



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 2016

No. 170

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 29, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE WOMACK 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 1:50 p.m.

RECOGNIZING BILL AND BETTY BURNS

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to recognize two very special individuals from Lake Villa for their continued dedication to our community. Those individuals are Bill and Betty Burns. They both have consistently been at the forefront of the planning and execution of a number of wonderful community events that really serve as an opportunity to bring everyone together.

Each and every year, Bill and Betty have helped plan the Lake Villa Memorial Day, St. Patrick's Day, and Christmas parades. With their consistent hard work and dedication, these events have been great successes that have been really the glue that has brought our community together, not just on these special days but really a sense of community throughout the entire year.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, the Tenth District recognized them for their service to Lake Villa and to Grayslake with the public servant award for their dedication to our community.

Mr. Speaker, it is really individuals like Bill and Betty Burns that make our community stronger; and there are people like Bill and Betty all over our great Nation that are doing the things necessary to make sure that the little details are not left undone. They do this work tirelessly and thanklessly, in order to make sure our communities are a little bit stronger and a little bit better.

So I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to thank Bill and Betty Burns for their tireless service and dedication to our community to make it a much stronger and better place.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:
Gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

You have blessed us with all good gifts, and this past week, with thankful hearts, we gathered with family and loved ones throughout this great land to celebrate our blessings together.

Bless the newly elected Members of the 115th Congress who resume their orientation on Capitol Hill. Give them calm and confidence as they prepare for a new role as servants of our Nation's citizens.

Bless the Members of the people's House who have been entrusted with the privilege to serve our Nation and all Americans in their need. Grant them to work together in respect and affection, faithful in the responsibilities they have been given.

As the end of the 114th Congress approaches, bestow upon them the gifts of wisdom and discernment, that in their actions they will do justice, love with mercy, and walk humbly with You.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

□ 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.

H6315

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNIZING THE FOOD BANK OF NORTHEAST GEORGIA

(Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Food Bank of Northeast Georgia for more than 20 years of dedication and service to the people of Georgia. Since 1992, the food bank has worked to combat hunger and alleviate poverty by feeding children, the elderly, the ill, and those in need throughout the northeastern part of Georgia.

Just this past October, my staff and I had the distinct pleasure of lending a hand to the hardworking staff of the food bank and saw their actions, which are indeed remarkable. Just this year alone, the food bank has distributed nearly 12 million pounds of food, which equals about 10½ million meals.

This is truly an outstanding organization that continues to expand its reach and scope through its charitable contributions.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Food Bank of Northeast Georgia for their outstanding service. I am honored deeply to have them in the 10th District of Georgia. I give my best wishes to the food bank and their staff as they continue to serve those in need.

FLINT, MICHIGAN

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Flint—I am sure you have heard me talk about this before—continues to suffer in this crisis. One hundred thousand people, citizens of that city, still can't drink their water, which has been exposed to high levels of lead.

That crisis is far from over. Flint families don't have access to clean drinking water. They demand—and we should provide—a response from every level of government, including the Federal Government.

That is why I am pleased and appreciate the fact that Democrats and Republicans in the House and the Senate have come together to make a commitment to help the people of Flint. Legislation passed in both bodies provides help for Flint. Now we have to finish that work before we leave this session.

Before we are Democrats or Republicans, we are Americans. We have a tradition in this country of always coming together for those who are facing a crisis, for those who are in great need. It is incumbent now upon Congress to do the same, to come together to help the people of Flint. I look for-

ward to Democrats and Republicans coming together to do that.

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL GRANGE ANNIVERSARY

(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 today in recognition of the National Grange's 150th anniversary and to celebrate their century and a half of service to agriculture and rural America.

The National Grange was founded in 1867 by Oliver H. Kelley, an employee at the United States Department of Agriculture. He formed this organization to bring farmers from all over the country together in order to share best agricultural practices, drive educational discussion, and promote the economic and social needs of farmers.

In the 150 years since its founding, the Grange has encouraged families and communities—both rural and urban—to come together at the community, county or district, State, and national level to advocate not only for agriculture, but for an array of causes affecting communities.

For example, the Grange played a critical role in developing rural access, from electricity to rural mail delivery, and was an early supporter of women's suffrage.

I congratulate the National Grange and its members on a century and a half of excellence.

MEDIA IGNORES ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a new report by the Wilson Center has found that illegal immigration across the southern border is on pace to break the previous record set in 2014.

This record should not come as a surprise. The administration's policies encourage illegal immigration.

The number of apprehensions at the southern border in August reached its highest point for that month in the last 5 years. This record-setting pace of illegal immigration was largely ignored by the media. Neither the Big Three networks nor the national daily newspapers covered the report.

The administration's failure to enforce immigration laws has caused the new record surge. Americans are understandably concerned about illegal immigration. It is unfortunate that the media does not consider it newsworthy.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following commu-

nication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 29, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
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 November 29, 2016, at 9:23 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 4665.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 5111.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 29, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
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 November 29, 2016, at 10:45 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2974.

That the Senate passed S. 2325.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 3 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1501

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

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.

VETERANS TRICARE CHOICE ACT OF 2016

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5458) to provide for coordination between the TRICARE program and eligibility for making contributions to a health savings account, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5458

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 “Veterans TRICARE Choice Act of 2016”.

SEC. 2. COORDINATION BETWEEN TRICARE PROGRAM AND ELIGIBILITY TO MAKE CONTRIBUTIONS TO HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 223(c)(1)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and” at the end of clause (ii), by striking the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iv) coverage under the TRICARE program under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, for any period with respect to which an election is in effect under section 1097e of such title providing that the individual is ineligible to be enrolled in (and receive benefits under) such program.”

(b) PROVISIONS RELATING TO ELECTION OF INELIGIBILITY UNDER TRICARE.—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1097d the following new section:

“§ 1097e. TRICARE program: election of eligibility

“(a) *ELECTION.*—Beginning January 1, 2017, a TRICARE-eligible individual may elect at any time to be ineligible to enroll in (and receive any benefits under) the TRICARE program.

“(b) *CHANGE OF ELECTION.*—(1) If a TRICARE-eligible individual makes an election under subsection (a), the TRICARE-eligible individual may later elect to be eligible to enroll in the TRICARE program. An election made under this subsection may be made only during a special enrollment period.

“(2) The Secretary shall ensure that a TRICARE-eligible individual who makes an election under subsection (a) may efficiently enroll in the TRICARE program pursuant to an election under paragraph (1), including by maintaining the individual, as appropriate, in the health care enrollment system under section 1099 of this title in an inactive manner.

“(c) *PERIOD OF ELECTION.*—If a TRICARE-eligible individual makes an election under subsection (a), such election shall be in effect beginning on the date of such election and ending on the date that such individual makes an election under subsection (b)(1) to enroll in the TRICARE program.

“(d) *HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNT PARTICIPATION.*—(1) For provisions allowing participation in a health savings account in connection with coverage under a high deductible health plan during the period that the election under subsection (a) is in effect, see section 223(c)(1)(B)(iv) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(2) The Secretary shall submit to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue the name of, and

any other information that the Commissioner may require with respect to, each TRICARE-eligible individual who makes an election under subsection (a) or (b), not later than 90 days after such election, for purposes of determining the eligibility of such TRICARE-eligible individual for a health savings account described in paragraph (1).

“(e) *RECORDS.*—The Secretary shall ensure that a TRICARE-eligible individual who makes an election under subsection (a) is maintained on the Defense Enrollment Eligibility Reporting System, or successor system, regardless of whether the individual is eligible for the TRICARE program during the period of such election.

“(f) *PROVISION OF INFORMATION.*—The Secretary shall provide to each TRICARE-eligible individual who seeks to make an election under subsection (a) information regarding—

“(1) health savings accounts in connection with coverage under a high deductible health plan described in subsection (d)(1), including a comparison of such health saving accounts and the health care benefits the individual is eligible to receive under the TRICARE program; and

“(2) changing such an election under subsection (b)(1).

“(g) *ANNUAL REPORT.*—Not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on elections by TRICARE-eligible individuals under this section that includes the following:

“(1) The number of TRICARE-eligible individuals, as of the date of the submittal of the report, who are ineligible to enroll in (and receive any benefits under) the TRICARE program pursuant to an election under subsection (a).

“(2) The number of TRICARE-eligible individuals who made an election described under subsection (a) but, as of the date of the submittal of the report, are enrolled in the TRICARE program pursuant to a change of election under subsection (b).

“(h) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this section:

“(1) The term “TRICARE-eligible individual” means an individual who is—

“(A) eligible to be a covered beneficiary entitled to health care benefits under the TRICARE program (determined without regard to this section); and

“(B) not serving on active duty in the uniformed services.

“(2) The term “special enrollment period” means the period in which a beneficiary under the Federal Employees Health Benefits program under chapter 89 of title 5 may enroll in or change a plan under such program by reason of a qualifying event or during an open enrollment season. For purposes of this section, such qualifying events shall also include events determined appropriate by the Secretary of Defense, including events relating to a member of the armed forces being ordered to active duty.”

(2) *CONFORMING AMENDMENT.*—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1097d the following new item:

“1097e. TRICARE program: election of eligibility.”

(c) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2016.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days

within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5458, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 5458, the Veterans TRICARE Choice Act of 2016. This legislation, introduced by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART), addresses a gap in current law which prevents veterans and their families with TRICARE coverage who also choose to participate in a high-deductible health plan from utilizing a health savings account, or HSA.

While veterans or their family members who participate in TRICARE may also have private health insurance coverage, including high-deductible plans, they are prohibited from contributing to an HSA affiliated with a high-deductible plan. In order to contribute to an HSA under current law, an individual must permanently renounce their TRICARE eligibility because no mechanism to allow reenrollment currently exists.

H.R. 5458 addresses this issue by allowing certain TRICARE-eligible individuals to voluntarily pause their TRICARE coverage for a period of time in which they choose to contribute to an HSA. The bill also creates special enrollment periods should these individuals choose to reenroll in TRICARE at a later date.

Our veterans devoted their lives to defending our freedoms. We should not allow arbitrary, bureaucratic obstacles to stop them from making the best healthcare choices for themselves and their families. This bill creates a mechanism to improve veterans' health coverage options and provides them greater opportunities to save toward their own healthcare needs. It also ensures patients can be more engaged in their own care while eliminating the inconsistency in our Tax Code.

I applaud the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART) for bringing us this good idea today. I urge support.

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

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, November 17, 2016.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,

Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 5458, the Veterans TRICARE Choice Act of 2016, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. There are certain provisions in the bill that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services.

In order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee on Armed Services will forgo action on this bill. This decision is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration in no way diminishes or alters the jurisdictional interests of the Committee on Armed

Services in this bill, any subsequent amendments, or similar legislation. I request you urge the Speaker to appoint members of the Committee on Armed Services to any conference committee convened to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 28, 2016.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5458, the "Veterans TRICARE Choice Act." As you noted, the Committee on Armed Services was granted an additional referral on the bill.

I am most appreciative of your decision to waive formal consideration of H.R. 5458 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you waived formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on Armed Services is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in those provisions of the bill that fall within your Rule X jurisdiction. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees on any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include a copy of our letters in the Congressional Record during consideration of this legislation on the House floor.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

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

While we are here today to debate H.R. 5458, which focuses on one small part of the transition for veterans completing their service and entering the civilian workforce, I wish to take a moment to reflect on a broader issue.

While many veterans enter the workforce, and some may even be offered a health savings account as part of their insurance coverage, many millions depend on Medicare and Medicaid. Now, we in the Congress can't forget the role these programs play in caring for our veterans and their loved ones as they return to the workforce, as they age, or as they live with disabilities.

For more than four decades, Medicare and Medicaid have helped Americans from all walks of life by improving their financial and health security; but if you have been paying attention to the news lately, you know these programs are under grave risk next year with a new Congress and a new President.

As we speak today to honor veterans' service to our country, we must also think about the safety net that has been in place for many years to offer security. For example, today, nearly 1 in 10 veterans lacks health insurance at all. More than 340,000 uninsured veterans and their spouses live in States that have chosen not to expand Medicaid to cover more residents. If those

States offered coverage, these veterans would have insurance if we really cared about them—but their Governors apparently don't.

In Florida, more than 55,000 veterans and their spouses would be Medicaid eligible had the State chosen to cover individuals earning less than \$21,000 a year. In North Carolina, 32,000 veterans and their spouses, and in Texas 67,000 veterans and their spouses would be eligible. But their Governors saw fit not to care.

Slashing Medicare funding by more than \$1 trillion, as Speaker RYAN has proposed, is not a way to help veterans. Yet that is what will be in store next year. That is what people are talking about as what we are going to do in the new year. Turning Medicare into a capped voucher, privatizing the program, shifting more costs on beneficiaries, won't help either.

Now back to the bill at hand. For veterans who are receiving coverage through TRICARE, using employer coverage that offers health savings accounts coupled with high-deductible health plans can cause a problem. Under present law, eligibility for TRICARE coverage disqualifies a retiree from HSA eligibility because the TRICARE program is not a high-deductible plan. This, I believe, is a good thing, and it keeps health care affordable for veterans, especially those who do not have the option for other coverage.

While there is a difference of opinion in the committee on tax-preferred health accounts, the legislation recognizes that some veterans may have that coverage and could run afoul of current law because of enrollment in TRICARE. H.R. 5458 would provide that military retirees may disclaim their eligibility for the TRICARE program. This would allow a retiree who enrolled in a high-deductible health plan to receive or make HSA contributions.

When we considered this bill in the Committee on Ways and Means, the Department of Defense as well as the House Committee on Armed Services had some concerns with the approach in this bill, in particular, that TRICARE eligibility is a statutory entitlement that cannot be waived. If the NDAA conference language is passed later this week, this legislation will no longer be needed as TRICARE enrollment will be voluntary and retirees can move between employer-sponsored insurance and TRICARE, depending on which coverage is best for their current needs. In other words, this bill is going to last about 3 days, until we pass the NDAA on Friday and it is signed into law.

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART), the author of this bill.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for the opportunity to speak on behalf of my

bill, the Veterans TRICARE Choice Act.

Mr. Speaker, it was my honor to serve for 14 years as a pilot in the Air Force, and for my family—my wife, my children, and me—those were some of the best years of our lives. I continue to be amazed at the quality of those who serve in our military. It shouldn't become cliché to say this: These are some of the finest young men and women that our country has ever produced; they are strong, intelligent, dedicated, courageous individuals who choose to use their talents to serve the rest of us.

It makes me uncomfortable sometimes when I hear those of us who serve in Congress being called public servants when we know that the true public servants are the airmen, the seamen, the soldiers, the marines—and their families; let's not forget their families and their sacrifice as well—those who spend their careers either fighting abroad or preparing for that eventuality. As Americans, we should make it a habit to always thank these servicemembers whenever we see them.

As Members of Congress, it is our job to be wise in our foreign policy, to give our warfighters the resources they need to win and then to ensure that veterans receive the benefits that we have promised them. In fact, that third responsibility is the genesis for this bill, fixing a glitch that was brought to my attention.

As the gentleman has said already, it is just a glitch, just a loophole in the current law that was brought to my attention by a group of airline pilots. These pilots, many of whom are veterans, realized that, as veterans, they were unable to take advantage of all the healthcare benefits offered by their civilian employers. Many of them wanted to use HSAs but, because of the TRICARE eligibility, were legally unable to do that.

Mr. Speaker, HSAs are an innovative healthcare option that House Republicans have advanced as an important part of a market-driven, affordable healthcare system. In fact, HSAs are a critical component to the Speaker's Better Way agenda, which I think many of us are excited to see signed into law in the coming months. With that in mind, it makes no sense to lock veterans out of this benefit based on eligibility for TRICARE.

These pilots came to my office and had a simple request: Give us an on-off switch for TRICARE so the veterans who wish to use an HSA while retaining their right to return to TRICARE in the future can do that if they choose. It made sense, so that is what we did with this bill. The Veterans TRICARE Choice Act allows a veteran to suspend his or her TRICARE benefits for the purpose of enrolling in a health savings plan. If, for whatever reason, the veteran wishes to return to TRICARE, he or she can do so. It is a simple, commonsense fix with broad, bipartisan support.

I would like to thank Representative TULSI GABBARD, a fellow veteran with a distinguished career in the United States Navy and a current member of the Hawaiian National Guard. Representative GABBARD and I have been fortunate to work together on this bill for almost 3 years now, and I am grateful for her work to bring this bill to this point.

I would also like to thank Chairman BRADY, Chairman THORBERRY, Chairman TIBERI, Chairman HECK, and each of their staffs for their great work and their support in refining the bill and bringing it to the floor today. I am grateful for a similar measure that will be included in the National Defense Authorization Act we will be voting on later this week.

Finally, I would like to thank Nathaniel Johnson, a former member of my staff, a member of the Utah National Guard, a former combat medic who served in Afghanistan, and of course we called him Doc then. I would like to thank Doc, who felt compelled to see this bill through to its conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans deserve our most profound gratitude. Nothing about their military service should prevent them from accessing the same benefits as their nonveteran coworkers. The very least we can do for them is ensure they receive the benefits we promised them and that the process goes forward as smoothly as possible. I recognize we have lots to do on that front, but I am hopeful the passage of this bill will be one small step forward in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, the problem that this bill seeks to solve for our veterans is, unfortunately, not uncommon. I have heard from many of my fellow veterans, as has previously been explained, who have similarly not been able to access options widely available to their civilian coworkers because of the current limitations in the law; and that is what this bill seeks to do: correct it.

The Veterans TRICARE Choice Act simply gives veterans and their dependents a choice: They can opt out of TRICARE and contribute to a health savings account with more flexibility and coverage options without fear of permanently losing their TRICARE coverage; and if their situation later changes, they will have the option to reenroll in TRICARE coverage, plain and simple.

Our veterans and their families make tremendous sacrifices in service to our country, and that service should never limit their access to quality health care and their ability to make their own decisions about their own health and the health care for their families in the future.

I would like to thank and congratulate my friend and colleague, CHRIS

STEWART, for his leadership on pushing this issue forward, and I encourage my colleagues to join us in supporting H.R. 5458 today.

□ 1515

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is one of those things that you fill time with, and I guess it is not going to hurt anything. So I would recommend that all of my colleagues vote for it. It will be moot on Friday, when we pass the NDAA.

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to again thank Mr. STEWART for his efforts. This is a good bill that, as the gentlewoman from Hawaii mentioned, will help many folks—certainly, those that she has heard from and I know others have as well. I support more veterans having more options. I support the bill’s passage and urge my colleagues to support it.

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 Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5458, 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.

RESPONSE ACT OF 2016

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 546) to establish the Railroad Emergency Services Preparedness, Operational Needs, and Safety Evaluation (RESPONSE) Subcommittee under the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s National Advisory Council to provide recommendations on emergency responder training and resources relating to hazardous materials incidents involving railroads, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 546

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 “RESPONSE Act of 2016”.

SEC. 2. RAILROAD EMERGENCY SERVICES PREPAREDNESS, OPERATIONAL NEEDS, AND SAFETY EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE.

Section 508 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 318) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) RESPONSE SUBCOMMITTEE.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the RESPONSE Act of 2016, the Administrator shall establish, as a subcommittee of the National Advisory Council, the Railroad Emergency Services Preparedness, Operational Needs, and Safety Evaluation Subcommittee (referred to in this subsection as the ‘RESPONSE Subcommittee’).

“(2) MEMBERSHIP.—Notwithstanding subsection (c), the RESPONSE Subcommittee shall be composed of the following:

“(A) The Deputy Administrator, Protection and National Preparedness of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, or designee.

“(B) The Chief Safety Officer of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, or designee.

“(C) The Associate Administrator for Hazardous Materials Safety of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, or designee.

“(D) The Director of the Office of Emergency Communications of the Department of Homeland Security, or designee.

“(E) The Director for the Office of Railroad, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Investigations of the National Transportation Safety Board, or designee.

“(F) The Chief Safety Officer and Associate Administrator for Railroad Safety of the Federal Railroad Administration, or designee.

“(G) The Assistant Administrator for Security Policy and Industry Engagement of the Transportation Security Administration, or designee.

“(H) The Assistant Commandant for Response Policy of the Coast Guard, or designee.

“(I) The Assistant Administrator for the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response of the Environmental Protection Agency, or designee.

“(J) Such other qualified individuals as the co-chairpersons shall jointly appoint as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of the RESPONSE Act of 2016 from among the following:

“(i) Members of the National Advisory Council that have the requisite technical knowledge and expertise to address rail emergency response issues, including members from the following disciplines:

“(I) Emergency management and emergency response providers, including fire service, law enforcement, hazardous materials response, and emergency medical services.

“(II) State, local, and tribal government officials.

“(ii) Individuals who have the requisite technical knowledge and expertise to serve on the RESPONSE Subcommittee, including at least 1 representative from each of the following:

“(I) The rail industry.

“(II) Rail labor

“(III) Persons who offer oil for transportation by rail.

“(IV) The communications industry.

“(V) Emergency response providers, including individuals nominated by national organizations representing State and local governments and emergency responders.

“(VI) Emergency response training providers.

“(VII) Representatives from tribal organizations.

“(VIII) Technical experts.

