

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, surplusing 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