments of 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5024. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2015 report on the financial aspects of the implementation of the Biosimilar User Fee Act of 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5025. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revision of Part 15 of the Commission's Rules to Permit Unlicensed National Information Infrastructure (U-NII) Devices in the 5 GHz Band [ET Docket No.: 13-49] received April 11, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5026. A letter from the Associate General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a notification of a federal vacancy and designation of acting officer, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5027. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Justice, transmitting six notifications that concern positions requiring Presidential nomination and Senate confirmation, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5028. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the FY 2015 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, 203(a); (116 Stat. 569); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5029. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the FY 2015 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, 203(a); (116 Stat. 569); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5030. A letter from the Director, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the FY 2015 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, 203(a); (116 Stat. 569); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5031. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the FY 2015 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, 203(a); (116 Stat. 569); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5032. A letter from the Director, Office of Equal Employment Opportunity Programs, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the FY 2015 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, 203(a); (116 Stat. 569); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5033. A letter from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commis-

sion, transmitting the FY 2015 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, 203(a); (116 Stat. 569); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5034. A letter from the Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the FY 2015 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, 203(a); (116 Stat. 569); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5035. A letter from the Senior Advisor to the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the Federal Voting Assistance Program's 2015 Annual Report to Congress, pursuant to 52 U.S.C. 20308(b) Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on House Administration.

5036. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rules — Revised Procedural Schedule in Stand-Alone Cost Cases [Docket No.: EP 732] received April 11, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5037. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, "Special Diabetes Program for Indians 2014 Report to Congress, Changing the Course of Diabetes: Turning Hope into Reality", pursuant to Public Law 105-33; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Natural Resources.

5038. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "Finalizing Medicare Rules under Section 902 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 for Calendar Year 2015", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395hh(a)(3)(D); Public Law 108-173, Sec. 902(a)(1); (117 Stat. 2375); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

5039. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Extension of the Workers' Compensation Offset from Age 65 to Full Retirement Age — Achieving a Better Life Experience (ABLE) Act [Docket No.: SSA-2015-0018] (RIN: 0960-AH85) received April 11, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 4509. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to clarify membership of State planning committees or urban area working groups for the Homeland Security Grant Program, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-491). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 4482. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prepare a southwest border threat analysis, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-492). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 4549. A bill to require the Transportation Security Administration to conduct security screening at certain airports,

and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-493). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 4921. A bill to amend chapter 31 of title 44, United States Code, to require the maintenance of certain records for 3 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 4922. A bill to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, to apply the requirements of the Freedom of Information Act to the National Security Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. REED, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WALKER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. BLUM):

H.R. 4923. A bill to establish a process for the submission and consideration of petitions for temporary duty suspensions and reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PETERSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. SALMON, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. PITTS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. PALMER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. MESSER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. OLSON, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. JONES, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. YODER, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LUTKEMEYER, Mr. KLINE, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LATTA, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H.R. 4924. A bill to prohibit discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex or

race, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. JORDAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. TURNER, Mr. GIBBS, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 4925. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 229 West Main Cross Street, in Findlay, Ohio, as the "Michael Garver Oxley Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BRAT, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 4926. A bill to direct the Librarian of Congress to retain the headings "Aliens" and "Illegal aliens" in the Library of Congress Subject Headings; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 4927. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require congressional approval of determinations to revoke the designation of the People's Republic of China as a non-market economy country for purposes of that Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GUINTA (for himself, Mr. BRAT, Mr. BARR, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BOST, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan):

H.R. 4928. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to amend the requirement that interstate firearms sales by Federal firearms licensees be made in accordance with the State law where the transaction occurs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 4929. A bill to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to establish a biennial commission to develop a comprehensive energy policy for the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 4930. A bill to ensure appropriate protections and redress for travelers, consistent with the transportation security and national security of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 4931. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish a national pharmaceutical stewardship program to facilitate the collection and disposal of prescription medications; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 4932. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to expand and clarify the prohibition on inaccurate caller identifica-

tion information and to require providers of telephone service to offer technology to subscribers to reduce the incidence of unwanted telephone calls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 4933. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to change certain eligibility provisions for loan forgiveness for teachers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 4934. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the excise tax on wine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. TSONGAS (for herself, Mr. POLIQUIN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. JONES, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 4935. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to require compliance with domestic source requirements for footwear furnished to enlisted members of the Armed Forces upon their initial entry into the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. KLINE, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. PETERSON):

H. Res. 677. A resolution congratulating the University of Minnesota Women's Ice Hockey Team on winning the 2016 National Collegiate Athletic Association Women's Ice Hockey Championship; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H. Res. 678. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of March 27, 2016, through April 2, 2016, as National Young Audiences Arts for Learning Week; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. AMODEI, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. RENACCI, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Res. 679. A resolution expressing support for designation of May 2016 as "National Brain Tumor Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

196. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, relative to House Resolution No. 6045, urging the Federal Government to require the use of sound science in evaluating crop protection chemistries and nutrients; to the Committee on Agriculture.

197. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Arkansas, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 1, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

198. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 12, supporting the recommendations of the Chicago Area Waterway System

Advisory Committee to prevent Asian Carp from entering the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 4921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 4922.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution. "To provide for the common defense," "to raise and support Armies," "to provide and maintain a Navy," and "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 4923.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 4924.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) the Commerce Clause;
(2) section 2 of the 13th amendment;
(3) section 5 of the 14th amendment, including the power to enforce the prohibition on government action denying equal protection of the laws; and

(4) section 8 of article I, to make all laws necessary and proper for the carrying into execution of powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States.