“(IX) Vendors, developers, and manufacturers of systems, facilities, equipment, and capabilities for emergency responder services.

“(iii) Representatives of such other stakeholders and interested and affected parties as the co-chairpersons consider appropriate.

“(3) CO-CHAIRPERSONS.—The members described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2) shall serve as the co-chairpersons of the RESPONSE Subcommittee.

“(4) INITIAL MEETING.—The initial meeting of the RESPONSE Subcommittee shall take place not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the RESPONSE Act of 2016.

“(5) CONSULTATION WITH NONMEMBERS.—The RESPONSE Subcommittee and the program offices for emergency responder training and resources shall consult with other relevant agencies and groups, including entities engaged in federally funded research and academic institutions engaged in relevant work and research, which are not represented on the RESPONSE Subcommittee to consider new and developing technologies and methods that may be beneficial to preparedness and response to rail hazardous materials incidents.

“(6) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The RESPONSE Subcommittee shall develop recommendations, as appropriate, for improving emergency responder training and resource allocation for hazardous materials incidents involving railroads after evaluating the following topics:

“(A) The quality and application of training for State and local emergency responders related to rail hazardous materials incidents, including training for emergency responders serving small communities near railroads, including the following:

“(i) Ease of access to relevant training for State and local emergency responders, including an analysis of—

“(I) the number of individuals being trained;

“(II) the number of individuals who are applying;

“(III) whether current demand is being met;

“(IV) current challenges; and

“(V) projected needs.

“(ii) Modernization of training course content related to rail hazardous materials incidents, with a particular focus on fluctuations in oil shipments by rail, including regular and ongoing evaluation of course opportunities, adaptation to emerging trends, agency and private sector outreach, effectiveness and ease of access for State and local emergency responders.

“(iii) Identification of overlap in training content and identification of opportunities to develop complementary courses and materials among governmental and nongovernmental entities.

“(iv) Online training platforms, train-the-trainer, and mobile training options.

“(B) The availability and effectiveness of Federal, State, local, and nongovernmental funding levels related to training emergency responders for rail hazardous materials incidents, including emergency responders serving small communities near railroads, including—

“(i) identifying overlap in resource allocations;

“(ii) identifying cost savings measures that can be implemented to increase training opportunities;

“(iii) leveraging government funding with nongovernmental funding to enhance training opportunities and fill existing training gaps;

“(iv) adaptation of priority settings for agency funding allocations in response to emerging trends;

“(v) historic levels of funding across Federal agencies for rail hazardous materials incident response and training, including funding provided by the private sector to public entities or in conjunction with Federal programs; and

“(vi) current funding resources across agencies.

“(C) The strategy for integrating commodity flow studies, mapping, and rail and hazardous materials databases for State and local emergency responders and increasing the rate of access to the individual responder in existing or emerging communications technology.

“(7) REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the RESPONSE Act of 2016, the RESPONSE Subcommittee shall submit a report to the National Advisory Council that—

“(i) includes the recommendations developed under paragraph (6);

“(ii) specifies the timeframes for implementing any such recommendations that do not require congressional action; and

“(iii) identifies any such recommendations that do require congressional action.

“(B) REVIEW.—Not later than 30 days after receiving the report under subparagraph (A), the National Advisory Council shall begin a review of the report. The National Advisory Council may ask for additional clarification, changes, or other information from the RESPONSE Subcommittee to assist in the approval of the recommendations.

“(C) RECOMMENDATION.—Once the National Advisory Council approves the recommendations of the RESPONSE Subcommittee, the National Advisory Council shall submit the report to—

“(i) the co-chairpersons of the RESPONSE Subcommittee;

“(ii) the head of each other agency represented on the RESPONSE Subcommittee;

“(iii) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

“(iv) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

“(v) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

“(vi) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

“(8) INTERIM ACTIVITY.—

“(A) UPDATES AND OVERSIGHT.—After the submission of the report by the National Advisory Council under paragraph (7), the Administrator shall—

“(i) provide annual updates to the congressional committees referred to in paragraph (7)(C) regarding the status of the implementation of the recommendations developed under paragraph (6); and

“(ii) coordinate the implementation of the recommendations described in paragraph (6)(G)(i), as appropriate.

“(B) SUNSET.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall terminate on the date that is 2 years after the date of the submission of the report required under paragraph (7)(A).

“(9) TERMINATION.—The RESPONSE Subcommittee shall terminate not later than 90 days after the submission of the report required under paragraph (7)(C).”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S. 546, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, rail safety is critical to the transport of goods and services throughout our country. As chairman of the Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials Subcommittee, I have consistently worked to improve the safety of transporting hazardous materials by rail, especially crude by rail.

In the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015, and later in the FAST Act, Congress required response plans and adopted strong national standards for transporting hazardous materials by rail. Additionally, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has held several hearings at

both the full committee and subcommittee level to examine how Congress can improve upon what is already a very safe rail network.

I personally have facilitated training for dozens of first responders in my district to ensure they are prepared to respond in the unlikely event of an accident involving hazardous materials transported by rail. Recently, I traveled with my good friends, Ranking Member CAPUANO and Congressman FARENTHOLD, to Colorado and the Transportation Technology Center to see how the first responder community trains for tank car accidents and the investments our Nation's freight railroad are making to build a safer network.

The bill before us today is an extension of these efforts to build and advance rail safety across our Nation. The RESPONSE Act tasks both government and nongovernmental experts to develop recommendations improving emergency responder training for hazardous materials incidents involving rail.

It requires the evaluation of a number of issues related to rail hazmat incidents, including the quality and application of training for local emergency first responders. Additionally, it looks at overlap in training and ways to modernize training for emergency responders, especially those in small communities near railroads.

This bill will further improve rail safety and enhance responses to rail hazmat incidents. I saw how important this hands-on training can be in August at the Transportation Technology Center in Pueblo. I believe that this bill will build upon the safety of our rail network in communities like mine.

Again, I want to thank the chairman, Mr. KIND, and Senator HEITKAMP for working on this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill as well. I want to thank Ranking Member DENHAM, Chairman SHUSTER, and Ranking Member DEFazio for taking the lead on this bill.

Very simply, this is the simplest bill in the world, to be perfectly honest. It gets all the stakeholders together to simply take a look at the current responses we have when there is a disaster relative to rail accidents.

It gets them all in one room to take a look at best practices to figure out what they can do better and to see if resources are allocated well. It is not just Washington insiders. It includes people from the rail industry, people from the labor community, and people from the public safety community at local and State levels. It gets everybody at the table to do things that Congress is not equipped to do appropriately. We are not the safety experts; they are.

There is a time limit. This is not one of those endless committees that is

going to sit there forever. For 1 year, they get together, work it out amongst themselves, and come back with recommendations to us so that we can do our job well, which is to support the people actually suppressing these fires and maintaining the safety of our communities.

Again, I rise in support of this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, this is a great bill. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation.

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 California (Mr. DENHAM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 546, 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.

FRED D. THOMPSON FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6135) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 719 Church Street in Nashville, Tennessee, as the "Fred D. Thompson Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6135

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 719 Church Street in Nashville, Tennessee, shall be known and designated as the "Fred D. Thompson Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Fred D. Thompson Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 6135.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6135 would designate the Federal building and United States courthouse at 719 Church Street in Nashville, Tennessee, as the Fred D. Thompson Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for her leadership on this legislation.

Senator Thompson was an accomplished lawyer, actor, U.S. Senator, and a great friend. We spent numerous occasions together here in the Washington, D.C., area as he got to know new Members when we came in 2010. I have appreciated his counsel, his friendship, and I look forward to seeing this bill passed.

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

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to rise on this occasion to have the courthouse in Nashville named for a distinguished American, a friend of mine, Senator Fred Thompson, who is the only University of Memphis graduate to serve in the United States Senate.

Fred was an outstanding attorney and Federal employee. He made Tennessee proud when he was counsel to the Watergate Committee. In a phenomenal fashion, he gave people a good feeling about bipartisanship when a Republican such as Fred Thompson stood up and raised the questions that needed to be raised to end the illegal and crime-ridden episodes of Richard Nixon that were exposed in Watergate.

Despite the fact that Richard Nixon was a Republican, Fred Thompson saw to it that when the President acted in an untoward fashion, diminishing the Constitution, diminishing our government, all Americans should stand up and oppose such. Fred did it in an admirable way, and Richard Nixon resigned eventually, and Gerald Ford helped save our country. Vice Presidents can do that.

Fred served as an Assistant U.S. Attorney. He was a mentee of Senator Howard Baker, a great Member of the United States Senate and a great American. He was also a private-practicing attorney who had a case concerning pardons. It was a Democrat was doing things that were illegal. Ray Blanton from Tennessee was giving pardons that were improper. Marie Ragghianti stepped forward.

Fred Thompson wrote a book about Marie exposing illegal pardons. Somebody who did the script thought Fred could make a good actor. And Fred made a good actor. He did a lot of TV series and movies and had another ca-

reer besides politician and lawyer: actor.

He came to Memphis one time, I remember specifically, to speak to the Chamber. And he had a droll way about him. He said—and I guess he said it other places, as well—sometimes when I am in Washington, I miss the reality and the sincerity of Hollywood. Well, I laughed when Fred said it. I think about it often here.

When he ran for office, Fred took a little red truck and used it to campaign. He drove that truck around the State. People identified with it. He was ahead of his time. It was kind of like Donald Trump eating McDonald's, I think. He related to the common man with that truck.

I thought about Fred as I was flying up here. I just did get here in time. I was on one of the last of those regional jets, which was kind of like Fred's truck with wings on it. But we made it.

I want to thank Fred Thompson for all he did as an attorney, as an actor, and as a friend to me. He was bipartisan. He was always friendly to me. He was a courteous gentleman.

I came here when Fred won the National Conference of State Legislatures Award for looking out for States' rights. He was the only member of the Senate to vote on a bill that the NCSL was in favor of. And he was right. There was a province that belonged to the States that the Federal Government usurped because it was so wonderful to do and sets good brownie points back home. But Fred didn't do that. He stayed with his position that States' rights should be first and those areas of tort liability should have remained with the States. I came to see Fred get that award.

Fred had a wonderful wife and a wonderful family. One of his sons was a good friend of my mine. He still is. I am honored to be a sponsor of this bill. I am sorry that Fred left us, succumbing to cancer last year, but it is appropriate that we name the U.S. courthouse and Federal building in Nashville after this great American.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California for his work in moving this legislation forward and also my colleague from Tennessee for joining me on this bill. It is such an honor to bring it forward and to push for the naming of the Federal courthouse in Nashville as the Fred D. Thompson Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

You know, it is so interesting. Fred learned a lot about life and about the law working in the current Federal building. As that building has been outgrown and the need for a new one is in the works, it is so exciting to know that Fred's name will be emblazoned on that building. It is exciting for all of the residents of Lawrence County, Tennessee. That is where Fred grew up.

That is in the Seventh Congressional District.

Then, as Fred decided to go to law school and came back to Nashville, he settled in Williamson County, right there in Franklin and Brentwood in suburban Nashville. And that is where I got to know the Thompson family.

□ 1530

I know this is a very exciting day for them, to know that this is actually taking place, that the House is completing their work and we are sending this on to the Senate for Senators CORKER and ALEXANDER to do their part of the work on this building.

Many people did know Fred Thompson as an actor, and one of the things you would hear people talk about is Fred was a “character actor.” But that unassuming manner, the way he valued and embodied integrity, that was just Fred. That was how he lived his life, and he was a great “character actor” because he really played himself.

Whether it was “Marie,” whether it was the “*Hunt for Red October*,” whether you were watching him on the small screen or the big screen, he was exactly who he appeared to be, very unassuming, very dedicated, very smart, and a wonderful attorney.

Of course, his public service did start as an Assistant U.S. Attorney in Nashville in the old Federal courthouse, and that did grow. The Watergate Committee, as Congressman COHEN has mentioned, was where Fred really made a mark and where he became extremely close to Senator Howard Baker, who was such a role model for so many generations of Tennesseans and Americans. How exciting it would be for Senator Baker to be here to know Fred’s name was going to be on that courthouse in Nashville.

This is the right move for the right person. I encourage all of my colleagues to join in passage of this legislation.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, given Senator Thompson’s dedication to the law and public service, I believe it is more than fitting to name this courthouse and Federal building in Nashville after him.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6135.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 29, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
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 November 29, 2016, at 1:48 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2873.
With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

JUSTICE FOR ALL REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2016

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2577) to protect crime victims’ rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA and other forensic evidence samples to improve and expand the forensic science testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of forensic evidence, to provide post-conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to support accreditation efforts of forensic science laboratories and medical examiner offices, to address training and equipment needs, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2577

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 “Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016”.

SEC. 2. CRIME VICTIMS’ RIGHTS.

(a) RESTITUTION DURING SUPERVISED RELEASE.—Section 3583(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the first sentence by inserting “, that the defendant make restitution in accordance with sections 3663 and 3663A, or any other statute authorizing a sentence of restitution,” after “supervision”.

(b) COLLECTION OF RESTITUTION FROM DEFENDANT’S ESTATE.—Section 3613(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: “The liability to pay restitution shall terminate on the date that is the later of 20 years from the entry of judgment or 20 years after the release from imprisonment of the person ordered to pay restitution. In the event of the death of the person ordered to pay restitution, the individual’s estate will be held responsible for any unpaid balance of the restitution amount, and the lien provided in subsection (c) of this section shall continue until the estate receives a written release of that liability.”.

(c) VICTIM INTERPRETERS.—Rule 28 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure is amended in the first sentence by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, including an interpreter for the victim”.

(d) GAO STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(A) conduct a study to determine whether enhancing the restitution provisions under sections 3663 and 3663A of title 18, United States Code, to provide courts broader authority to award restitution for Federal offenses would be beneficial to crime victims and what other factors Congress should consider in weighing such changes; and

(B) submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subparagraph (A).

(2) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall focus on the benefits to crime victims that would result if the restitution provisions under sections 3663 and 3663A of title 18, United States Code, were expanded—

(A) to apply to victims who have suffered harm, injury, or loss that would not have occurred but for the defendant’s related conduct;

(B) in the case of an offense resulting in bodily injury resulting in the victim’s death, to allow the court to use its discretion to award an appropriate sum to reflect the income lost by the victim’s surviving family members or estate as a result of the victim’s death;

(C) to require that the defendant pay to the victim an amount determined by the court to restore the victim to the position he or she would have been in had the defendant not committed the offense; and

(D) to require that the defendant compensate the victim for any injury, harm, or loss, including emotional distress, that occurred as a result of the offense.

SEC. 3. REDUCING THE RAPE KIT BACKLOG.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts made available to the Attorney General for a DNA Analysis and capacity enhancement program and for other local, State, and Federal forensic activities under the heading “STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT” under the heading “OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS” under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE” in fiscal years 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021—

(1) not less than 75 percent of such amounts shall be provided for grants for activities described under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 2(a) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135(a)); and

(2) not less than 5 percent of such amounts shall be provided for grants for law enforcement agencies to conduct audits of their backlogged rape kits under section 2(a)(7) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135(a)(7)) to create and operate associated tracking systems and to prioritize testing in those cases in which the statute of limitation will soon expire.

(b) REPORTING.—

(1) REPORT BY GRANT RECIPIENTS.—With respect to amounts made available to the Attorney General for a DNA Analysis and capacity enhancement program and for other local, State, and Federal forensic activities under the heading “STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT” under the heading “OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS” under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE”, the Attorney General shall require recipients of the amounts to report on the effectiveness of the activities carried out using the amounts, including any information the Attorney General needs in order to submit the report required under paragraph (2).

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 month after the last day of each even-numbered fiscal year, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes, for each recipient of amounts described in paragraph (1)—

(A) the amounts distributed to the recipient;

(B) a summary of the purposes for which the amounts were used and an evaluation of the progress of the recipient in achieving those purposes;

(C) a statistical summary of the crime scene samples and arrestee or offender samples submitted to laboratories, the average time between the submission of a sample to a laboratory and the testing of the sample, and the percentage of the amounts that were paid to private laboratories; and

(D) an evaluation of the effectiveness of the grant amounts in increasing capacity and reducing backlogs.

SEC. 4. SEXUAL ASSAULT NURSE EXAMINERS.

Section 304 of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) PREFERENCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In reviewing applications submitted in accordance with a program authorized, in whole or in part, by this section, the Attorney General shall give preference to any eligible entity that certifies that the entity will use the grant funds to—

“(A) improve forensic nurse examiner programs in a rural area or for an underserved population, as those terms are defined in section 4002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925);

“(B) engage in activities that will assist in the employment of full-time forensic nurse examiners to conduct activities under subsection (a); or

“(C) sustain or establish a training program for forensic nurse examiners.

“(2) DIRECTIVE TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Not later than the beginning of fiscal year 2018, the Attorney General shall coordinate with the Secretary of Health and Human Services to inform Federally Qualified Health Centers, Community Health Centers, hospitals, colleges and universities, and other appropriate health-related entities about the role of forensic nurses and existing resources available within the Department of Justice and the Department of Health and Human Services to train or employ forensic nurses to address the needs of communities dealing with sexual assault, domestic violence, and elder abuse. The Attorney General shall collaborate on this effort with non-governmental organizations representing forensic nurses.”

SEC. 5. PROTECTING THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT.

Section 8(e)(1)(A) of the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (42 U.S.C. 15607(e)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in clause (ii), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting at the end the following:

“(iii) the program is not administered by the Office on Violence Against Women of the Department of Justice.”

SEC. 6. CLARIFICATION OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT HOUSING PROTECTIONS.

Section 41411(b)(3)(B)(ii) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043e-11(b)(3)(B)(ii)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting “or resident” after “any remaining tenant”; and

(2) in the second sentence, by inserting “or resident” after “tenant” each place it appears.

SEC. 7. STRENGTHENING THE PRISON RAPE ELIMINATION ACT.

The Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (42 U.S.C. 15601 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 6(d)(2) (42 U.S.C. 15605(d)(2)), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A)(i) include the certification of the chief executive that the State receiving such grant has adopted all national prison rape standards that, as of the date on which the application was submitted, have been promulgated under this Act; or

“(ii) demonstrate to the Attorney General, in such manner as the Attorney General shall require, that the State receiving such grant is actively working to adopt and achieve full compliance with the national prison rape standards described in clause (i);” and

(2) in section 8(e) (42 U.S.C. 15607(e))—

(A) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) ADOPTION OF NATIONAL STANDARDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year, any amount that a State would otherwise receive for prison purposes for that fiscal year under a grant program covered by this subsection shall be reduced by 5 percent, unless the chief executive officer of the State submits to the Attorney General proof of compliance with this Act through—

“(i) a certification that the State has adopted, and is in full compliance with, the national standards described in subsection (a); or

“(ii) an assurance that the State intends to adopt and achieve full compliance with those national standards so as to ensure that a certification under clause (i) may be submitted in future years, which includes—

“(I) a commitment that not less than 5 percent of such amount shall be used for this purpose; or

“(II) a request that the Attorney General hold 5 percent of such amount in abeyance pursuant to the requirements of subparagraph (E).

“(B) RULES FOR CERTIFICATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A chief executive officer of a State who submits a certification under this paragraph shall also provide the Attorney General with—

“(I) a list of the prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State;

“(II) a list of the prisons listed under subclause (I) that were audited during the most recently concluded audit year;

“(III) all final audit reports for prisons listed under subclause (I) that were completed during the most recently concluded audit year; and

“(IV) a proposed schedule for completing an audit of all the prisons listed under subclause (I) during the following 3 audit years.

“(ii) AUDIT APPEAL EXCEPTION.—Beginning on the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, a chief executive officer of a State may submit a certification that the State is in full compliance pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i) even if a prison under the operational control of the executive branch of the State has an audit appeal pending.

“(C) RULES FOR ASSURANCES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A chief executive officer of a State who submits an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall also provide the Attorney General with—

“(I) a list of the prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State;

“(II) a list of the prisons listed under subclause (I) that were audited during the most recently concluded audit year;

“(III) an explanation of any barriers the State faces to completing required audits;

“(IV) all final audit reports for prisons listed under subclause (I) that were completed

during the most recently concluded audit year;

“(V) a proposed schedule for completing an audit of all prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State during the following 3 audit years; and

“(VI) an explanation of the State’s current degree of implementation of the national standards.

“(ii) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—A chief executive officer of a State who submits an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(I) shall, before receiving the applicable funds described in subparagraph (A)(ii)(I), also provide the Attorney General with a proposed plan for the expenditure of the funds during the applicable grant period.

“(iii) ACCOUNTING OF FUNDS.—A chief executive officer of a State who submits an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(I) shall, in a manner consistent with the applicable grant reporting requirements, submit to the Attorney General a detailed accounting of how the funds described in subparagraph (A) were used.

“(D) SUNSET OF ASSURANCE OPTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—On the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, subclause (II) of subparagraph (A)(ii) shall cease to have effect.

“(ii) ADDITIONAL SUNSET.—On the date that is 6 years after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, clause (ii) of subparagraph (A) shall cease to have effect.

“(iii) EMERGENCY ASSURANCES.—

“(I) REQUEST.—Notwithstanding clause (ii), during the 2-year period beginning 6 years after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, a chief executive officer of a State who certifies that the State has audited not less than 90 percent of prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State may request that the Attorney General allow the chief executive officer to submit an emergency assurance in accordance with subparagraph (A)(ii) as in effect on the day before the date on which that subparagraph ceased to have effect under clause (ii) of this subparagraph.

“(II) GRANT OF REQUEST.—The Attorney General shall grant a request submitted under subclause (I) within 60 days upon a showing of good cause.

“(E) DISPOSITION OF FUNDS HELD IN ABEYANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If the chief executive officer of a State who has submitted an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(I) subsequently submits a certification under subparagraph (A)(i) during the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, the Attorney General will release all funds held in abeyance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(I) to be used by the State in accordance with the conditions of the grant program for which the funds were provided.

“(ii) RELEASE OF FUNDS.—If the chief executive officer of a State who has submitted an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(I) is unable to submit a certification during the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, but does assure the Attorney General that $\frac{2}{3}$ of prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State have been audited at least once, the Attorney General shall release all of the funds of the State held in abeyance to be used in adopting and achieving full compliance with the national standards, if the State agrees to comply with the applicable requirements in clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (C).

“(iii) REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—If the chief executive officer of a State who has

submitted an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(II) is unable to submit a certification during the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016 and does not assure the Attorney General that % of prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State have been audited at least once, the Attorney General shall redistribute the funds of the State held in abeyance to other States to be used in accordance with the conditions of the grant program for which the funds were provided.

“(F) PUBLICATION OF AUDIT RESULTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, the Attorney General shall request from each State, and make available on an appropriate Internet website, all final audit reports completed to date for prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of each State. The Attorney General shall update such website annually with reports received from States under subparagraphs (B)(i) and (C)(i).

“(G) REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL STANDARDS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, the Attorney General shall issue a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on the status of implementation of the national standards and the steps the Department, in conjunction with the States and other key stakeholders, is taking to address any unresolved implementation issues.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR AUDITORS.—An individual seeking certification by the Department of Justice to serve as an auditor of prison compliance with the national standards described in subsection (a) shall, upon request, submit fingerprints in the manner determined by the Attorney General for criminal history record checks of the applicable State and Federal Bureau of Investigation repositories.”.

SEC. 8. ADDITIONAL REAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) DNA RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Section 305(c) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136b(c)) is amended by striking “\$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “\$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021”.

(b) FBI DNA PROGRAMS.—Section 307(a) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-405; 118 Stat. 2275) is amended by striking “\$42,100,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “\$7,400,000 for fiscal year 2017 and \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2021”.

(c) DNA IDENTIFICATION OF MISSING PERSONS.—Section 308(c) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136d(c)) is amended by striking “fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “fiscal years 2017 through 2021”.

SEC. 9. PAUL COVERDELL FORENSIC SCIENCES IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.

(a) GRANTS.—Part BB of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797j) is amended—

(1) in section 2802(2) (42 U.S.C. 3797k(2)), by inserting after “bodies” the following: “and, except with regard to any medical examiner’s office, or coroner’s office in the State, is accredited by an accrediting body that is a signatory to an internationally recognized arrangement and that offers accreditation to forensic science conformity assessment bodies using an accreditation standard that is recognized by that internationally recognized arrangement, or attests, in a manner that is legally binding and enforceable, to use a portion of the grant amount to prepare and apply for such accreditation not more

than 2 years after the date on which a grant is awarded under section 2801”;

(2) in section 2803(a) (42 U.S.C. 3797l(a))—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “Seventy-five percent” and inserting “Eighty-five percent”; and

(ii) by striking “75 percent” and inserting “85 percent”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “Twenty-five percent” and inserting “Fifteen percent”;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “.06 percent” and inserting “.1 percent”;

(3) in section 2804(a) (42 U.S.C. 3797m(a))—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “impression evidence,” after “latent prints,”; and

(ii) by inserting “digital evidence, fire evidence,” after “toxicology,”;

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting “and medicolegal death investigators” after “laboratory personnel”; and

(C) by inserting at the end the following:

“(4) To address emerging forensic science issues (such as statistics, contextual bias, and uncertainty of measurement) and emerging forensic science technology (such as high throughput automation, statistical software, and new types of instrumentation).

“(5) To educate and train forensic pathologists.

“(6) To fund medicolegal death investigation systems to facilitate accreditation of medical examiner and coroner offices and certification of medicolegal death investigators.”; and

(4) in section 2806(a) (42 U.S.C. 3797o(a))—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) the progress of any unaccredited forensic science service provider receiving grant funds toward obtaining accreditation; and”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a)(24) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(24)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (H), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (I), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(J) \$13,500,000 for fiscal year 2017;

“(K) \$18,500,000 for fiscal year 2018;

“(L) \$19,000,000 for fiscal year 2019;

“(M) \$21,000,000 for fiscal year 2020; and

“(N) \$23,000,000 for fiscal year 2021.”.

SEC. 10. IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF REPRESENTATION IN STATE CAPITAL CASES.

Section 426 of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14163e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “\$75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting:

“(1) \$2,500,000 for fiscal year 2017;

“(2) \$7,500,000 for fiscal year 2018;

“(3) \$12,500,000 for fiscal year 2019;

“(4) \$17,500,000 for fiscal year 2020; and

“(5) \$22,500,000 for fiscal year 2021.”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, or upon a showing of good cause, and at the discretion of the Attorney General, the State may determine a fair allocation of funds across the uses described in sections 421 and 422”.

SEC. 11. POST-CONVICTION DNA TESTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3600 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “under a sentence of” in each place it appears and inserting “sentenced to”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B)(i), by striking “death”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “and the applicant did not—” and all that follows through “knowingly fail to request” and inserting “and the applicant did not knowingly fail to request”;

(3) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) order the Government to—

“(i) prepare an inventory of the evidence related to the case; and

“(ii) issue a copy of the inventory to the court, the applicant, and the Government.”;

(4) in subsection (e)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) RESULTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The results of any DNA testing ordered under this section shall be simultaneously disclosed to the court, the applicant, and the Government.

“(B) RESULTS EXCLUDE APPLICANT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If a DNA profile is obtained through testing that excludes the applicant as the source and the DNA complies with the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s requirements for the uploading of crime scene profiles to the National DNA Index System (referred to in this subsection as ‘NDIS’), the court shall order that the law enforcement entity with direct or conveyed statutory jurisdiction that has access to the NDIS submit the DNA profile obtained from probative biological material from crime scene evidence to determine whether the DNA profile matches a profile of a known individual or a profile from an unsolved crime.

“(ii) NDIS SEARCH.—The results of a search under clause (i) shall be simultaneously disclosed to the court, the applicant, and the Government.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “the National DNA Index System (referred to in this subsection as ‘NDIS’)” and inserting “NDIS”; and

(5) in subsection (g)(2)(B), by striking “death”.

(b) PRESERVATION OF BIOLOGICAL EVIDENCE.—Section 3600A of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “under a sentence of” and inserting “sentenced to”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively.

SEC. 12. KIRK BLOODSWORTH POST-CONVICTION DNA TESTING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 413 of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136 note) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “fiscal years 2017 through 2021”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) for eligible entities that are a State or unit of local government, provide a certification by the chief legal officer of the State in which the eligible entity operates or the chief legal officer of the jurisdiction in which the funds will be used for the purposes of the grants, that the State or jurisdiction—

“(A) provides DNA testing of specified evidence under a State statute or a State or local rule or regulation to persons sentenced to imprisonment or death for a State felony offense, in a manner intended to ensure a

reasonable process for resolving claims of actual innocence that ensures post-conviction DNA testing in at least those cases that would be covered by section 3600(a) of title 18, United States Code, had they been Federal cases and, if the results of the testing exclude the applicant as the source of the DNA, permits the applicant to apply for post-conviction relief, notwithstanding any provision of law that would otherwise bar the application as untimely; and

“(B) preserves biological evidence, as defined in section 3600A of title 18, United States Code, under a State statute or a State or local rule, regulation, or practice in a manner intended to ensure that reasonable measures are taken by the State or jurisdiction to preserve biological evidence secured in relation to the investigation or prosecution of, at a minimum, murder, nonnegligent manslaughter and sexual offenses.”

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 412(b) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136e(b)) is amended by striking “\$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “\$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021”.

SEC. 13. ESTABLISHMENT OF BEST PRACTICES FOR EVIDENCE RETENTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle A of title IV of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-405; 118 Stat. 2278) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 414. ESTABLISHMENT OF BEST PRACTICES FOR EVIDENCE RETENTION.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the National Institute of Justice, in consultation with Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies and government laboratories, shall—

“(1) establish best practices for evidence retention to focus on the preservation of forensic evidence; and

“(2) assist State, local, and tribal governments in adopting and implementing the best practices established under paragraph (1).

“(b) **DEADLINE.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Director of the National Institute of Justice shall publish the best practices established under subsection (a)(1).

“(c) **LIMITATION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require or obligate compliance with the best practices established under subsection (a)(1).”

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-405; 118 Stat. 2260) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 413 the following:

“Sec. 414. Establishment of best practices for evidence retention.”

SEC. 14. EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Effective Administration of Criminal Justice Act of 2016”.

(b) **STRATEGIC PLANNING.**—Section 502 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3752) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(A) **IN GENERAL.**—” before “To request a grant”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) A comprehensive Statewide plan detailing how grants received under this section will be used to improve the administration of the criminal justice system, which shall—

“(A) be designed in consultation with local governments, and representatives of all segments of the criminal justice system, including judges, prosecutors, law enforcement personnel, corrections personnel, and providers of indigent defense services, victim services,

juvenile justice delinquency prevention programs, community corrections, and reentry services;

“(B) include a description of how the State will allocate funding within and among each of the uses described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of section 501(a)(1);

“(C) describe the process used by the State for gathering evidence-based data and developing and using evidence-based and evidence-gathering approaches in support of funding decisions;

“(D) describe the barriers at the State and local level for accessing data and implementing evidence-based approaches to preventing and reducing crime and recidivism; and

“(E) be updated every 5 years, with annual progress reports that—

“(i) address changing circumstances in the State, if any;

“(ii) describe how the State plans to adjust funding within and among each of the uses described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of section 501(a)(1);

“(iii) provide an ongoing assessment of need;

“(iv) discuss the accomplishment of goals identified in any plan previously prepared under this paragraph; and

“(v) reflect how the plan influenced funding decisions in the previous year.

“(b) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—

“(1) **STRATEGIC PLANNING.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall begin to provide technical assistance to States and local governments requesting support to develop and implement the strategic plan required under subsection (a)(6). The Attorney General may enter into agreements with 1 or more non-governmental organizations to provide technical assistance and training under this paragraph.

“(2) **PROTECTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall begin to provide technical assistance to States and local governments, including any agent thereof with responsibility for administration of justice, requesting support to meet the obligations established by the Sixth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall include—

“(A) public dissemination of practices, structures, or models for the administration of justice consistent with the requirements of the Sixth Amendment; and

“(B) assistance with adopting and implementing a system for the administration of justice consistent with the requirements of the Sixth Amendment.

“(3) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—For each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021, of the amounts appropriated to carry out this subpart, not less than \$5,000,000 and not more than \$10,000,000 shall be used to carry out this subsection.”

(c) **APPLICABILITY.**—The requirement to submit a strategic plan under section 501(a)(6) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as added by subsection (b), shall apply to any application submitted under such section 501 for a grant for any fiscal year beginning after the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 15. OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

All grants awarded by the Department of Justice that are authorized under this Act shall be subject to the following:

(1) **AUDIT REQUIREMENT.**—Beginning in fiscal year 2016, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants under this Act to prevent waste,

fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

(2) **MANDATORY EXCLUSION.**—A recipient of grant funds under this Act that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this Act during the 2 fiscal years beginning after the 12-month period described in paragraph (5).

(3) **PRIORITY.**—In awarding grants under this Act, the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible entities that, during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this Act, did not have an unresolved audit finding showing a violation in the terms or conditions of a Department of Justice grant program.

(4) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this Act during the 2-fiscal-year period in which the entity is barred from receiving grants under paragraph (2), the Attorney General shall—

(A) deposit an amount equal to the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

(B) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

(5) **DEFINED TERM.**—In this section, the term “unresolved audit finding” means an audit report finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within a 12-month period beginning on the date when the final audit report is issued.

(6) **NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.**—

(A) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section and the grant programs described in this Act, the term “nonprofit organization” means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

(B) **PROHIBITION.**—The Attorney General shall not award a grant under any grant program described in this Act to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(C) **DISCLOSURE.**—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a grant under a grant program described in this Act and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subsection available for public inspection.

(7) **ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—Unless otherwise explicitly provided in authorizing legislation, not more than 7.5 percent of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under this Act may be used by the Attorney General for salaries and administrative expenses of the Department of Justice.

(8) **CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.**—

(A) **LIMITATION.**—No amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice under this Act may be used by the Attorney General or by any individual or organization awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this Act, to host or

support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than \$20,000 in Department funds, unless the Deputy Attorney General or the appropriate Assistant Attorney General, Director, or principal deputy as the Deputy Attorney General may designate, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host a conference.

(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food and beverages, audio/visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and any entertainment.

(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved by operation of this paragraph.

(9) PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this Act may not be utilized by any grant recipient to—

(i) lobby any representative of the Department of Justice regarding the award of grant funding; or

(ii) lobby any representative of a Federal, State, local, or tribal government regarding the award of grant funding.

(B) PENALTY.—If the Attorney General determines that any recipient of a grant under this Act has violated subparagraph (A), the Attorney General shall—

(i) require the grant recipient to repay the grant in full; and

(ii) prohibit the grant recipient from receiving another grant under this Act for not less than 5 years.

(10) PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Before the Attorney General awards a grant to an applicant under this Act, the Attorney General shall compare potential grant awards with other grants awarded under this Act to determine whether duplicate grants are awarded for the same purpose.

(B) REPORT.—If the Attorney General awards duplicate grants to the same applicant for the same purpose, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

(i) a list of all duplicate grants awarded, including the total dollar amount of any duplicate grants awarded; and

(ii) the reason the Attorney General awarded the duplicate grants.

SEC. 16. NEEDS ASSESSMENT OF FORENSIC LABORATORIES.

(a) STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than October 1, 2018, the Attorney General shall conduct a study and submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on the status and needs of the forensic science community.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) examine the status of current workload, backlog, personnel, equipment, and equipment needs of public crime laboratories and medical examiner and coroner offices;

(2) include an overview of academic forensic science resources and needs, from a broad forensic science perspective, including non-traditional crime laboratory disciplines such as forensic anthropology, forensic entomology, and others as determined appropriate by the Attorney General;

(3) consider—

(A) the National Institute of Justice study, *Forensic Sciences: Review of Status and Needs*, published in 1999;

(B) the Bureau of Justice Statistics census reports on Publicly Funded Forensic Crime

Laboratories, published in 2002, 2005, 2009, and 2014;

(C) the National Academy of Sciences report, *Strengthening Forensic Science: A Path Forward*, published in 2009; and

(D) the Bureau of Justice Statistics survey of forensic providers recommended by the National Commission of Forensic Science and approved by the Attorney General on September 8, 2014;

(4) provide Congress with a comprehensive view of the infrastructure, equipment, and personnel needs of the broad forensic science community; and

(5) be made available to the public.

SEC. 17. CRIME VICTIM ASSISTANCE.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 1404(c)(1)(A) of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10603(c)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting “victim services,” before “demonstration projects”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the proposed rule entitled “VOCA Victim Assistance Program” published by the Office of Victims of Crime of the Department of Justice in the Federal Register on August 27, 2013 (78 Fed. Reg. 52877), is consistent with section 1404 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10603).

SEC. 18. IMPROVING THE RESTITUTION PROCESS.

Section 3612 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) EVALUATION OF OFFICES OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY AND DEPARTMENT COMPONENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall, as part of the regular evaluation process, evaluate each office of the United States attorney and each component of the Department of Justice on the performance of the office or the component, as the case may be, in seeking and recovering restitution for victims under each provision of this title and the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) that authorizes restitution.

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—Following an evaluation under paragraph (1), each office of the United States attorney and each component of the Department of Justice shall work to improve the practices of the office or component, as the case may be, with respect to seeking and recovering restitution for victims under each provision of this title and the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) that authorizes restitution.

“(k) GAO REPORTS.—

“(1) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report on restitution sought by the Attorney General under each provision of this title and the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) that authorizes restitution during the 3-year period preceding the report.

“(2) CONTENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include statistically valid estimates of—

“(A) the number of cases in which a defendant was convicted and the Attorney General could seek restitution under this title or the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.);

“(B) the number of cases in which the Attorney General sought restitution;

“(C) of the cases in which the Attorney General sought restitution, the number of times restitution was ordered by the district courts of the United States;

“(D) the amount of restitution ordered by the district courts of the United States;

“(E) the amount of restitution collected pursuant to the restitution orders described in subparagraph (D);

“(F) the percentage of restitution orders for which the full amount of restitution has not been collected; and

“(G) any other measurement the Comptroller General determines would assist in evaluating how to improve the restitution process in Federal criminal cases.

“(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include recommendations on the best practices for—

“(A) requesting restitution in cases in which restitution may be sought under each provision of this title and the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) that authorizes restitution;

“(B) obtaining restitution orders from the district courts of the United States; and

“(C) collecting restitution ordered by the district courts of the United States.

“(4) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which the report required under paragraph (1) is submitted, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report on the implementation by the Attorney General of the best practices recommended under paragraph (3).”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S. 2577, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

On October 30, 2004, President George W. Bush signed into law the Justice for All Act of 2004. The law contains four very important sections related to victims of crime and improving the criminal justice process. The law protects the rights of crime victims and eliminates the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from both crime scenes and convicted offenders. It also improves and expands the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories.

Finally, it establishes the rights of crime victims in Federal criminal proceedings and provides mechanisms for enforcing these rights.

The bill before us today, S. 2577, the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, is a bipartisan and bicameral bill that builds on the 2004 Justice for All Act. It further improves the criminal justice system and ensures public confidence in it. It strengthens crime victims' rights and programs by increasing access to restitution for Federal crime victims.

The act also further reduces the rape kit backlog and provides resources for

forensic labs while protecting the innocent by improving access to post-conviction DNA testing.

The Justice for All Act works to improve the administration of criminal justice programs by increasing accountability for Federal funds and requiring the Justice Department to assist State and local governments to improve their indigent defense systems. Additionally, it ensures the implementation of the Prison Rape Elimination Act.

I commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for his hard work on this bill.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 2577, the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, and the complementary House bill that was authored by my good friend and colleague from Texas (Mr. POE), and my good friend and colleague from California (Mr. COSTA)—this is an important bill—and, of course, my Senator from the State of Texas, Senator CORNYN.

This bill now comes to the floor of the House as S. 2577. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation advances this Congress' efforts to enhance and improve our Nation's criminal justice system for victims, law enforcement, the courts, and innocent persons, while also fostering public trust and confidence in our criminal justice system.

It also reinforces the important work that the House Judiciary Committee has been doing under Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS. My greatest hope, as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, is that we can finish our work with the enormity of bills, sentencing reduction, prison reform, juvenile justice reform. I would like to optimistically think we might get these for the holiday season.

S. 2577 would reauthorize and improve upon various programs that began with the initial passage of the appropriately named Justice for All Act. I was proud to support this groundbreaking legislation in 2004, legislation intended to protect all persons who find themselves involved with the criminal justice system, and instill accountability throughout that system.

The programs we enacted in 2004 increased resources to boost the testing capabilities of forensic crime laboratories and eliminate the backlog of DNA samples from sexual assaults, crime scenes, and convicted offenders. I know this firsthand because Harris County—a very large county; fifth in the Nation—experienced this calamity, along with the city of Houston, the fact that these kits and other DNA evidence just couldn't seem to be tested expeditiously.

It also enhanced protections for victims of crimes, and established meas-

ures to prevent and overturn wrongful convictions.

The time has come to build upon the foundation we laid in 2004. Fairness and equal treatment under the law are two fundamental values of our Nation's system of justice. When the innocent are jailed for decades for crimes they did not commit, when victims watch their attackers go free because the physical evidence was misplaced or never tested, or when overworked forensic lab technicians provide false reports, the people's trust and belief in the system is diminished.

The bill we are considering today would strengthen crime victims' rights, programs, and services. In addition, it would further reduce the rape kit backlog, provide additional resources to forensic labs, improve access to post-conviction DNA testing, ensure implementation of the Prison Rape Elimination Act, and improve the overall administration of criminal justice systems nationwide, including increasing accountability, transparency, effectiveness and fiscal efficiency.

I hate having to give anecdotal stories, but, unfortunately, again, in Harris County, thousands of pieces of evidence were lost when they were in the possession of one of our local law enforcement structures. We have a lot of law enforcement layers. This happened to be a constable's office.

Mr. Speaker, you know how damaging and dangerous that is to victims' rights, to criminal justice, to the Constitution. That is why this bill is so very important. Being the victim of a crime is a harrowing, disorienting experience. We must do our best to erase or ease the suffering of victims and assist them as they work to rebuild their lives.