By Mr. LATTI:

H.R. 4925.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7

To establish Post Offices and post Roads.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 4926.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution as well as Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution which grants Congress the authority to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 4927.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GUINTA:

H.R. 4928.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18

Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, as all other powers vested by the Con-

stitution in the government of the United States

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 4929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE:

H.R. 4930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 4931.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4932.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 4933.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 4934.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution Article I, Section 1.

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 4935.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. ASHFORD and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 40: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 228: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 303: Mr. WELCH, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 333: Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 415: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 446: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 491: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 581: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 605: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 729: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 762: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 789: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 802: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 837: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 849: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 863: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. ZINKE.

H.R. 885: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 911: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 953: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 973: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1114: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1148: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1153: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1185: Mr. KILMER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 1188: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1206: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1211: Ms. ESTY and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1292: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1336: Mr. PETERS and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1343: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1422: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1427: Mr. TAKAI, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1441: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1523: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1552: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1559: Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1588: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1595: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 1603: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 1655: Mr. RUSH and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1769: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 1854: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1859: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 1943: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1963: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 2031: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 2072: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2102: Mr. PETERSON,

H.R. 2121: Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 2170: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 2237: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 2264: Mr. HARPER and Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 2274: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 2280: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2368: Mr. WALZ and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 2411: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2518: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2656: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 2713: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2726: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2805: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 2846: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2872: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2903: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 2920: Mr. GIBSON and Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.

H.R. 2942: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2992: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 3002: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 3007: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 3054: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 3119: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 3123: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 3165: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 3180: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 3209: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 3235: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 3326: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 3349: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 3374: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 3381: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. POMPEO, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 3427: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 3514: Mr. KIND, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3515: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. CRENSHAW.

- H.R. 3546: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
- H.R. 3604: Ms. MOORE.
- H.R. 3632: Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 3687: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. MOULTON.
- H.R. 3765: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 3841: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
- H.R. 3849: Mr. SCHIFF.
- H.R. 3870: Mr. WELCH and Mr. CARNEY.
- H.R. 3871: Mr. POE of Texas.
- H.R. 3952: Mr. SESSIONS.
- H.R. 3989: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. JONES.
- H.R. 4006: Mr. COSTA and Mr. QUIGLEY.
- H.R. 4027: Mr. PETERS.
- H.R. 4055: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
- H.R. 4165: Mr. WALZ.
- H.R. 4219: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. MCCAUL.
- H.R. 4223: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. DEFazio.
- H.R. 4247: Mr. JOYCE.
- H.R. 4352: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
- H.R. 4365: Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. CRAMER.
- H.R. 4447: Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 4499: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. DONOVAN.
- H.R. 4514: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. ROUZER.
- H.R. 4538: Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. BEYER.
- H.R. 4558: Mr. GRIJALVA.
- H.R. 4562: Ms. GRAHAM.
- H.R. 4563: Ms. GRAHAM.
- H.R. 4570: Mr. REED.
- H.R. 4594: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 4599: Ms. MATSUI.
- H.R. 4602: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
- H.R. 4611: Mr. FOSTER.
- H.R. 4615: Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. FARR.
- H.R. 4617: Mr. LYNCH.
- H.R. 4625: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. DELBENE.
- H.R. 4636: Mr. ALLEN.
- H.R. 4646: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FARR, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. TAKANO.
- H.R. 4652: Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 4667: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. NUGENT.
- H.R. 4683: Ms. GABBARD.
- H.R. 4684: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, and Mr. O'ROURKE.
- H.R. 4694: Mr. POCAN and Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 4706: Mr. KLINE.
- H.R. 4715: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
- H.R. 4750: Mr. JONES.
- H.R. 4756: Miss RICE of New York.
- H.R. 4764: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BRAT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PITTINGER, and Mr. BABIN.
- H.R. 4765: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
- H.R. 4768: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. STEWART.
- H.R. 4770: Mr. RENACCI.
- H.R. 4775: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LONG, and Mr. COSTA.
- H.R. 4779: Mr. JONES.
- H.R. 4787: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
- H.R. 4792: Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 4807: Mr. VEASEY.
- H.R. 4818: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
- H.R. 4828: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. LATTA, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
- H.R. 4829: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. HONDA.
- H.R. 4830: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
- H.R. 4835: Mr. COURTNEY.
- H.R. 4844: Mr. JEFFRIES and Ms. KAPTUR.
- H.R. 4851: Ms. MCSALLY and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 4880: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. BURGESS.
- H.R. 4892: Mr. ASHFORD.
- H.R. 4901: Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. ALLEN.
- H.R. 4904: Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BLUM, and Mr. HURD of Texas.
- H.R. 4915: Mr. BEYER.
- H.R. 4919: Mr. DONOVAN.
- H.J. Res. 52: Mr. NORCROSS.
- H. Con. Res. 112: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. GOSAR.
- H. Res. 14: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
- H. Res. 290: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
- H. Res. 318: Mr. LANGEVIN.
- H. Res. 569: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
- H. Res. 590: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
- H. Res. 591: Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
- H. Res. 612: Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H. Res. 633: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
- H. Res. 634: Mr. COHEN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BARR, Mr. COLE, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
- H. Res. 645: Mr. POMPEO.