Under S. 2577, housing rights for victims of domestic violence would be expanded, and Violence Against Women Act funding would be protected from reductions due to Federal penalties. Other victim-centered programs would be reauthorized by this bill, including programs used to notify victims of their right to be heard in court, to offer victims legal assistance, and to provide interpreters for Federal crime victims who wish to participate in court proceedings.

Additionally, the Government Accountability Office will be required to determine the potential benefits to crime victims, if any, by broadening the authority of Federal courts to award restitution. Our crime victims need relief. We need to give them hope and a sense that we care about them.

The Attorney General will be required to evaluate the effectiveness of the Justice Department components and U.S. Attorney Offices in pursuing and obtaining restitution for crime victims. We all know DNA is a crucial element of many criminal cases, helping to identify suspects, perpetrators of crimes, and to exclude the innocent.

This bill would ensure that victims of sexual assault receive essential serv-

ices and are able to see their attackers brought to justice by renewing the DNA Backlog grant program and by expanding grants for forensic nurse examiners, giving priority to hiring full-time forensic nurses, establishing programs in rural and underserved areas, and training forensic nurses.

□ 1545

Agencies across the country would realize further reductions in their rape kit backlogs because the Justice Department would be required, under this legislation, to use at least 75 percent of the funds made available for forensic testing for direct testing of crime scene evidence, including rape kits.

Under this measure, Debbie Smith grant recipients would have to report on the achievement of activities conducted using grant funds. S. 2577 would require the Attorney General to report annually to Congress on how Debbie Smith grant funds are being used to improve DNA testing and reduce the backlogs.

I know that my good friend CAROLYN MALONEY has been involved in these issues as well.

S. 2577 would reauthorize funding for several other DNA grant programs, including the Paul Coverdell Forensic Science Improvement Grant Program, which helps States and local governments that need it greatly speak to the loss of thousands of pieces of evidence in a local law enforcement office.

In that same vein, the Attorney General would be required to conduct a needs assessment for State and local forensic science labs to better utilize Federal funding.

This bill would also enhance protections for the innocent by improving access to postconviction DNA testing, encouraging States to test DNA evidence in criminal cases for which there is untested DNA evidence, expanding State access to postconviction DNA testing funds by narrowing the evidence preservation requirement, and authorizing Federal postconviction DNA testing for individuals who can show exculpatory DNA evidence exists in their case despite having pled guilty.

We have a responsibility to make this criminal justice system fit in the four corners of the Constitution. That includes due process as one of the elements and certainly the response and caring of those individuals who have been victims. We have a responsibility to ensure the safe and humane treatment of individuals, even if they are convicted of crimes and in prison.

Compliance with the Prison Rape Elimination Act would be an all-but-certain result of the incentive structure set in S. 2577, which would require State and local governments to focus more resources on implementation of this legislation's directives, which we really need, while allowing the flexibility necessary to reach full compliance. For example, States that receive Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grants would be required to

develop a strategic plan setting out how the grant money will be used.

Finally, this bill includes various provisions to ensure Federal funds are used efficiently and effectively.

I believe that this bill answers our concerns on the question of criminal justice reform and constitutional protection for all.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 2577, the "Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016," as amended.

This bipartisan, bicameral legislation advances this Congress's efforts to enhance and improve our Nation's criminal justice system for victims, law enforcement, the courts, and innocent persons, while also fostering public trust and confidence in our criminal justice system.

S. 2577 would reauthorize and improve upon various programs that began with the initial passage of the appropriately-named Justice for All Act.

I was proud to support this groundbreaking legislation in 2004—legislation intended to protect all persons who find themselves involved with the criminal justice system and instill accountability throughout that system.

The programs we enacted in 2004 increased resources to boost the testing capabilities of forensic crime laboratories and eliminate the backlog of DNA samples from sexual assaults, crime scenes, and convicted offenders.

It also enhanced protections for victims of crimes and established measures to prevent and overturn wrongful convictions.

The time has come to build upon the foundation we laid in 2004.

Fairness and equal treatment under the law are two fundamental values of our Nation's system of justice. When the innocent are jailed for decades for crimes they did not commit, when victims watch their attackers go free because the physical evidence was misplaced or never tested, or when overworked forensic lab technicians provide false reports, the people's trust and belief in the system is diminished.

The bill we are considering today would strengthen crime victims' rights, programs, and services.

In addition, it would—
 further reduce the rape kit backlog;
 provide additional resources to forensic labs;
 improve access to post-conviction DNA testing;

ensure implementation of the Prison Rape Elimination Act; and

improve the overall administration of criminal justice systems nationwide by increasing accountability, transparency, effectiveness, and fiscal efficiency.

Being the victim of a crime is a harrowing, disorienting experience. We must do our best to ease the suffering of victims and assist them as they work to rebuild their lives.

Under S. 2577, housing rights for victims of domestic violence would be expanded and Violence Against Women Act funding would be protected from reductions due to federal penalties.

Other victim-centered programs would be reauthorized by this bill, including programs used to notify victims of their right to be heard

in court, to offer victims legal assistance, and to provide interpreters for federal crime victims who wish to participate in court proceedings.

Additionally, the Government Accountability Office would be required to determine the potential benefits to crime victims, if any, by broadening the authority of federal courts to award restitution.

And, the Attorney General would be required to evaluate the effectiveness of Justice Department components and U.S. Attorney Offices in pursuing and obtaining restitution for crime victims.

We all know DNA is a crucial element of many criminal cases, helping to identify suspects and perpetrators of crimes and exclude the innocent.

This bill would ensure that victims of sexual assault receive essential services and are able to see their attackers brought to justice by renewing the DNA Backlog Grant Program and expanding grants for forensic nurse examiners, giving priority to hiring full-time forensic nurses, establishing programs in rural and underserved areas, and training forensic nurses.

Agencies across the country would realize further reductions in their rape kit backlogs because the Justice Department would be required under this legislation to use at least 75 percent of funds made available for forensic testing for direct testing of crime scene evidence, including rape kits.

Under this measure, Debbie Smith Grant recipients would have to report on the achievement of activities conducted using grant funds. S. 2577 would require the Attorney General to report annually to Congress on how Debbie Smith Grant funds are being used to improve DNA testing and reduce the backlogs.

Further, S. 2577 would reauthorize funding for several other DNA grant programs, including the Paul Coverdell Forensic Sciences Improvement Grant Program, which helps states and local governments improve the quality of forensic science services provided.

In that same vein, the Attorney General would be required to conduct a needs assessment for state and local forensic science labs to better utilize federal funding.

This bill would also enhance protections for the innocent by—
 improving access to post-conviction DNA testing;

encouraging states to test DNA evidence in criminal cases for which there is untested DNA evidence;

expanding state access to post-conviction DNA testing funds by narrowing the evidence preservation requirement; and

authorizing federal post-conviction DNA testing for individuals who can show exculpatory DNA evidence exists in their case despite having pled guilty.

We have a responsibility to ensure the safe and humane treatment of individuals even if they are convicted of crimes and sentenced to prison.

Compliance with the Prison Rape Elimination Act would be an all but certain result of the incentive structure set forth in S. 2577, which would require state and local governments to focus more resources on implementation of this legislation's directives, while allowing the flexibility necessary to reach full compliance.

For example, states that receive Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant grants would be required to develop a stra-

tegic plan setting out how the grant money will be used to improve their criminal systems.

Finally, this bill includes various provisions to ensure federal funds are used efficiently and effectively.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation and I reserve the balance of my time.

The Justice for All Reauthorization Act is supported by a broad spectrum of organizations involved in, or affected by, our criminal justice system.

These organizations include—
 the National Sheriffs Association and the National District Attorneys Association;
 the Council of State Governments;
 the U.S. Conference of Mayors;
 the National Center for Victims of Crime;
 the Washington Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights;
 the Human Rights Campaign; and
 the Innocence Project.

In closing, I want to commend my colleagues in the House, including Judiciary Committee Chairman BOB GOODLATTE, Crime Subcommittee Chairman JIM SENSENBRENNER, and Congressman TED POE, sponsor of the House companion.

And, I also want to acknowledge Senator PATRICK LEAHY for his authorship of the underlying statute and for his leadership in the reauthorization of these critical programs.

For the foregoing reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this legislation today.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), who is an original cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. COSTA. I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding 2 minutes, and I want to thank her and the chairman, the gentleman from Virginia, for their hard work on this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as the lead Democratic cosponsor of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act and the co-chair of the Congressional Victims' Rights Caucus, along with my good friend and colleague Congressman TED POE, who I know wanted to be here and who has worked so hard on this legislation, we as the chairs of the bipartisan Congressional Victims' Rights Caucus want those groups out there throughout the country to understand how important this legislation is. The broad coalition of groups that are supporting this and the bipartisan group of lawmakers who worked tirelessly to get this legislation on the House floor today is making a difference.

The Justice for All Reauthorization Act will improve our criminal justice system, and it will strengthen programs for victims of crimes. The healing process for the survivors of violent crime, as we all know, can be extremely painful and it can be difficult.

This legislation also helps those survivors by providing resources to reduce, as has been noted already, the

rape kit backlog. It also improves housing rights for domestic violence victims. We have these centers in our congressional districts that many of us are familiar with where spouses and children go to escape violence. It also assists with hiring full-time sexual assault nurse examiners in every hospital throughout the country.

Additionally, this bill ensures that the guilty are punished and helps to protect the wrongfully convicted by improving access to postconviction DNA testing. One thing we have learned for certain over the last decade is that, in law enforcement, DNA testing has become an important tool to apprehend and to prove guilt where, in fact, we did not have that tool before.

These strengthened policies will better provide support for victims of crime throughout the country.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. COSTA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, these policies will provide better support for victims of crime throughout the country, especially those who live in rural regions, and we have many rural regions throughout the country. I represent one of those areas in California, the San Joaquin Valley.

I urge my colleagues in the House to support this bill, and I hope the Senate acts swiftly before the end of the year so this Justice for All Reauthorization Act is enacted before Congress adjourns.

Let us remember, Mr. Speaker, that these victims of crimes are members of our families; they are our neighbors; they are people who we know in our communities and in our congressional districts. We know who they are, and we know that these are innocent victims of crime. This legislation goes a long way to address their issues. I urge the support of my colleagues.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will close my remarks by thanking Mr. COSTA for his leadership. We know that our good friend Congressman TED POE wanted to be here. We thank him for his leadership and the many Members who engaged in this important legislation.

The Justice for All Reauthorization Act is supported by a broad spectrum of organizations involved in or affected by our criminal justice system. Let me share a few: the National Sheriffs' Association, the National District Attorneys Association, the Council of State Governments, the United States Conference of Mayors, the National Center for Victims of Crime, the Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights, the Human Rights Campaign, and the Innocence Project.

In closing, I would like to commend my colleagues in the House, including Judiciary Committee Chairman BOB GOODLATTE; Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee Chairman SENSENBRENNER; and Congressman TED POE, the sponsor of the House companion; and the work that we have done on the Judiciary Committee, as I started out my remarks, in dealing with the enormity of sentencing, passing legislation that will reduce the impact of mandatory minimums, prison reform that we have passed, and certainly looking to reform juvenile justice.

I, too, hope that the legislation that we are speaking of will move and be passed before this session of Congress ends. I would like to think optimistically that we may get some very important bills that we have dealt with in the Judiciary Committee passed as well.

I also want to acknowledge Senator PATRICK LEAHY for his authorship of the underlying statute and for his leadership of the reauthorization of these critical programs, and as I indicated, my senior Senator, JOHN CORNYN, of Texas.

I want to conclude by saying that I left Texas in the backdrop of a Federal court hearing that dealt with the broken bail system, another aspect of criminal justice reform, where 40 percent of individuals on misdemeanors who cannot pay \$150 or cannot pay \$100 remain incarcerated. What we are doing today is we are joining in a bipartisan manner to begin to approach some of those inequities by this legislation, and I know that we can move forward on many others. So I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this legislation today, which is an important bill, S. 2577, and the House companion.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for his hard work and his leadership on this issue, and I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) as well.

This is a very good bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote for the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, I urge the House to pass the Justice for All Reauthorization Act to improve crime victims access to justice, support law enforcement, exonerate the innocent, and strengthen and improve our criminal justice system. In the House, I would like to thank Representative JIM COSTA for joining me in introducing this important legislation. I would also like to thank Senator JOHN CORNYN and Senator PATRICK LEAHY for sponsoring this bill in the Senate.

The Justice for All Act of 2004 enhanced protection for crime victims, provided resources to expand the use of DNA and forensic technology to capture and convict criminals, and established safeguards to reverse wrongful convictions.

This legislation reauthorizes these important programs and also increases crime victims access to restitution and improves housing protections for domestic violence victims. Under this legislation, states will be encouraged to test unexamined DNA evidence in criminal cases to ensure that innocent people are not imprisoned for crimes they did not commit. But one of the most important things this law will do is tackle the national rape kit backlog by providing critically important resources to forensic labs. A victim of rape is sentenced to a lifetime of mental turmoil, but as rape victim Debbie Smith can attest, also knowing that your attacker is still on the streets is far worse.

Debbie was at home doing laundry one afternoon in Williamsburg, Virginia. Suddenly, a masked intruder walked through her backdoor and dragged her outside into a wooded area where he raped her repeatedly. Her attacker told her that if she called the police, he would return to her house and kill her. She was lucky to escape with her life. It was only after her husband begged her to contact the police that she agreed to take a forensic exam. Even though the police had a DNA sample, they didn't test her rape kit. Debbie was left in fear that her rapist would return to her home and kill her for reporting her rape. Finally, after six and a half years, the police tested Debbie's kit and put her attacker behind bars. Debbie has since become a fierce advocate for the elimination of the rape kit testing backlog that occurs all across the nation, and she has been a loud supporter of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act's provisions to address this issue.

As Debbie has said, I know that DNA testing gave me peace, and I want to make sure that other victims have that same opportunity. The Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016 is supported by over a thousand victim advocacy groups from around the country. I urge my colleagues to vote to pass this important, bipartisan piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2577, 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.

FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING HOTLINE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5422) to ensure funding for the National Human Trafficking Hotline, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5422

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

SECTION 1. FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING HOTLINE; PERFECTING AMENDMENT.

(a) HHS FUNDING FOR TRAFFICKING HOTLINE.—Section 107(b)(1)(B)(ii) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22

U.S.C. 7105(b)(1)(B)(ii) is amended by striking “of amounts made available for grants under paragraph (2).”.

(b) PERFECTING AMENDMENT.—Section 603 of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–22; 129 Stat. 259) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Victims of Crime Trafficking” and inserting “Victims of Trafficking”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall take effect as if enacted as part of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–22; 129 Stat. 227).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5422, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today we consider on suspension H.R. 5422. This bill corrects an inadvertent change made in the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 that caused grant funding for the National Human Trafficking Hotline to be processed through the Department of Justice rather than through the Department of Health and Human Services, as it had been historically.

The National Human Trafficking Hotline is a toll-free hotline, available to answer calls from anywhere in the United States, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, in more than 200 languages. The hotline’s mission is to connect trafficking victims and survivors to critical support services and to equip the antitrafficking community with the tools to effectively combat all forms of human trafficking.

This bill was introduced on June 9, 2015, by Congressman TED POE, a tireless advocate for the prevention of human trafficking and for trafficking victims, and the bill passed out of the Judiciary Committee on November 16 by a voice vote.

While Congressman POE is undergoing treatment for leukemia and is unable to be here, I want to once again let him know that he is in our prayers. We are confident in his recovery and continue to appreciate all his work on these important human trafficking matters. I thank Congressman POE for sponsoring this legislation that corrects an inadvertent drafting oversight, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5422, a bill that I have cosponsored in order to ensure funding for the National Human Trafficking Hotline, a crucial component in the fight against human trafficking, and also to pay tribute to my neighbor, Congressman TED POE, and join in wishing him a strong recovery. We look forward to continuing to work against the scourge of human trafficking. We have been told, of course, of Houston being the epicenter of such.

As I have said many times before, trafficking in human beings has no place in a civilized society. Congress decided 150 years ago that no individual deserves to be bought, owned, or sold. Our country is now faced with a modern-day version of slavery that denies victims of their humanity and violates the most basic American ideals of liberty and individual autonomy.

Human trafficking is the second fastest growing criminal enterprise: 4,177 sex trafficking cases and 824 trafficking cases were reported in the first 9 months of this year in the United States and its territories. Traffickers use trickery and, most often, coercion and violence to force victims to provide labor or perform sexual acts.

My home city of Houston has been identified as a hub for human trafficking, as I have said. I am proud to say that Houston and the entire State of Texas are working hard to stave off this growing threat.

In an effort to understand the problem and find real solutions, we held several hearings in 2014, including the first-ever field hearing on human trafficking held by the Committee on Homeland Security that I serve on. During that hearing, we heard from victims and survivors of human trafficking. They recounted indignities they suffered as well as the physical and psychological damage done while they were young children but still felt as adults. I am very gratified that Congressman TED POE participated in that hearing, and it was very constructive and instructive as we try to continue working on a solution.

I traveled to a stash house and witnessed the atrocious conditions under which these people are held and forced to engage.

We now know that a comprehensive, collaborative approach that includes lawmakers, law enforcement, victim advocates, community organizations, and social service providers is necessary to identify victims and lead them to safety, restore them, and bring their captors to justice.

□ 1600

The National Human Trafficking Resource Center plays a critical role in the effort to save, protect, and restore victims of human trafficking. The NHTRC is a national anti-trafficking hotline and resource center created and overseen by the Department of Health and Human Services and funded through grant money appropriated to HHS. It is very important.

In 2015, the NHTRC received more than 24,000 signals regarding human trafficking cases or issues related to human trafficking, which includes phone calls, online tips, and emails.

The NHTRC is invaluable to victims, survivors, and stakeholders involving the fight against human trafficking—connecting human trafficking victims and survivors to local, victim-centered support services that provide crisis intervention, urgent or nonurgent care, or lead them to safety; providing tools to fight against human trafficking; and reporting potential trafficking tips to law enforcement. This is a very valuable service and lifeline.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS), who has a long history of working with children, of arguing and advocating against the mistreatment of foster care children who find themselves disproportionately involved and subjected to the potential of human trafficking. I thank her for her leadership, for being a cosponsor of this legislation, and a Member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the National Human Trafficking Hotline.

I also want to join with my colleagues in wishing well Judge POE, and wishing him a speedy recovery. He has been a leader on this issue for many, many years, and the hotline is a critical feature of how we can address human trafficking in our country.

I also support the resources being managed under Health and Human Services. I believe it reflects the current awareness and knowledge that this really shouldn’t be managed by law enforcement. We have all heard the stories of women and children who have been taken from location to location and forced to have sex against their will.

Currently, there are more cases of human trafficking reported in California than in any other State. This hotline has served as a lifeline/vital resource to human trafficking victims and their advocates. In California alone this year, there have been over 3,000 calls received on the hotline, resulting in over 1,000 human trafficking cases being reported, nearly a third of which are minors.

Unfortunately, there is a growing body of evidence that youth who fall through the cracks in the foster care system end up trafficked. As of 2012 in California, 50 to 80 percent of the commercially exploited children had been involved in the child welfare system. Fifty-eight percent of sexually trafficked girls in the Los Angeles County STAR Court in 2012 were under age and were connected to the foster care system. In Los Angeles, we are fortunate

to have a STAR Court, but the purpose of this court is to deal with underage children who have been trafficked.

I recently hosted an event in my district in order to train faith leaders in my community to identify and direct resources to women and girls who had been victims of trafficking. Often, it is members of our communities who are the first line of defense for these girls.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEUGEBAUER). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from California an additional 1 minute.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, we must work to break the foster-care-to-child-sex-trafficking-victim pipeline by continuing to fund additional programs, like the National Human Trafficking Hotline, to help identify victims and provide them with the resources that they need.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me give my closing remarks and indicate that I am grateful in determining that the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, which, unfortunately, was enacted last year, mistakenly directed that funding for the NHTRC be given to the Justice Department instead of HHS, which would still be responsible for administering it. Therefore, we need to change the law to ensure that funding be directed to HHS so that it will continue to fund and oversee NHTRC in the same manner and efficiently as it has in the past. For that reason, this is an important initiative.

I commend again the actions and efforts and commitment of my colleague, Congressman TED POE. I wish him good health and thank him for continuing to work on behalf of human trafficking victims.

This bill is evidence that we have the ability to work together as a unified body to address issues that affect our country and, more importantly, that those victims of this dastardly human trafficking, when they feel so alone and cannot reach out, have a body of Members, House and Senate, who recognize the urgency and importance of this effort to help them restore their lives, but, more importantly, to stand in the way of this terrible and heinous act.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5422, a bill I have cosponsored in order to ensure funding for the National Human Trafficking Hotline, a crucial component in the fight against human trafficking.

As I have said many times before, trafficking in human beings has no place in a civilized society.

Congress decided 150 years ago that no individual deserves to be bought, owned, or sold.

Our country is now faced with a modern-day version of slavery that denies victims of their humanity and violates the most basic American ideals of liberty and individual autonomy.

Human trafficking is the second-fastest growing criminal enterprise.

4,177 sex trafficking cases and 824 labor trafficking cases were reported in the first nine months of this year in the United States and its territories.

Traffickers use trickery and, most often, coercion and violence to force victims to provide labor or perform sexual acts.

My home city of Houston has been identified as a hub for human trafficking. I am proud to say that Houston and the entire state of Texas are working hard to stave off this growing threat.

In an effort to understand the problem and find real solutions, we held several hearings in 2014, including a Field Hearing before the Committee on Homeland Security.

During that hearing, we heard from victims and survivors of human trafficking. They recounted indignities they suffered as well as the physical and psychological damage done while they were young children, but still felt as adults.

I traveled to a stash house and witnessed the atrocious conditions under which these people are held.

We now know that a comprehensive, collaborative approach that includes law makers, law enforcement, victim advocates, community organizations, and social service providers is necessary to identify victims, lead them to safety, restore them, and bring their captors to justice.

The National Human Trafficking Resource Center plays a critical role in the effort to save, protect, and restore victims of human trafficking.

The NHTRC is a national anti-trafficking hotline and resource center, created and overseen by the Department of Health and Human Services, and funded through grant money appropriated to HHS.

In 2015, the NHTRC received more than 24,000 alerts regarding human trafficking cases or issues related to human trafficking, which includes phone calls, online tips, and emails.

The NHTRC is invaluable to victims, survivors, and stakeholders involved in the fight against human trafficking—connecting human trafficking victims and survivors to local, victim-centered support services that provide crisis intervention, urgent or non-urgent care, or lead them to safety; providing tools to fight against human trafficking; and reporting potential trafficking tips to law enforcement.

Unfortunately, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, which was enacted last year, mistakenly directed that funding for the NHTRC be given to the Justice Department instead of HHS, which would still be responsible for administering it.

Therefore, we need to change the law to ensure that funding be directed to HHS so that it will continue to fund and oversee the NHTRC in the same, efficient manner as it has in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the efforts of my colleague, Congressman TED POE. I wish him good health and thank him for continuing to work on behalf of human trafficking victims.

This bill is evidence that we have the ability to work together as a unified body to address issues that affect our country.

I ask that my colleagues join me in supporting this bill today.

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

Let's pass this legislation in honor of Congressman and former Judge TED POE, who has been a champion in the battle against human trafficking. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Laura was a middle school counselor who noticed that one of her students had begun to act strangely. Laura's instincts were right. Out of the classroom, her student, Alyssa, had started to frequently flee her foster home and was often found in random locations with adult strangers. After some investigation, Laura learned that Alyssa had been lured into the business of having sex with adults. Traffickers did what they do best, identified a vulnerable young woman and lured her into the sex trade. Laura immediately contacted the National Human Trafficking Hotline, reported what had happened to her young student and they were able to advise her on how to proceed and what social services and law enforcement agencies to contact. Because of the hotline, Laura was able to save Alyssa's life.

The National Human Trafficking Hotline serves as an essential lifeline to victims of trafficking, but it also serves as an important source of information to those who suspect they have encountered a victim of trafficking and don't know how to help. This hotline is an essential tool in the fight against human trafficking in the United States.

H.R. 5422 is a bipartisan, non-controversial bill that makes a small technical fix to allow the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to continue funding the National Human Trafficking Hotline (NHTRC). In the House, I introduced this bill with Representative CAROLYN MALONEY. I would also like to thank Senator JOHN CORNYN and Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR for sponsoring this bill in the Senate.

Without the National Hotline's guidance, Laura may never have known how to help that poor child escape her traffickers. The hotline provides trafficking victims and survivors with access to critical support and emergency services, collects tips about potential trafficking situations and disseminates training and informational materials to help raise awareness in our communities. HHS created and currently oversees and funds the NHTRC. As it stands today, the funding for HHS's annual grants has been appropriated to the Department of Justice. This bill is a simple technical fix to codify the hotline within HHS and to help continue the important work being done by our nation's anti-human trafficking hotline.

Having the hotline under the jurisdiction of DOJ creates an unnecessary and unhelpful additional layer of bureaucracy. It forces HHS to be dependent on funds from DOJ to run the hotline. It is more efficient and effective for HHS to continue using its own funds to operate the NHTRC.

I urge the House to pass this simple bipartisan measure to ensure the continued ease of funding to the National Human Trafficking Hotline through the Department of Health and Human Services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5422.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ADVANCED RESEARCH PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 2016

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5877) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 and the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 to promote cooperative homeland security research and antiterrorism programs relating to cybersecurity, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5877

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 "United States-Israel Advanced Research Partnership Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. COOPERATIVE HOMELAND SECURITY RESEARCH AND ANTITERRORISM PROGRAMS RELATING TO CYBERSECURITY.

(a) HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002.—Section 317 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 195c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "and" after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraphs:

"(3) for international cooperative activities identified in the previous reporting period, a status update on the progress of such activities, including whether goals were realized, explaining any lessons learned, and evaluating overall success; and

"(4) a discussion of obstacles encountered in the course of forming, executing, or implementing agreements for international cooperative activities, including administrative, legal, or diplomatic challenges or resource constraints.";

(2) by redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as subsections (h) and (i), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

"(g) CYBERSECURITY.—As part of the international cooperative activities authorized in this section, the Under Secretary, in coordination with the Department of State and appropriate Federal officials, may enter into cooperative research activities with Israel to strengthen preparedness against cyber threats and enhance capabilities in cybersecurity."

(b) UNITED STATES-ISRAEL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 2014.—Subsection (c) of section 7 of the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-296; 22 U.S.C. 8606) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking "PILOT";

(2) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "pilot";

(3) in paragraph (2), by striking "and" at the end;

(4) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) cybersecurity."

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL FUNDING.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act or the amendments made by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RATCLIFFE. 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 gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that today the House is considering H.R. 5877, the United States-Israel Advanced Research Partnership Act of 2016.

Israel is our strongest and most trusted ally in the Middle East, and I am grateful to join with the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), my friend, in working to expand and strengthen this bond through long-term collaboration on cybersecurity efforts between our countries. H.R. 5877 builds on decades of partnership with the State of Israel by amending current law to authorize the Under Secretary of the Science and Technology Directorate at the Department of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to enter into cooperative research activities with Israel.

H.R. 5877 also amends the U.S.-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 by further formalizing the program and by adding cybersecurity to the list of research areas authorized under the act. The U.S.-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 currently authorizes the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct cooperative research programs to enhance Israel's capabilities in border security, explosives detection, and emergency services. My bill now adds cybersecurity to that important list.

Mr. Speaker, violence and instability in the Middle East present significant challenges for Israel as our major strategic partner in that region of the world, and enhancing collaboration between our countries is, therefore, essential to ensuring Israel's continued ability to defend herself.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced this legislation following an in-depth congress-

sional delegation that I led to Israel earlier this year, along with my colleague, Mr. LANGEVIN. While there, we were able to meet with Israel's top national security figures, including Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, to discuss homeland security and cybersecurity threats to the United States and Israel, and to develop strategies for better cooperation in defending against these threats.

Mr. LANGEVIN and I also met with Israel's cybersecurity firms to learn about their efforts and to discuss the potential application of these innovative technologies to U.S. homeland security. In recent years, Israel's tech sector has been booming with cybersecurity and technology startups, and many United States tech companies now have a presence in Israel. Much of Israel's success in the tech sector results from its development of a very robust cyber workforce, and we discussed ways to apply these lessons here in the United States.

The United States and Israel share a joint recognition that cybersecurity is national security, and that our two nations must closely partner to combat these growing threats. This is exactly why I was so pleased to be able to introduce H.R. 5877, the United States-Israel Advanced Research Partnership Act of 2016, and why I also express my strong support for Mr. LANGEVIN's bill, H.R. 5843, the United States-Israel Cybersecurity Cooperation Enhancement Act of 2016.

I thank my friend and colleague, Mr. LANGEVIN, for his bipartisan partnership on these very important bills. As the co-founder and cochairman of the bipartisan Cybersecurity Caucus, he has long been a leader on cybersecurity issues here in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank Chairman MCCAUL, Ranking Member THOMPSON, and subcommittee Ranking Member RICHMOND for their help in getting this legislation across the finish line today. I also thank Chairman ROYCE and the staff of the Foreign Affairs Committee for their assistance in moving the legislation to the floor today.

I urge all Members to join me in supporting this bill.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, November 14, 2016.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, House Committee on Homeland Security.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee regarding H.R. 5877, the United States-Israel Advanced Research Partnership Act of 2016. I agree that the Foreign Affairs Committee may be discharged from further consideration of that measure, so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding that forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar

legislation in the future. I also request your support for the appointment of Foreign Affairs conferees to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in your committee report, and also in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, November 15, 2016.

Hon. ED ROYCE,

Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5877, the "United States-Israel Advanced Research Partnership Act of 2016." I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will forego further action on the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing further action on this bill at this time, the Committee on Foreign Affairs does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Foreign Affairs represented on the conference committee.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the report on the bill and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. McCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security.

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 5877, the United States-Israel Advanced Research Partnership Act of 2016.

Mr. Speaker, both this bill and the subsequent measure that we will consider today are connected, as the chairman mentioned, to a congressional delegation trip that Chairman RATCLIFFE and I took to Israel earlier this year. I thank Chairman RATCLIFFE for his leadership on cybersecurity and other homeland security related issues.

The focus of our trip was cybersecurity, and we learned a great deal about the innovative work the Israelis are doing in this space, both within government and in the private sector.

Israel was one of the first countries to recognize the potential threat posed by interconnected computer systems, and they have been leaders in cybersecurity now for decades. For instance, the first stateful firewall technology was developed by an Israeli firm. Today, these firewalls are ubiquitous across the information security landscape.

□ 1615

In fact, despite its size, Israel is the second largest exporter of cybersecurity goods and services behind only the United States.

In addition to being a fertile source of public and private sector innovation in the domain, Israel is also the United States' critical strategic partner in the

Middle East. In recognizing this confluence of strategic and research interests, the Department of Homeland Security established a memorandum of agreement with the Israeli Ministry of Public Security that was focused on joint homeland security research and development efforts, including cybersecurity. As a founding member of the Homeland Security Committee, I remember when this MOA was first reached, and I think it is a very positive thing that we are working together on these types of issues with Israel.

This MOA provides an excellent foundation for cooperation between our two nations; but one of the common themes we heard during our trip was: Can we be doing even more? After all, it is my firm belief that cybersecurity is the most significant national security challenge of the information age in which we live.

It has certainly been a pleasure working with Mr. RATCLIFFE, who, very quickly during his time here in Congress, has recognized the significance of the challenge that is in front of us.

This national security challenge, of course, is not confined to any nation. On the contrary, our adversaries in cyberspace—most notably Iran—are infiltrating the networks in both of our countries. What is more, the interconnected nature of our information systems leads to a blurring of geography. A cyber threat against Israel could easily migrate to the United States or vice versa, and there is no Internet border patrol, if you will, that will preemptively stop it from spreading.

Some of these challenges can be addressed through collective cyber defense, particularly information sharing, which is why I am grateful that then-Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security Alejandro Mayorkas negotiated an enhanced cybersecurity cooperative agreement with Israel earlier this year that will promote engagement and collaboration by our respective computer emergency readiness teams, or CERTs.

One of the things that I have learned in my near decade as co-chair of the Congressional Cybersecurity Caucus is that the landscape evolves at a dizzying pace. While we must work with our allies to jointly use existing capabilities, it is only through the development of innovative new techniques and technologies that we have any hope of stemming the tide of the cyber attacks that we face.

With that background in mind, Mr. Speaker, I offer my full-throated support for the bill under consideration. H.R. 5877 expands an existing pilot program at the Homeland Security Advanced Research Projects Agency, or HSARPA, to further collaboration on cybersecurity capability development. This program is particularly important because it addresses specific needs from the homeland security community which may not be present in other

sectors and which may not be addressed by existing commercial, off-the-shelf products.

Cybersecurity is subject to the same valley of death, if you will, between early applied research and viable commercial product as other cutting-edge fields, and this bill helps ensure that innovative technologies will make it to market that are responsive to the needs of our DHS cybersecurity professionals. This last point, of course, is worth reemphasizing. While we face similar challenges on government networks as other entities, small businesses and government agencies all run Windows on their PCs.

We also face problems that, of course, are unique to nation-states. It is incumbent upon nations that believe in a free and open Internet to work together to preserve its immense benefit and to facilitate collaboration between our countries' innovators. It is natural for us to expand other areas of similar homeland security interests—explosives detection, border security, and emergency services—to include cybersecurity.

I am grateful for Mr. RATCLIFFE's leadership in bringing forth a bill that both cements existing relationships and expands them to the leading threat facing our Nation. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5877.

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

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I again thank Congressman LANGEVIN for his kind words and for his leadership in connection with this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining on my side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Rhode Island has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend Mr. RATCLIFFE and Mr. LANGEVIN for their leadership on this issue, and I rise in support of H.R. 5877, which speaks to the crucialness of cybersecurity as does the following bill by Mr. LANGEVIN.

It is interesting that, some years ago, as the chairperson of the Transportation Security Subcommittee, infrastructure was included, and cybersecurity was a part of that. During that tenure, we looked at the vast impact that cyber and security would have on the lives of Americans and on the people around the world. From water systems to sewer systems, an attack on the cyber system could clearly undermine the quality of life of people around the world. Obviously, Israel fully comprehended this in its enhanced level of innovative work when dealing with cybersecurity and particularly, as Mr. LANGEVIN said, in the importance of creating firewalls, which we have been able to see.

I congratulate the sponsors of this legislation and will say that we need to

have cybersecurity issues clearly in our eyes' view. I acknowledge the bipartisan work of the Committee on Homeland Security under the leadership of Chairman McCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON, and I acknowledge the Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies Subcommittee that has Mr. RICHMOND as the ranking member.

I also add my support for H.R. 5843, sponsored by Mr. LANGEVIN, which provides a pilot cybersecurity research program that will require the Department of Homeland Security to establish a grant program to support cybersecurity research and development and the demonstration and commercialization of cybersecurity technology in accordance with the agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of Israel.

I cannot think of two more important steps that are being made. I hope this legislation will pass before this Congress ends because, if there is any threat that is great to this Nation, it is the unintended impact of cybersecurity.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in the backdrop of seeing technology impact the recent election, I think that we clearly know that we have to be studious, that we have to be thorough, and that we have to make sure that systems work and that systems are protected.

I ask my colleagues to support the underlying bill and also H.R. 5843.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5843, United States-Israel Cybersecurity Cooperation Enhancement Act, because it will establish a pilot cybersecurity research program between our nation and our strongest friends in the region for the purpose of strengthening cybersecurity.

I support this bill because the bill requires the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to establish a grant program to support cybersecurity research and development, and the demonstration and commercialization of cybersecurity technology, in accordance with the Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the State of Israel on Cooperation in Science and Technology for Homeland Security Matters.

This bill will codifies and makes available funding for an existing mutual cooperation agreement between the United States and Israel on matters related to cybersecurity.

Grants provided under this bill may be awarded for social science research and technology intended to identify, protect against, respond to, and recover from cybersecurity threats.

To be eligible for a grant, a project must be a joint venture between:

(1) for-profit, nonprofit, or academic entities including U.S. national laboratories in the United States and Israel; or

(2) the governments of the United States and Israel.

Grants shall be awarded only for projects considered unclassified by both the United States and Israel.

Under the terms of this bill DHS must require cost sharing of at least 50% from non-federal sources for grant activities, but it may reduce the nonfederal percentage if necessary on a case-by-case basis.

DHS will also establish an advisory board to monitor the impartial scientific and technical merit method by which grants are awarded and provide periodic reviews of the actions taken to carry out the program.

The grant program terminates seven years after this bill's enactment.

The Science and Technology Homeland Security International Cooperative Programs Office will produce a report every five years by the Science and Technology must contain:

(1) a status update on the progress of such international cooperative activities identified in the previous reporting period; and

(2) a discussion of obstacles encountered in forming, executing, or implementing agreements for such activities.

As a member of the House Committee on Homeland Security since its establishment, and current Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security this bill is of importance to me.

I introduced H.R. 85, the Terrorism Prevention and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2015 out of well-founded concerns regarding the security of critical infrastructure of our nation from terrorists attack.

H.R. 85, directs the Secretary DHS to:

(1) work with critical infrastructure owners and operators and state, local, tribal, and territorial entities to take proactive steps to manage risk and strengthen the security and resilience of the nation's critical infrastructure against terrorist attacks;

(2) establish terrorism prevention policy to engage with international partners to strengthen the security and resilience of domestic critical infrastructure and critical infrastructure located outside of the United States;

(4) establish the Strategic Research Imperatives Program to lead DHS's federal civilian agency approach to strengthen critical infrastructure security and resilience; and

(5) make available research findings and guidance to federal civilian agencies for the identification, prioritization, assessment, remediation, and security of their internal critical infrastructure to assist in the prevention, mediation, and recovery from terrorism events.

H.R. 85, also directs the Secretary of DHS to: (1) appoint a research working group that shall study how best to achieve national unity of effort to protect against terrorism threats and investigate the security and resilience of the nation's information assurance components that provide such protection; and (2) establish a research program to provide strategic guidance, promote a national unity of effort, and coordinate the overall federal effort to promote the security and resilience of the nation's critical infrastructure from terrorist threats.

As we have worked to define and support the mission of the Department of Homeland Security we have worked to keep the efforts of the agency focused not only on the threats we have faced, but also the new ones that may come.

Collaborative agreements that can bolster the ability of DHS to be able to effectively re-

spond to cyber threats is in the best interest of the United States.

It is the responsibility of Congress not only to provide DHS with new guidelines, but also to provide the agency with the funding it needs to do the work of protecting this great nation.

For several Congresses DHS has faced a government shutdown and sequestration that has depleted its resources and stranded its efforts to do all of the work members of this body demands.

As I urge my colleagues to support this bill, I also remind them that the passage of new laws that require more of the agency should also mean that we should require more of ourselves as members of Congress.

We should support the work of the men and women of DHS as they stand to defend this nation from all threats including those that come from cyberspace.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5843.

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

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

This bill will meaningfully improve our homeland security professionals' ability to manage cybersecurity risk. It will do so in a way that also increases the capacity of our Israeli allies to operate securely despite the many and varied threats they face on a daily basis.

Again, I thank Mr. RATCLIFFE for his leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor. It was a pleasure to travel with him to Israel on this factfinding mission, and we both learned a great deal.

I also thank Chairman McCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON, as well as Ranking Member RICHMOND of the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, for their assistance in support of this. I also, of course, thank the staffs on both the Homeland Security Committee, Mr. RATCLIFFE's personal staff, and my personal staff for their hard work in bringing this to the floor. We could not do what we do without their invaluable assistance and due diligence. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, once again, I thank Congressman LANGEVIN, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5877.

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. RATCLIFFE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5877, 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.

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL CYBERSECURITY COOPERATION ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2016

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5843) to establish a grant program at the Department of Homeland Security to promote cooperative research and development between the United States and Israel on cybersecurity, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5843

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 “United States-Israel Cybersecurity Cooperation Enhancement Act of 2016”.

SEC. 2. UNITED STATES-ISRAEL CYBERSECURITY COOPERATION.

(a) GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary, in accordance with the agreement entitled the “Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the State of Israel on Cooperation in Science and Technology for Homeland Security Matters”, dated May 29, 2008 (or successor agreement), and the requirements specified in paragraph (2), shall establish a grant program at the Department to support—

(A) cybersecurity research and development; and

(B) demonstration and commercialization of cybersecurity technology.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) APPLICABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in carrying out a research, development, demonstration, or commercial application program or activity that is authorized under this section, the Secretary shall require cost sharing in accordance with this paragraph.

(B) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Secretary shall require not less than 50 percent of the cost of a research, development, demonstration, or commercial application program or activity described in subparagraph (A) to be provided by a non-Federal source.

(ii) REDUCTION.—The Secretary may reduce or eliminate, on a case-by-case basis, the percentage requirement specified in clause (i) if the Secretary determines that such reduction or elimination is necessary and appropriate.

(C) MERIT REVIEW.—In carrying out a research, development, demonstration, or commercial application program or activity that is authorized under this section, awards shall be made only after an impartial review of the scientific and technical merit of the proposals for such awards has been carried out by or for the Department.

(D) REVIEW PROCESSES.—In carrying out a review under subparagraph (C), the Secretary may use merit review processes developed under section 302(14) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 182(14)).

(3) ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.—An applicant shall be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection if the project of such applicant—

(A) addresses a requirement in the area of cybersecurity research or cybersecurity technology, as determined by the Secretary; and

(B) is a joint venture between—

(i)(I) a for-profit business entity, academic institution, National Laboratory (as defined in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005

(42 U.S.C. 15801)), or nonprofit entity in the United States; and

(II) a for-profit business entity, academic institution, or nonprofit entity in Israel; or

(ii)(I) the Federal Government; and

(II) the Government of Israel.

(4) APPLICATIONS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, an applicant shall submit to the Secretary an application for such grant in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary, in consultation with the advisory board established under paragraph (5).

(5) ADVISORY BOARD.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish an advisory board to—

(i) monitor the method by which grants are awarded under this subsection; and

(ii) provide to the Secretary periodic performance reviews of actions taken to carry out this subsection.

(B) COMPOSITION.—The advisory board established under subparagraph (A) shall be composed of three members, to be appointed by the Secretary, of whom—

(i) one shall be a representative of the Federal Government;

(ii) one shall be selected from a list of nominees provided by the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation; and

(iii) one shall be selected from a list of nominees provided by the United States-Israel Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation.

(6) CONTRIBUTED FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may accept or retain funds contributed by any person, government entity, or organization for purposes of carrying out this subsection. Such funds shall be available, subject to appropriation, without fiscal year limitation.

(7) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of completion of a project for which a grant is provided under this subsection, the grant recipient shall submit to the Secretary a report that contains—

(A) a description of how the grant funds were used by the recipient; and

(B) an evaluation of the level of success of each project funded by the grant.

(8) CLASSIFICATION.—Grants shall be awarded under this subsection only for projects that are considered to be unclassified by both the United States and Israel.

(b) TERMINATION.—The grant program and the advisory board established under this section terminate on the date that is seven years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “cybersecurity research” means research, including social science research, into ways to identify, protect against, detect, respond to, and recover from cybersecurity threats;

(2) the term “cybersecurity technology” means technology intended to identify, protect against, detect, respond to, and recover from cybersecurity threats;

(3) the term “cybersecurity threat” has the meaning given such term in section 102 of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 (enacted as title I of the Cybersecurity Act of 2015 (division N of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (Public Law 114-113)));

(4) the term “Department” means the Department of Homeland Security; and

(5) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and the gen-

tleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

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

I thank my colleague, Mr. LANGEVIN, for offering this very important piece of legislation today.

As I mentioned earlier, both H.R. 5843 and H.R. 5877 were the result of our successful congressional delegation to the State of Israel, where we heard and learned firsthand about the importance of strong collaboration between our two nations—the United States and Israel.

This legislation further builds on the existing agreements between the United States and Israel by authorizing the Secretary to carry out a grant program to bolster the cyber defenses of both countries. It is vitally important that the United States and Israel have robust and innovative cyber defenses in order to stay ahead of our adversaries, and this legislation will help ensure that that is achieved.

Again, I thank Mr. LANGEVIN and his staff for their partnership on this very important issue, and I urge all Members to join me in supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 5843, the United States-Israel Cybersecurity Cooperation Enhancement Act of 2016. Much like the previous bill, H.R. 5843 is about enhancing cooperation with our allies in Israel to develop innovative cybersecurity solutions that are directly responsive to the needs of our national security.

Specifically, the bill creates a cybersecurity grant program for joint research and development ventures between Israeli and American entities. Projects would be selected after a merit-review—peer-review—process and would have to address requirements in cybersecurity that are determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security. The grants would also be subject to a cost-sharing requirement, with at least 50 percent of project funds coming from a non-Federal source.

Importantly, H.R. 5843 leverages existing United States-Israel R&D infrastructure, specifically the Binational Industrial Research and Development, or BIRD, Foundation and the Binational Science Foundation, or BSF. Both organizations have a proven track record of encouraging joint research efforts.

BIRD, for instance, has financed R&D and commercialization projects that have led to a cumulative \$8 billion in commercial sales since its founding while BSF regularly funds collaborations between the top scientists in our respective countries, as 45 Nobel laureates have received support from the foundation. Using the existing infrastructure, as was done in 2007 when Congress passed the Energy Independence and Security Act, which led to the creation of BIRD Energy, also allows us to capitalize on both foundations' robust networks of American and Israeli entities to help seed these joint efforts.

All of these factors are particularly critical in the fast-moving cybersecurity domain where offensive and defensive tactics and techniques change on a monthly or on even a weekly basis.

□ 1630

As such, advances in the discipline require a near constant reexamining of assumptions, and having people from different backgrounds and security cultures working together engenders an environment where such reexamination is encouraged.

While both the U.S. and Israel have robust cybersecurity communities, further collaboration is needed to spur more advances to combat the threats that we face. Although some of these advances are technological in nature, basic cybersecurity research, such as investigations into the psychology of secure interface design and social engineering, is also supported by the bill.

All told, the programs authorized in H.R. 5843 and H.R. 5877 will both address urgent homeland security needs and build capacity for further transnational collaboration on cybersecurity, all while matching Federal investment with private dollars and funds from the Israeli Government.

As with any bill to make it to the floor, both H.R. 5843 and H.R. 5877 owe much to the dedicated staff who spent hours behind the scenes reviewing the legislation. In particular, I would like to thank Brett DeWitt, Christopher Schepis, and Erik Peterson from the Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, who joined Representative RATCLIFFE and me on the congressional delegation trip that we took to Israel, as well as Emily Leviner on Mr. RATCLIFFE's personal staff and Nick Leiserson on my own staff.

I am also very grateful, of course, to Chairman MCCAUL, Ranking Member THOMPSON, and Subcommittee Ranking Member RICHMOND for their continued leadership on the issue of cybersecurity and for their assistance in quickly actualizing the lessons we learned on our trip to Israel.

Finally, once again, I owe a debt of gratitude to the gentleman across the aisle, Mr. RATCLIFFE, who, in just in his first term, has immediately had a substantial impact on our Nation's cy-

bersecurity, as I said previously, and with whom it has been a great pleasure to work.

Mr. Speaker, taken together, H.R. 5843 and H.R. 5877 do three things: they encourage innovative approaches to address top priorities in homeland security R&D; they strengthen ties with Israel, one of our closest allies; and they do so in a public-private partnership that matches Federal investment. I urge Members to support H.R. 5843. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman LANGEVIN for his kind words. I would also like to congratulate him on his hard work and his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This bill is about innovation. It is a bill about bringing together the best minds in the U.S. and in Israel to help manage what has become an intractable problem. It is a bill that is sorely needed.

In the past year, just by way of example, we have seen the first cyber attack on a power grid in Ukraine. Many devices that are part of the Internet of Things have been compromised and used to attack Web sites and services.

Most disturbingly, the very foundation of our democracy, our voting system, has been targeted in a Russian information warfare campaign that leverages hacked documents. These are the national and Homeland Security threats that keep me up at night, and they are also the same types of threats that motivate the Israel National Cyber Bureau.

Working together, I believe that we can make meaningful progress to reduce the nation-state specific risk both countries face and better secure the entire Internet ecosystem.

I hope my colleagues in the Senate will move quickly to take up this issue. I would like to particularly thank my dear friend and home State colleague, Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, for his efforts in this regard. He has been the leader in so many ways on the Senate side on cybersecurity, among other things, and has been an invaluable partner to me in this effort.

Again, let me thank Representative RATCLIFFE for his work on this bill and his leadership on the committee.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman LANGEVIN, and I urge my colleagues to support his bill, H.R. 5843.

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. RATCLIFFE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5843, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR HEADSTONES, MARKERS, AND MEDALLIONS FOR MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4757) to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the eligibility for headstones, markers, and medallions furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for deceased individuals who were awarded the Medal of Honor and are buried in private cemeteries, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4757

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

SECTION 1. EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR HEADSTONES, MARKERS, AND MEDALLIONS FOR MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS.

Section 2306(d) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5)(A) In carrying out this subsection with respect to a deceased individual described in subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall furnish, upon request, a headstone or marker under paragraph (1) or a medallion under paragraph (4) that signifies the deceased's status as a Medal of Honor recipient.

“(B) If the Secretary furnished a headstone, marker, or medallion under paragraph (1) or (4) for a deceased individual described in subparagraph (C) that does not signify the deceased's status as a Medal of Honor recipient, the Secretary shall, upon request, replace such headstone, marker, or medallion with a headstone, marker, or medallion, as the case may be, that so signifies the deceased's status as a Medal of Honor recipient.

“(C) A deceased individual described in this subparagraph is a deceased individual who—

“(i) served in the Armed Forces on or after April 6, 1917;

“(ii) is eligible for a headstone or marker furnished under paragraph (1) or a medallion furnished under paragraph (4) (or would be so eligible for such headstone, marker, or medallion but for the date of the death of the individual); and

“(iii) was awarded the Medal of Honor (including posthumously).”.

SEC. 2. EXPANSION OF PRESIDENTIAL MEMORIAL CERTIFICATE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 112(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “veterans,” and all that follows through “service,” and inserting the following: “persons eligible for burial in a national cemetery by reason of any of paragraphs (1), (2), (3), or (7) of section 2402(a) of this title.”.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the

death of a person eligible for burial in a national cemetery by reason of paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (7) of section 2402(a) of title 38, United States Code, occurring before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on H.R. 4757, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge all of our colleagues to support H.R. 4757, as amended. This bill would expand two different honors for our Nation's heroes, guaranteeing that their service would never be forgotten.

First, the bill would expand eligibility for a Presidential Memorial Certificate to members of the National Guard or Reserve. Mr. Speaker, Presidential Memorial Certificates are engraved certificates that are signed by the President and sent to a deceased servicemember's family, honoring their loved one's service and sacrifice to our country. My bill would ensure that all service is recognized and cherished because all servicemembers take the exact same oath to support and to defend the Constitution of the United States.

Second, H.R. 4757, as amended, would allow the VA to furnish a headstone, marker, or medallion signifying that the deceased was awarded the Medal of Honor. We all know that veterans who were awarded the Medal of Honor, the highest award for valor, deserve to have their service recognized both in life and after they pass. This bill would make it easier for visitors at any cemetery to pay their respects to Medal of Honor recipients by allowing them to quickly identify our national heroes.

Moreover, these headstones, markers, or medallions will also continue to inspire the next generation of Americans who will be serving our country. I hope that in 100, 200, or even 1,000 years from now future Americans will still take the time to find the graves of these incredibly brave men and women and give thanks that they are living in the greatest Nation in the history of this world. This legislation would help us fulfill our duty as a nation to encourage continued respect and admiration for those that have gone on before us.

I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 4757, as amended.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise to offer my unqualified support for H.R. 4757, Chairman MILLER's bill that updates current law to ensure our Nation's heroes are accorded the recognition they deserve, particularly those afforded the Nation's highest honor for valor, the Medal of Honor.

First, H.R. 4757 directs the VA to provide, upon request, a distinctive headstone, marker, or medallion to Medal of Honor recipients who are buried in private cemeteries. This bill is necessary because current law actually prohibits the Secretary from furnishing these honors to recipients not buried in national cemeteries.

Second, while the VA sends a Presidential Memorial Certificate that expresses the Nation's recognition and gratitude of military service to family members of a deceased veteran, current law limits Presidential Memorial Certificates to the families of those who served in regular armed services or National Guard and Reserve members who were called to Active Duty. H.R. 4757 very rightly expands eligibility for a Presidential Memorial Certificate to members of the Reserve component of the Armed Forces and the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard eligible for interment or inurnment in national cemeteries.

Finally, current law only allows VA to pay for the cost of transporting the remains of a deceased veteran to the nearest open national cemetery. If it is the family's choice instead to be buried in a State or tribal veteran's cemetery, H.R. 4757 authorizes VA to pay the costs associated with transporting the remains of an eligible deceased veteran to that cemetery nearest to the deceased veteran's last residence.

Mr. Speaker, honoring the memory of deceased veterans is our greatest responsibility at the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and I am pleased to support Chairman MILLER's legislation which refines and improves on the ways we are doing that. I encourage my colleagues to support this important legislation and join me in passing H.R. 4757, as amended.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I, too, urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 4757, as amended.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4757, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROTECTING VETERANS' EDUCATIONAL CHOICE ACT OF 2016

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5047) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Labor to provide information to veterans and members of the Armed Forces about articulation agreements between institutions of higher learning, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5047

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 "Protecting Veterans' Educational Choice Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS PROVISION OF INFORMATION ON ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING.

(a) INFORMATION.—Department of Veterans Affairs counselors who provide educational or vocational counseling services pursuant to section 3697A of title 38, United States Code, shall provide to any eligible individual who requests such counseling services information about the articulation agreements of each institution of higher learning in which the veteran is interested.

(b) CERTIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY.—When the Secretary of Veterans Affairs provides to a veteran a certification of eligibility for educational assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary shall also include detailed information on such educational assistance, including information on requesting education counseling services and on articulation agreements.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "institution of higher learning" has the meaning given such term in section 3452(f) of title 38, United States Code.

(2) The term "articulation agreement" has the meaning given such term in section 486A of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-329; 20 U.S.C. 1093a).

(d) DEADLINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall implement this section not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material and other items to H.R. 5047.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5047, the Protecting Veterans' Educational Choice Act of 2016, would further protect student veterans by requiring that, when the Department of Veterans Affairs

provides educational counseling or a certificate of eligibility to veterans or servicemembers who are eligible for VA education benefits, the Department also provide information on articulation agreements at institutions of higher learning.

□ 1645

The Post-9/11 GI Bill has benefitted more than 1.5 million servicemembers, veterans, and their dependents since its inception in 2009. While many of these beneficiaries complete their entire program of education at one school, we often see individuals who transfer to another school in the middle of their program due to a plethora of circumstances. If they do transfer schools, their previously earned credits can play a large role in determining the length of time it may take for students to complete their program at the new school that they have chosen to go to, and in some cases not all earned credits will transfer. Often, the transferability of certain credits between different institutions of higher learning is not always on an individual's radar when they apply for a certain school or a certain program, and a veteran may or may not have understood how credits transfer when they first initiated their education career.

H.R. 5047 would simply provide our student veterans with additional information as they apply to and attend schools by requiring VA to provide information on articulation agreements at a particular school and that school's agreements with another institution. Our veterans and their dependents deserve full transparency as they set out to use their hard-earned benefits. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE) for introducing this bipartisan legislation which has my complete support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5047, the Protecting Veterans' Educational Choice Act of 2016. I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE) for introducing this commendable legislation.

This bill would require the VA to include information about the educational services available to all veterans seeking to use their Post-9/11 GI Bill benefits, and it would require VA counselors who provide educational or vocational counseling to inform the veterans about the articulation agreements that exist between schools that govern the transfer of credits. Articulation agreements refer to formal agreements between two or more institutions of higher learning, documenting the credit transfer policies for a specific academic program.

Student veterans have an important decision to make when they choose a college or university to attend with their Post-9/11 GI Bill benefits. It is essential that they understand at the

outset whether they could transfer their credits to another college or university down the line.

We have seen too many examples of student veterans depleting their limited GI Bill benefits to attend for-profit colleges, only to find out later that their opportunities to transfer to schools without losing time, money, and credit hours are severely limited.

Ensuring that student veterans know in advance whether a school will give them credit for completed courses if they choose to transfer will help veterans avoid choosing schools where their credits will not transfer, thus saving them both time and their hard-earned Post-9/11 GI Bill benefits.

I thank Representative HICE for introducing this important piece of legislation, which I am proud to cosponsor and support.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the 10th District of Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE), the sponsor of this particular piece of legislation, the gentleman from the great community of Monroe.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, obviously I rise in strong support of this bill, H.R. 5047, the Protecting Veterans' Educational Choice Act of 2016.

Let me just extend a very sincere and heartfelt thank you to Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member TAKANO—who, by the way, is an original cosponsor of this bill—for their support of this bill and overall wide support for this bill. I appreciate the comments that both of my colleagues have made pertaining to this bill.

The Post-9/11 GI Bill, I believe without question, is the most generous educational benefit that our Nation has ever passed. As has already been mentioned, over a million student veterans have benefitted tremendously from that particular piece of legislation. Some of the benefits include help to cover cost of tuition, books, supplies, even housing. Yet, in spite of all this, we still find that many of our veterans find themselves still having to take out student loans. Part of the reason for that is, as has been discussed by my colleagues, many of these veterans, as they are going to various schools somewhere in the midst of the process, discover that the credits that they have received from this school won't transfer over here; and somewhere in the middle of that timeframe, much of their GI Bill has already been spent, and so they find themselves in an extremely difficult and awkward position.

I won't reiterate the details of this bill because it has already been done, but the basics of this addresses that problem, Mr. Speaker. It does not have anything to say regarding what school a veteran chooses. They are free to go to whatever school they want to, but what this bill says is up front they

need to be aware of whether or not their credits will transfer to another school. They don't need to find that out on the back end. They need to be fully informed on the front end as they are making these career and educational choices.

I think it is a shame for many of our veterans to feel that they have misused their GI benefits because they weren't informed enough from the beginning of this process. It is incumbent upon Congress, I believe, to ensure that our veterans have as much information as they need at the front end of their educational choices that will best benefit them and their families.

Again, I strongly thank the chairman and the ranking member for their support. I believe this bill is going to go a long way in addressing this problem. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5047.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation. I have no other speakers. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 5047.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would encourage all Members to support H.R. 5047.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5047.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

WORKING TO INTEGRATE NETWORKS GUARANTEEING MEMBER ACCESS NOW ACT

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5166) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide certain employees of Members of Congress and certain employees of State or local governmental agencies with access to case-tracking information of the Department of Veterans Affairs, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5166

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 "Working to Integrate Networks Guaranteeing Member Access Now Act" or the "WINGMAN Act".

SEC. 2. PROVISION OF ACCESS TO CASE-TRACKING INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 59 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§5906. Access of certain congressional employees to veteran records

“(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) The Secretary shall provide to each veteran who submits a claim for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary an opportunity to permit a covered congressional employee employed in the office of the Member of Congress representing the district where the veteran resides to have access to all of the records of the veteran in the databases of the Veterans Benefits Administration.

“(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon receipt of permission from the veteran under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide read-only access to such records to such a covered congressional employee in a manner that does not allow such employee to modify the data contained in such records or in any part of a database of the Veterans Benefits Administration.

“(3) A Member of Congress may designate not more than two employees of the Member as covered congressional employees.

“(b) COVERED CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYEES.—(1) In this section, a covered congressional employee is a permanent, full-time employee of a Member of Congress—

“(A) whose responsibilities include assisting the constituents of the Member with issues regarding departments or agencies of the Federal Government;

“(B) who satisfies the criteria required by the Secretary for recognition as an agent or attorney under this chapter; and

“(C) who is designated by a Member of Congress as a covered congressional employee for purposes of this section.

“(2) The Secretary may not impose any requirement other than the requirements under paragraph (1) before treating an employee as a covered congressional employee for purposes of this section.

“(c) NONRECOGNITION.—A covered congressional employee may not be recognized as an agent or attorney under this chapter.

“(d) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the amounts made available to carry out this section may be used to design, develop, or administer any training for purposes of providing training to covered congressional employees.

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—(1) No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section. This section may only be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated.

“(2) For the period of fiscal years 2017 through 2020, not more than \$10,000,000 may be made available to carry out this section.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘database of the Veterans Benefits Administration’ means any database of the Veterans Benefits Administration in which the records of veterans relating to claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary are retained, including information regarding medical records, compensation and pension exams records, rating decisions, statements of the case, supplementary statements of the case, notices of disagreement, Form-9, and any successor form.

“(2) The term ‘Member of Congress’ means a Representative, a Senator, a Delegate to Congress, or the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“5906. Access of certain congressional employees to veteran records.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gen-

tleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous material on H.R. 5166, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 5166, as amended, the WINGMAN Act. I thank our colleagues, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), for introducing the WINGMAN Act, which will help Members better serve our constituents.

H.R. 5166 would allow our offices to assist veterans who are seeking information about the status of their claims for disability compensation. Unfortunately, when a congressional staff member contacts the VA for more information about a claim, it can take often weeks or months for the Department of Veterans Affairs to respond. VA's delay in answering congressional inquiries only adds to the veteran's frustration. The veteran simply wants to know the status of his or her claim.

H.R. 5166, as amended, would require VA to give designated permanent, full-time congressional employees access to VA databases so that our staff can tell a veteran the current status of their application for benefits. Moreover, to protect veterans' privacy, the WINGMAN Act mandates that congressional employees first obtain permission before viewing a veteran's information. At the same time, the congressional employee would not be able to alter the electronic file in any way.

Passing this bill will help veterans who simply want to understand where their claim is in the process. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5166, as amended.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 5166, sponsored by Representative YOHO, which would give certified congressional office caseworkers access to veterans' electronic disability claims records at the Veterans Benefits Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to provide faster answers to our veteran constituents who call our offices to help with their VA claims. By the time veterans contact us, many have already faced delays or frustrating experiences trying to get answers themselves. This bill will allow our congressional caseworkers read-only access to disability claims records. This means they will

not be able to add or remove anything from a veteran's record.

The bill also includes privacy safeguards, which reinforce the necessity for getting prior consent from a veteran before a caseworker can access a veteran's files. Additionally, the bill requires that congressional employees certified for this access must be full-time employees who provide constituent services.

I am hopeful that as this program is developed, VA will put in place a tracking system to ensure these employees are only assisting constituents from their congressional districts and that congressional staff are held accountable if found to have abused any aspect of this new and unprecedented authority.

In short, Mr. Speaker, there is broad, bipartisan support among our colleagues for helping veterans get timely answers to their claims questions. Allowing full-time congressional staff members access to electronic disability claims records on a read-only basis is a step in the direction of putting the veteran's interest first and foremost.

I support H.R. 5166, as amended, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the Third District of the State of Florida (Mr. YOHO), a primary sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman MILLER, a fellow Floridian, for his support of this measure. Without his help and the help of his team—Maria and Cecilia in particular—we would not be here today.

This is a monumental bill for our veterans. This comes down to customer service for our veterans. I feel we are in the customer service business. They are not constituents. These are people who have paid the price to defend this country, and it is time that we give them the service that they need.

What this does is it gives us read-only access to a veteran's claim. We have already got a privacy form. We are on a secure system, and this just moves the claim through the process that much quicker so that we can find out why it is hung up. So many times, as the chairman said, the average time it takes for an office to receive the records they request from the VA is 6 months, and at times even over a year. What this will do is, we can look into there, we can read only that particular case, and we can say, You forgot to sign it, you forgot to date it, you forgot to check this box; and we can report immediately back to the veteran. It should free up the VA system.

No single man or woman who has served and protected our freedoms should have to wait to receive the care and benefits that they have more than earned. Unfortunately, they have become statistics, nothing more than numbers on the page, so many times with the VA system. This ends with the

passage of the WINGMAN bill. The WINGMAN removes the middleman and allows the staff to access these records directly without waiting on the VA.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues in the House to support this measure and be a good wingman and let our Nation's veterans know that we have their six. Again, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) for his help on this strong bipartisan bill.

□ 1700

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor as a veteran who is currently still serving in the United States Air Force Reserve. I served in Iraq. What Mr. YOHO and Mr. DAVIS have done here is come together to bring common sense to something that really is amazing: we have veterans today who have to call their Congressman to get help, and we are actually hamstrung in trying to help them.

That is not the way it should be. Our veterans deserve the best service that they can have. They deserve it on time, they deserve it in a prompt fashion, and they should not have to call their Congressman. But when they do, we need to give our congressional offices all the tools that they need to help with that.

I just want to compliment these Congressmen for bringing this bill forward and encourage the House to support this. This is a great bill, and it is really the reason why we are here.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), another prime sponsor of this bill, who is from the 13th Congressional District.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about Carl, an Army veteran from Springfield, Illinois, who couldn't get a response from the VA to receive cancer treatment through the VA Choice program. After multiple communications, my office was finally able to get the authorization from the VA.

Bette, from Staunton, Illinois, the wife of a decorated Vietnam vet who served his country for more than a decade, waited over a year for an answer from the VA about benefits owed to her late husband. Finally, my office was successful in getting Bette, who was experiencing financial difficulty at the time, the accrued benefits owed to her husband.

Kenneth, of Urbana, Illinois, a Bronze Star recipient while serving in Kuwait, Iraq, and Afghanistan, was denied benefits due to a missing doctor's examination because he was deployed at the time and the VA never rescheduled the appointment. He contacted my office, and we worked with the VA to ensure that the benefits were received.

Lawrence, of Palmer, Illinois, another Bronze Star and Purple Heart recipient, simply wanted a copy of his

medical records but never heard back from the VA. After several months, he reached out to our office and we were able to get them from the VA.

Another constituent of mine recently asked my office for help after her husband, who was a veteran, passed away. She has been waiting for 6 months for an answer from the VA, and now my office continues to wait for a response from the VA.

These examples not only show the sometimes incompetence and unresponsiveness of certain personnel at the VA, but they also show how important congressional offices are to getting the answers our veterans need and deserve.

Many times when a veteran contacts their Member of Congress for help, it is their last resort. It is not their first call. They don't know where else to turn. Our caseworkers become the middleman between the veteran and the VA.

VA casework in my office remains highest in volume. We currently have over 96 open cases, and we have closed nearly 1,000 in the 4 years that I have been in office. Ask almost any caseworker, and they will tell you the VA is one of the most difficult agencies to get a response from.

It is unacceptable that it takes this long. That is why the WINGMAN Act, H.R. 5166, needs to be passed. It simply allows our certified constituent caseworkers, our advocates, to access certain VA files in order to check the status and progress of claims. This technology will be used to help our veterans get the answers they deserve. It is not going to solve the systemic problems we see at the VA, but it is going to help us hold the VA accountable and get answers for veterans whom we are honored to represent.

I want to thank my colleague, Representative YOHO, for working with me and many others on this important piece of legislation; and, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman MILLER not only for his help on this, but for his service to this great institution. He is somebody who has put our veterans first as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and somebody who has spent his career making sure that commonsense proposals like this get enacted so that our veterans, those whom he cares about the most and we care about the most, get the answers and the responses they deserve.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5166, as amended.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 5166, as amended.

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 Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5166, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill amend title 38, United States Code, to permit veterans to grant access to their records in the databases of the Veterans Benefits Administration to certain designated congressional employees, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING INVESTMENTS IN RECRUITING AND EMPLOYING AMERICAN MILITARY VETERANS ACT OF 2016

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3286) to encourage effective, voluntary private sector investments to recruit, employ, and retain men and women who have served in the United States military with annual presidential awards to private sector employers recognizing such efforts, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3286

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 "Honoring Investments in Recruiting and Employing American Military Veterans Act of 2016" or the "HIRE Vets Act".

SEC. 2. HIRE VETS MEDALLION PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM ESTABLISHED.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall establish, by rule, a HIRE Vets Medallion Program to solicit voluntary information from employers for purposes of recognizing, by means of an award to be designated a "HIRE Vets Medallion", verified efforts by such employers—

(1) to recruit, employ, and retain veterans; and

(2) to provide community and charitable services supporting the veteran community.

(b) APPLICATION PROCESS.—Beginning in the calendar year following the calendar year in which the Secretary establishes the program—

(1) the Secretary shall annually—

(A) solicit and accept voluntary applications from employers in order to consider whether those employers should receive a HIRE Vets Medallion;

(B) review applications received in each calendar year; and

(C) provide to the President a list of recipients; and

(2) the President shall annually—

(A) notify such recipients of their awards; and

(B) at a time to coincide with the annual commemoration of Veterans Day—

(i) announce the names of such recipients;

(ii) recognize such recipients through publication in the Federal Register; and

(iii) issue to each such recipient—

(I) a HIRE Vets Medallion of the level determined under section 3; and

(II) a certificate stating that such employer is entitled to display such HIRE Vets Medallion during the following calendar year, to be designated a "HIRE Vets Medallion Certificate".

(c) TIMING.—

(1) SOLICITATION PERIOD.—The Secretary shall solicit applications not later than January 31st of each calendar year for the medallions to be awarded in November of that calendar year.

(2) END OF ACCEPTANCE PERIOD.—The Secretary shall stop accepting applications not earlier than April 30th of each calendar year for the medallions to be awarded in November of that calendar year.

(3) REVIEW PERIOD.—The Secretary shall finish reviewing applications not later than August 31st of each calendar year for the medallions to be awarded in November of that calendar year.

(4) RECOMMENDATIONS TO PRESIDENT.—The Secretary shall provide to the President a list of employers to receive HIRE Vets Medallions not later than September 30th of each calendar year for the medallions to be awarded in November of that calendar year.

(5) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS.—The President shall notify employers who will receive HIRE Vets Medallions not later than October 11th of each calendar year for the medallions to be awarded in November of that calendar year.

SEC. 3. SELECTION OF RECIPIENTS.

(a) APPLICATION REVIEW PROCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall review all applications received in a calendar year to determine whether an employer should receive a HIRE Vets Medallion, and, if so, of what level.

(2) APPLICATION CONTENTS.—The Secretary shall require that all applications provide information on the programs and other efforts of applicant employers during the calendar year prior to that in which the medallion is to be awarded, including the categories and activities governing the level of award for which the applicant is eligible under subsection (b).

(3) VERIFICATION.—In reviewing applications, the Secretary shall verify all information provided in the applications, to the extent that such information is relevant in determining whether or not an applicant should receive a HIRE Vets Medallion or in determining the appropriate level of HIRE Vets Medallion for that employer to receive.

(b) AWARDS.—

(1) LARGE EMPLOYERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish two levels of HIRE Vets Medallions to be awarded to employers employing 500 or more employees, to be designated the “Gold HIRE Vets Medallion” and the “Platinum HIRE Vets Medallion”.

(B) GOLD HIRE VETS MEDALLION.—No employer shall be eligible to receive a Gold HIRE Vets Medallion in a given calendar year unless—

(i) veterans constitute not less than 7 percent of all employees hired by such employer during the prior calendar year;

(ii) such employer has established an employee veteran organization or resource group to assist new veteran employees with integration, including coaching and mentoring; and

(iii) such employer has established programs to enhance the leadership skills of veteran employees during their employment.

(C) PLATINUM HIRE VETS MEDALLION.—No employer shall be eligible to receive a Platinum HIRE Vets Medallion in a given calendar year unless—

(i) veterans constitute not less than 10 percent of all employees hired by such employer during the prior calendar year;

(ii) such employer retains through the end of the prior calendar year not less than 85 percent of veteran employees hired during the calendar year before the prior calendar year;

(iii) such employer employs dedicated human resources professionals to support hiring and retention of veteran employees, including efforts focused on veteran hiring and training;

(iv) such employer provides each of its employees serving on active duty in the United States National Guard or Reserve with compensation sufficient, in combination with the employee’s active duty pay, to achieve a combined level of income commensurate with the employee’s salary prior to undertaking active duty; and

(v) such employer has established a tuition assistance program to support veteran employees’ attendance in postsecondary education during the term of their employment.

(D) EXEMPTION FOR SMALLER EMPLOYERS.—An employer shall be deemed to meet the requirements of subparagraph (C)(iv) if such employer—

(i) employs 5,000 or fewer employees; and

(ii) employs at least one human resources professional whose regular work duties include those described under subparagraph (C)(iii).

(E) ADDITIONAL CRITERIA.—The Secretary may provide, by rule, additional criteria with which to determine qualifications for receipt of each level of HIRE Vets Medallion.

(2) SMALL- AND MEDIUM-SIZED EMPLOYERS.—The Secretary shall establish similar awards in order to recognize achievements in supporting veterans by—

(A) employers with 50 or fewer employees; and

(B) employers with more than 50 but fewer than 500 employees.

(c) DESIGN BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall establish the shape, form, and metallic content of each HIRE Vets Medallion.

SEC. 4. DISPLAY OF AWARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The recipient of a HIRE Vets Medallion may—

(1) publicly display such medallion through the end of the calendar year following receipt of such medallion; and

(2) publicly display the HIRE Vets Medallion Certificate issued in conjunction with such medallion.

(b) UNLAWFUL DISPLAY PROHIBITED.—It is unlawful for any employer to publicly display a HIRE Vets Medallion, in connection with, or as a part of, any advertisement, solicitation, business activity, or product—

(1) for the purpose of conveying, or in a manner reasonably calculated to convey, a false impression that the employer received the medallion through the HIRE Vets Medallion Program, if such employer did not receive such medallion through the HIRE Vets Medallion Program; or

(2) for the purpose of conveying, or in a manner reasonably calculated to convey, a false impression that the employer received the medallion through the HIRE Vets Medallion Program during the preceding calendar year if it is after the end of the calendar year following the calendar year in which such medallion was issued to such employer through the HIRE Vets Medallion Program.

SEC. 5. APPLICATION FEE AND FUNDING.

(a) FUND ESTABLISHED.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be designated the “HIRE Vets Medallion Award Fund”.

(b) FEE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may assess a reasonable fee on employers that apply for receipt of a HIRE Vets Medallion and the Secretary shall deposit such fees into the HIRE Vets Medallion Award Fund. The Secretary shall establish the amount of the fee such that the amounts collected as fees and deposited into the Fund are sufficient to cover the costs associated with carrying out this Act.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts in the HIRE Vets Medallion Award Fund shall be avail-

able, subject to appropriation, to the Secretary to carry out the HIRE Vets Medallion Program.

SEC. 6. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORTS.—Beginning not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress annual reports on—

(1) the fees collected from applicants for HIRE Vets Medallions in the prior year and any changes in fees to be proposed in the present year;

(2) the cost of administering the HIRE Vets Medallion Program in the prior year;

(3) the number of applications for HIRE Vets Medallions received in the prior year; and

(4) the HIRE Vets Medallions awarded in the prior year, including the name of each employer to whom a HIRE Vets Medallion was awarded and the level of medallion awarded to each such employer.

(b) COMMITTEES.—The Secretary shall provide the reports required under subsection (a) to the Chairman and Ranking Member of—

(1) the Committees on Education and the Workforce and Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committees on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(a) EMPLOYER.—The term “employer” has the meaning given such term under section 4303 of title 38, United States Code, except that such term does not include—

(1) the Federal Government;

(2) any State, as defined in such section; or

(3) any foreign state.

(b) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Labor.

(c) VETERAN.—The term “veteran” has the meaning given such term under section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3286, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3286, as amended, would require the Department of Labor to establish a HIRE Vets Medallion Program to recognize and to award employers with a HIRE Vets Medallion for their efforts to recruit, employ, and retain veterans, as well as their work to provide community and charitable services to veterans in their local communities.

While we still have work to do, it is important to note that the veteran unemployment rate has continued to decrease over recent years and, as of last month, it was at a low of 4.3 percent.

While many factors have led to the continued reduction of the unemployment rate for the men and women who have served, our Nation's employers in both the public and the private sectors deserve a lot of the credit, and it is important that we highlight the work that these companies have done and publicly recognize their commitment for hiring veterans.

With this idea in mind, H.R. 3286, as amended, would authorize the Secretary of Labor to create the HIRE Vets Medallion Program, which would recognize employers who hire and retain veterans, as well as companies who provide support services to the veterans in their communities.

Employers would earn either platinum or gold status based on requirements related to the number of veterans hired each year, providing pay equity for guardsmen and Reserve employees who were called up to active military service, and other requirements. Once these employers have earned a HIRE Vets Medallion, they would be able to publicly display their award to illustrate the work they have done on behalf of veterans and the priority that they place on hiring veterans within their workforce.

As we work to continue to decrease the national unemployment rate among our men and women who have served, it is vital that we highlight and step up and thank the employers who have employed these individuals and recognize the benefits of hiring a veteran.

I want to thank Colonel PAUL COOK of California for introducing and advocating for this bill. It has my full and complete support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3286, as amended, the Honoring Investments in Recruiting and Employing American Military Veterans Act of 2016, or the HIRE Vets Act. I thank my colleague and fellow Inland Empire and California Representative Colonel PAUL COOK for introducing this innovative bill.

The HIRE Vets Act directs the Department of Labor's Veterans' Employment and Training Services, otherwise known as DOL VETS, to establish a HIRE Vets Medallion Program. This program will solicit voluntary information from private sector employers who successfully recruit, employ, and retain veterans, and allow these employers to display on their marketing materials a recognized medallion as a symbol of their commendable hiring practices. Employers who provide community and charitable services supporting veterans will also be eligible to display a HIRE Vets Medallion.

Hiring veterans isn't just the right thing to do from a moral perspective; it also makes good business sense. The men and women who served in our military received invaluable training

and experience that has been proven to help them thrive in postmilitary employment, whether in the public or private sectors.

Fortunately, we have been seeing encouraging trends in veterans' employment. Thanks to the hard work of DOL VETS, combined with efforts within the private sector and Federal and State governments, the veterans' unemployment rate in October was 4.3 percent. That is lower than the national unemployment rate, which was 4.9 percent. This continues a 24-month trend, with only a single exception.

We can all be very proud of the progress we have made in making sure more veterans are able to find quality, good-paying jobs upon transitioning into civilian life. That said, we want to remain vigilant to make sure that the men and women who signed up to defend our Nation enjoy opportunities for growth and prosperity when they return home.

Again, I want to thank my colleague, Colonel COOK, for offering this legislation to provide a uniform, recognizable medallion to show our appreciation to companies that hire and retain veteran employees. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill and to stand in support of its passage today.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK), the sponsor of this legislation, from the Eighth District of California.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, as a combat veteran, I am deeply concerned that the men and women of our Armed Forces continue to struggle to find jobs upon their return to civilian life. These individuals have not only displayed great courage serving their country, but have acquired distinctive skills that make them ideal candidates for employment.

Veterans who serve this country honorably should never struggle to find employment, which is why I have introduced H.R. 3286, the Honoring Investments in Recruiting and Employing American Military Veterans Act, the HIRE Vets Act.

As already mentioned, this bill creates an innovative system to encourage and recognize employers who make veterans a priority in their hiring practices, incentivizing the creation of thousands of jobs for veterans.

This bill goes beyond simply recognizing that a business hires veterans. It is critical that we establish a nationwide gold standard program that creates a strong and consistent brand. This bill is an opportunity for Americans to see which companies truly live up to the employment promises they made to veterans.

It is our duty to ensure veterans receive the benefits and resources they have earned through their services to this country, and that includes encouraging meaningful job opportunities.

I have been around a long while and, of course, have my own experiences

from Vietnam, where a lot of veterans returned to their hometown and were shunned; they were ostracized, creating problems in terms of alcohol, drugs, you name it. A lot of it was related to the fact that they couldn't find a job or people didn't want to talk to them. This bill, I think, with the help of businesses, goes a long way to correct a problem we have had for many, many years.

This bill passed out of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee unanimously, and I want to thank Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member TAKANO for their support. I would also like to thank Representative TULSI GABBARD for being the original cosponsor of this important legislation.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

□ 1715

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3286, a bill on which I am proud to have worked with my colleague and fellow veteran, the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK), whose service I honor very much.

Every single day, we have roughly 500 veterans who return to civilian life, joining the more than 2.9 million veterans who have returned home just since 9/11 alone. Now, some choose to take advantage of educational benefits they have earned, and others choose to jump right back into the workforce. Unfortunately, for many of our veterans, making that move is not as simple as submitting a resume and waiting for a call back.

Our veterans, unfortunately, often face sometimes an unfriendly job market or an unfriendly job culture that does not fully understand their needs and the unique challenges of transitioning from military servicemember life to civilian life.

Now, we have taken some important steps to encourage employers to hire more veterans, and we have seen the total percentage of unemployed veterans drop by 1.5 percent over the past year. While this is progress, the fact is, we still have over 400,000 veterans unemployed today. This tells us that more must be done, not only to get them employed but to make sure that they are employed in meaningful, good-paying jobs.

I recently hosted a panel of experts from both the public and private sector where we talked about how we can better empower our veterans in the tech sector specifically. The tech industry has experienced unprecedented growth over the past decade and is the fastest growing sector in our economy. Yet, so far, veterans remain largely underrepresented, making up just 2 percent of this fast-growing industry.

Now, it is not because they are not qualified. It is not because they don't have what it takes to do the job. Through their service and training, our

highly trained men and women develop the ability to lead, make decisions under pressure, act as a member of a team and accomplish the mission. The bottom line is they get the job done. These skills make them especially valuable to employers, whether it be in the tech industry or in any other business, nonprofit, or civic leadership position.

That is why I am proud to join my fellow veteran and friend, Congressman PAUL COOK, today in support of this important legislation because it incentivizes employers to hire and retain veterans by creating a standard of recognition for those who go the extra mile to recruit and retain veterans, and provide services that support our veteran community.

I strongly urge our colleagues to pass this legislation and help serve and empower our veterans and businesses to thrive.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no more requests for time at this point. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It just strikes me, Colonel COOK, I know we have named this act the HIRE Vets Act, and knowing of your service in Vietnam, and so many of the Vietnam veterans that live in the Inland Empire, we could also call this the Welcome Home Act because nothing is more welcoming than a job.

I share your passion for caring about our veterans in the Inland Empire, and in California, of course, all over our country, and I certainly honor your service to our country.

So I urge all my colleagues to support—to join me in passing H.R. 3286, and I look forward to seeing those medallions in many businesses across your district and mine in California.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3286, as amended.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3286, 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.

NO HERO LEFT UNTREATED ACT

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5600) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide access to magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy to veterans, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5600

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 “No Hero Left Untreated Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy has successfully treated more than 400 veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, military sexual trauma, chronic pain, and opiate addiction.

(2) Recent clinical trials and randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind studies have produced promising measurable outcomes in the evolution of magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy.

(3) These outcomes have resulted in escalating demand from returning warriors and veterans who are seeking access to this treatment.

(4) Congress recognizes the importance of initiating innovative pilot programs that demonstrate the use and effectiveness of new treatment options for post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, military sexual trauma, chronic pain, and opiate addiction.

SEC. 3. MAGNETIC EEG/EKG-GUIDED RESONANCE THERAPY PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall carry out a pilot program to provide access to magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy to treat larger populations of veterans suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, military sexual trauma, chronic pain, or opiate addiction.

(b) LOCATIONS.—The Secretary shall carry out the pilot program under subsection (a) at not more than two facilities of the Department of Veteran Affairs.

(c) PARTICIPANTS.—In carrying out the pilot program under subsection (a), the Secretary may not provide access to magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy to more than 50 veterans.

(d) DURATION.—The Secretary shall carry out the pilot program under subsection (a) for a one-year period.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the termination of the pilot program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on the pilot program.

(f) NO AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the requirements of this section. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise their remarks and add extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

I do rise today in support of H.R. 5600, as amended, the No Hero Left Untreated Act.

There is no greater priority we have as a grateful nation than to care for those who have been wounded in the service of our country and to ensure that they are provided with the most successful treatments, including those that are new and are promising to assist them on their path to recovery.

H.R. 5600, as amended, would require the Department of Veterans Affairs to carry out a 1-year pilot program to provide access to magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy to veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, chronic pain, opiate addiction, or who have experienced military sexual trauma.

Magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy has proven effective in addressing symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury among veteran patients. For example, in a 2015 study, veteran patients experienced an almost 50 percent reduction in symptom severity after just 2 weeks of using this therapy.

Though the pilot this bill would create is limited, I am hopeful that it will provide the needed data to support the provision of this promising new treatment for many more servicemembers and veterans in the future.

This bill is sponsored by our good friend, Congressman STEVE KNIGHT from California, and I am grateful to him for sponsoring this legislation to increase access to innovative treatment for America's heroes.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5600, as amended.

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

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 5600, as amended, the No Hero Left Untreated Act. This bill is designed to create a pilot program in the VA to determine if magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy technology is appropriate for larger populations of veterans suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, military sexual trauma, chronic pain, or opiate addiction.

Under this treatment, a veteran's EEG and EKG are analyzed to ascertain the brain's patterns of function and detect any possible abnormalities. This information is used to develop a personalized treatment for each patient aimed at restoring the brain to its optimal state.

It is essential that the VA continue to explore new and innovative treatments, like resonance therapy, that can offer breakthroughs for veterans and servicemembers suffering from PTSD and other traumas. For more than 90 years, the Veterans Affairs Research and Development program has been improving the lives of veterans and all Americans through healthcare discovery and innovation.

VA research is unique because of its focus on health issues that affect veterans. It is part of an integrated

healthcare system that coordinates care for veterans and affiliates with university medical schools and teaching hospitals to train our healthcare providers and perform groundbreaking medical research.

I look forward to learning more about this treatment and its effects on those veterans who have continued to suffer from the wounds of combat trauma here at home. Innovative pilot programs and continued investment in research will help to ensure that our Nation's veterans get the high-quality care they have earned and deserve.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the 25th District of California (Mr. KNIGHT), the prime sponsor of this important piece of legislation.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chair and ranking member for their support of this piece of legislation.

The No Hero Left Untreated Act is just that. We expect our young warriors to protect our values and our ideals, and we, as Americans, should do nothing less than to take care of them when they return home. The No Hero Left Untreated Act is a new and innovative way of looking at how we can treat our veterans, and I think that that is what people in America are looking for. They are looking for how we can help our veterans in new and innovative ways. Well, this is one of those.

This is a way that we have taken 500 veterans, we have given them this treatment, and about 95 percent of them have said that they have had some difference in their life because of the treatment. Sixty-one percent have said that it is a dramatic change because of this treatment. If we took those numbers and we took them to any kind of treatment or any kind of medical help across this country, I think that all of the physicians and all of the medical industry would say: yes, those are great numbers.

So what we are trying to do here is we are going to put it into two of our medical facilities; put it into two of our VA centers, and we are going to collect some data on the enormous successes that we have seen in the past and hopefully in the future. Then, I hope to come back at a certain time in the future and say: this has been great; the data that we have collected has helped our veterans, has helped our warriors when they have come home. Let's put this across the country.

I expect that everyone in every district across this country, when they see this, these types of successes, would want to put it into their VA facilities. So that is kind of our goal in what we are trying to do here.

Mental and physical injuries are part of battle. Treatment that works should be pushed by our legislative bodies. It shouldn't be stagnated. And that is exactly what this body is doing. We are

looking at this, and we are saying: this is working. Why wouldn't we push it?

I thank everyone for looking at this in a bipartisan measure and saying this will help our veterans. Let's move this forward.

This therapy has shown enormous successes, and I think that when the American people look at this and they say, we have got these successes, let's make sure that we push this forward, I think that we should also look at other treatments that might not be having these types of successes and saying, you know what, we can do different changes, and the medical industry, I am sure, would support that.

So that is what we are trying to do with the No Hero Left Untreated Act. That is why we have named it that because that is exactly what we want. We don't want to leave any hero untreated.

I appreciate the support from both sides of the aisle, and I ask for support of this important measure.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation and join me in passing H.R. 5600, as amended.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I too encourage my colleagues to support this piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5600, 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.

TIBOR RUBIN VA MEDICAL CENTER

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6323) to name the Department of Veterans Affairs health care system in Long Beach, California, the "Tibor Rubin VA Medical Center".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6323

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

SECTION 1. NAME OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS HEALTH CARE SYSTEM, LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA.

The Department of Veterans Affairs health care system located at 5901 East 7th Street, Long Beach, California, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the "Tibor Rubin VA Medical Center". Any reference to such health care system in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the Tibor Rubin VA Medical Center.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous material on H.R. 6323.

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

There was no objection.

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

I do rise today in support of H.R. 6323, a bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs healthcare system in Long Beach, California, the Tibor Rubin VA Medical Center.

Mr. Speaker, as a young man, Corporal Tibor Rubin survived 14 months in a German concentration camp in Austria during World War II before it was liberated by the United States Army.

Corporal Rubin was so inspired by the American soldiers who rescued him that he eventually moved to the United States, enlisted in the Army, and became a United States citizen. He was deployed as a member of the 1st Cavalry Division during the Korean war, and was eventually captured by the North Korean military.

During his captivity, he provided crucial moral support and improvised medical support to his fellow prisoners of war. For his service, Corporal Rubin was awarded two Purple Hearts and the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Sadly, he passed away just last year. After such an outstanding life of service and survival, it is only appropriate that we honor Corporal Rubin by naming the Long Beach VA Medical Center after him. H.R. 6323 satisfies the Committee's naming criteria and is supported by the entire California congressional delegation, as well as many local veterans service organizations.

□ 1730

I am grateful to Congressman LOWENTHAL for sponsoring this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6323, to name the Department of Veterans Affairs health care system in Long Beach, California, the Tibor Rubin VA Medical Center.

What a remarkable story about Tibor Rubin. Tibor Rubin survived the Mauthausen concentration camp for 14 months before being liberated by American soldiers in May of 1945. After immigrating to the United States in 1948, he enlisted in the United States Army and volunteered to serve in

Korea despite not being required to serve overseas as a non-U.S. citizen.

While in Korea, Corporal Rubin was ordered to defend a road while his division was in retreat. He held that position for 24 hours until the 8th Cavalry could safely withdraw.

Corporal Rubin spent 30 months as a prisoner of war in North Korea, where testimony from his fellow prisoners detailed his willingness to sacrifice for the others. He helped his fellow POWs by sneaking out of the camp at night and foraging for food, stealing from enemy supplies, and bringing back what he could to help the soldiers imprisoned with him. He declined the offer of his Communist captors to return him to Soviet Hungary, his country of origin, to help protect those from his adopted country.

"He shared the food evenly among the GIs," a fellow prisoner wrote. "He also took care of us, nursed us, carried us to the latrine." This GI also added, "Helping his fellow men was the most important thing to him."

For these actions and more, Mr. Rubin was awarded the Medal of Honor in 2005. For all that this brave immigrant did to protect the freedoms of our great country, we are honored to be able to name this VA Medical Center after him.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from California, who has been such a great leader on veterans' issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Holocaust survivor and Medal of Honor recipient and a person that I knew personally before he passed away, Mr. Tibor "Ted" Rubin.

With the support of all 53 members of the California delegation, both California Senators, and many of my State's leading veterans' groups, I recently introduced H.R. 6323, legislation to name the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Long Beach as the Tibor Rubin VA Medical Center.

As was already noted, Tibor Rubin was born in Hungary on June 18, 1929. During World War II, he survived 14 months in a Nazi concentration camp in Austria, where both his parents and both of his sisters would eventually die.

Liberated by the United States Army, he was inspired by the American soldiers who rescued him, immigrating to the United States and enlisting in the United States Army. He was deployed to Korea as a member of the United States Army's 8th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Cavalry Division during the Korean war.

Despite facing religious discrimination from his sergeant who sent him on the most dangerous patrols and missions and withheld his Medal of Honor commendation, Tibor fought valiantly in several notable engagements. In one

such engagement, Tibor enabled the complete withdrawal of his compatriots to the Pusan Perimeter by solely defending a hill under an overwhelming assault by North Korean troops. During this engagement, he inflicted a staggering number of casualties on the attacking force during his personal 24-hour battle, single-handedly slowing the enemy's advance and allowing the 8th Cavalry to withdraw successfully.

Following the successful U.S. Army breakout from the Pusan Perimeter and advance into North Korea, Tibor was personally responsible for the capture of several hundred North Korean soldiers.

In an additional engagement near Usan, Chinese forces attacked his unit during a massive nighttime assault. For nearly 24 hours, he remained at his post with a .30-caliber machine gun at the south end of the unit's line until his ammunition was exhausted. His determined stand slowed the pace of the enemy advance into his sector, permitting the remnants of his unit to retreat southward. However, as the battle raged, Tibor was severely wounded and captured by the Chinese. While in Chinese custody, he refused to be repatriated to Hungary, instead choosing to remain in the prison camp. He would refuse the offer on numerous occasions.

Tibor disregarded his own personal safety and immediately began sneaking out of the camp at night in search of food for his fellow prisoners. Breaking into enemy food storehouses and gardens, he risked certain torture or death if caught.

Tibor provided not only food for the starving soldiers, but also desperately needed medical care and moral support for the sick and wounded of the POW camp. As one of his fellow prisoners recounted about the camp: "Tibor did many good deeds, which he told us were mitzvahs in the Jewish tradition. He was a very religious Jew, and helping his fellow men was the most important thing to him."

Tibor's brave, selfless efforts were directly attributed to saving the lives of as many as 40 of his fellow prisoners. As his Medal of Honor citation reads: "Corporal Rubin's gallant actions in close contact with the enemy and unyielding courage and bravery while a prisoner of war are in the highest traditions of military service and reflect great credit upon himself and the United States Army."

It is worth noting that Tibor was nominated in the field on four occasions for the Medal of Honor. When he was finally presented his Medal of Honor in 2005, it was not presented by President George W. Bush for a single act of heroism. It was instead presented for nearly his entire 3 years of service in the Korean war.

Tibor was fiercely proud of the country he adopted. When he was later asked about his decision to immigrate to the United States, he said: "I always wanted to become a citizen of the

United States, and when I became a citizen, it was one of the happiest days in my life.

"I think about the United States, and I am a lucky person to live here.

"When I came to America, it was the first time I was free. It was one of the reasons I joined the U.S. Army, because I wanted to show my appreciation.

"It is the best country in the world, and I am part of it now. I do not have to worry about the Gestapo knocking on my doors."

I am proud to say that after his service, Tibor became a longtime resident of Garden Grove, California, in my district. It was still his home when he passed away on December 5, 2015, and it was the Long Beach VA Hospital where he received his medical services for over 50 years.

It was my great honor to meet Tibor and to represent him in Congress. He was a survivor, a soldier, a nurse, a compatriot, and a wonderful citizen.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. What an amazing and inspiring story behind Corporal Rubin.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation, H.R. 6323.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I, too, encourage all of our colleagues to support this legislation.

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 Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6323.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REAFFIRMING LONGSTANDING UNITED STATES POLICY IN SUPPORT OF A DIRECT BILATERALLY NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT OF THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 165) expressing the sense of Congress and reaffirming longstanding United States policy in support of a direct bilaterally negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and opposition to United Nations Security Council resolutions imposing a solution to the conflict.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 165

Whereas the United States has long supported a negotiated settlement leading to a sustainable two-state solution with the democratic, Jewish state of Israel and a democratic Palestinian state living side-by-side in peace and security;

Whereas it is the long-standing policy of the United States Government that a peaceful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict will only come through direct, bilateral negotiations between the two parties;

Whereas President Barack Obama reiterated this policy at the United Nations General Assembly in 2011, stating, "Peace is hard work. Peace will not come through statements and resolutions at the United Nations—if it were that easy, it would have been accomplished by now. Ultimately, it is the Israelis and the Palestinians who must live side by side. Ultimately, it is the Israelis and the Palestinians—not us—who must reach agreement on the issues that divide them . . .";

Whereas the Palestinian Authority has failed to end incitement to hatred and violence through Palestinian Authority-directed institutions against Israel and Israelis, and end payments to prisoners and the families of those who have engaged in terrorism or acts of violence against Israelis or the State of Israel;

Whereas the Palestinian Authority has continued to provide payments to prisoners and the families of those who have engaged in terrorism or acts of violence against Israelis or the State of Israel, including reports of approximately \$300 million in 2016;

Whereas efforts to impose a solution or parameters for a solution can make negotiations more difficult and can set back the cause of peace;

Whereas it is long-standing practice of the United States Government to oppose and, if necessary, veto United Nations Security Council resolutions dictating additional binding parameters on the peace process;

Whereas it is also the historic position of the United States Government to oppose and veto, if necessary, one-sided or anti-Israel resolutions at the United Nations Security Council;

Whereas and for this reason, the United States has vetoed 42 Israel-related resolutions in the United Nations Security Council since 1972;

Whereas the Palestinian Authority must engage in broad, meaningful, and systemic reforms in order to ultimately prepare its institutions and people for statehood and peaceful coexistence with Israel; and

Whereas unilateral recognition of a Palestinian state would bypass negotiations and undermine incentives for the Palestinian Authority to make the changes necessary that are prerequisites for peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), that it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) a durable and sustainable peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians will come only through direct bilateral negotiations between the parties;

(2) any widespread international recognition of a unilateral declaration of Palestinian statehood outside of the context of a peace agreement with Israel would cause severe harm to the peace process, and would likely trigger the implementation of penalties under sections 7036 and 7041(j) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (Public Law 114-113);

(3) efforts by outside bodies, including the United Nations Security Council, to impose an agreement or parameters for an agreement are likely to set back the cause of peace;

(4) the United States Government should continue to oppose and veto United Nations Security Council resolutions that seek to impose solutions to final status issues, or are one-sided and anti-Israel; and

(5) the United States Government should continue to support and facilitate the re-

sumption of negotiations without preconditions between Israelis and Palestinians toward a sustainable peace agreement.

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 extraneous materials in the RECORD.

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.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), and thank Mr. BRAD SHERMAN of California as well for working with me in a bipartisan manner to bring this important resolution to the floor today.

There is a growing concern in Congress—it is a concern felt on both sides of the aisle—that despite established, bipartisan United States policy, the Obama administration may end the practice of vetoing resolutions in the Security Council that strayed from the principle that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can only be resolved through direct negotiations between the parties. This administration could also end the related practice of vetoing Security Council resolutions that are one-sided or anti-Israel. This is a real concern. Press reports—including one today—suggest that such a one-sided resolution could be submitted in days.

Worse, the Obama administration could support a resolution at the U.N. Security Council setting parameters for a final settlement between Israel and the Palestinians. U.S. policy has long and wisely been that only Israelis and Palestinians can work out a peace agreement between themselves and that efforts to impose one would be counterproductive. Whatever parameters the U.N. established would be unacceptable to any Israeli Government—a government to the left or a government to the right—making it impossible to see any future peace.

What on Earth today, at this point in time, suggests that Israel has a willing partner in peace?

Not at this moment. Our committee has held hearings to expose the current Palestinian Authority's complicity in inciting violence against the State of Israel as well as against Israelis.

Mr. Speaker, Israel is contending with a deep-seated hatred. It is a deep-seated hatred nurtured, unfortunately, by Palestinian leaders over radio and also in direct communication with the population many, many years, whether it was in the mosques or the schools or the newspapers or on television. As one witness told the committee:

"Incitement" is the term we usually use, but that is not really what we mean. Hatred is what we mean, teaching generations of Palestinians to hate Jews by demonizing and dehumanizing them.

That is the nature of the problem.

Unfortunately, some Palestinians are lured to terrorism with more than just words. Since 2003, it has been Palestinian law to reward Palestinian terrorists in Israeli jails with a monthly paycheck. The Palestinian Authority and the Palestinian Liberation Organization use a so-called martyrs' fund to pay the families of Palestinian prisoners and to pay suicide bombers.

□ 1745

This pay-to-play scheme has got to stop, period. In the face of such hatred, the United States must stand firm. The Israel-Palestinian conflict can only be resolved through direct negotiations between the parties.

I again thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), as well, for their work on this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 165. This is a bipartisan resolution put forward by the chair and ranking member of our committee, Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL, cosponsored by myself, with a host of other bipartisan cosponsors.

This resolution comes at a precarious time for the two-state solution, with a new administration preparing to enter office and as turmoil continues in the Middle East. I, myself, have always been a supporter of a negotiated solution between the Israeli and Palestinian sides of this conflict which would result in a secure, democratic Jewish State of Israel alongside a stable and democratic state for the Palestinian people.

This resolution reaffirms this commitment, which has been longstanding American policy. The United States has provided important leadership as the two parties have negotiated. We would hope to see bilateral negotiations in the future. Peace must be made by the parties themselves. A peace settlement will only come through direct bilateral negotiations. These negotiations are delicate and they are complicated.

As President Barack Obama said in 2011: "Peace is hard work. Peace will not come through statements and resolutions at the United Nations. If it were that easy, it would have been accomplished by now." The President continued: "Ultimately, it is the Israelis and the Palestinians who must live side by side. Ultimately, it is the Israelis and the Palestinians, not us, who must reach agreement on the issues that divide them . . ."

This resolution is consistent with administration policy and consistent with the policy of several prior administrations.

We must heed this advice. Imposing a solution on the parties will not work. In fact, it will be counterproductive to peace. It would undermine incentives for the Palestinian authority to make the necessary changes that are prerequisites for peace. Statehood can be accomplished by ensuring security, eliminating incitement, and demonstrating that the Palestinian side can live peacefully with Israel.

This resolution expresses a sense of Congress as follows:

That the Israeli-Palestinian peace will come only through direct bilateral negotiations;

That recognition of a Palestinian state without a peace deal would cause harm to the peace process;

That efforts by outside bodies to impose an agreement or the parameters for an agreement are likely to set back the peace process;

The United States should veto any one-sided United Nations Security Council resolutions, or those resolutions that would seek to impose solutions on final status issues—again, consistent with the administration policies;

And finally, of course, that America will continue to support negotiations without preconditions between the Israelis and the Palestinians.

The Palestinian people deserve a state of their own. The Israeli people deserve to live in peace as Jews in the State of Israel. In this spirit, I call upon my colleagues to join us in passing this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 165, in support of direct bilateral negotiations to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, introduced by Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL. This resolution is much more than a restatement of longstanding U.S. policy. It is an urgent defense of our commitments to the State of Israel in the face of innumerable threats.

The United States has long insisted that the only path to peace for the Israelis and Palestinians is through direct, bilateral negotiations. Any so-called resolution imposed from the outside is doomed to failure because it inherently lacks the political support of both parties to the conflict. Peacemaking is hard work, but that reality has not stopped others from looking for a shortcut.

The U.N. Security Council is one such forum that has served as a platform for anti-Israel schemes for many, many years. Thankfully, the United States has always resolutely imposed such unilateralism and, when nec-

essary, through both Democratic and Republican White Houses, has always resolutely used the veto. Since 1972, the United States has used its veto power 42 times to block anti-Israel measures in the Security Council. However, in the closing days of this administration, this longstanding policy is being called into question.

Mr. Speaker, there are many reports that President Obama is considering moving the needle on the peace process before he leaves office by supporting a U.N. Security Council resolution enshrining certain conditions for peace. Just last month, The New York Times editorial board came out forcefully in favor of this scheme. The editorial board wrote: "The best idea under discussion now would be to have the United Nations Security Council, in an official resolution, lay down guidelines for a peace agreement covering such issues as Israel's security, the future of Jerusalem, the fate of Palestinian refugees and borders for both states."

On the contrary, this is just about the worst idea. It would have the effect of dangerously undercutting the peace process. Israel's security, the future of Jerusalem, Palestinian refugees, and borders—anyone familiar with this issue knows—are the four most sensitive matters at stake in this conflict and should not be imposed from without. The United States ought to be very clear when faced with such proposals. Any attempt to determine the fate of these issues outside of direct, bilateral talks undermines the sovereignty of our strong ally Israel, destroys goodwill, and threatens to prolong the conflict further.

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

Mr. ROYCE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Sadly, the drumbeat for unilateral United Nations action on this issue continues. On October 14, the U.N. Security Council held a special debate, titled, "Illegal Israeli Settlements: Obstacles to Peace and the Two-State Solution." The session was held at the request of Security Council members Egypt, Venezuela, Malaysia, Senegal, and Angola, with the backing of the Palestinians. Such one-sided initiatives only damage prospects for peace.

Last April, 390 Members of the House on both sides of the aisle signed a letter to the President. It was signed by so many of us, including some in this room, including NITA LOWEY, KAY GRANGER, KAREN BASS, TED DEUTCH, LEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, ED ROYCE, ELIOT ENGEL, KEVIN MCCARTHY, STENY HOYER, NANCY PELOSI, and myself—390 in all—that laid out the simple principles that have guided our policy. These principles include:

A refusal to support counterproductive efforts aimed at imposing a solution on the parties;

Opposition to Palestinian efforts to seek recognition of statehood status in international bodies; and

A willingness to oppose, if need be, a one-sided U.N. resolution by way of a veto.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), my friend, for yielding.

I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 165, reaffirming longstanding U.S. policy in support of a direct, bilaterally negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

For several decades, the United States has maintained a consistent, bipartisan policy toward the conflict that supports a two-state solution and opposes settlement expansion. Explicit congressional support for the two-state solution is critically important, especially in light of President-elect Donald Trump's previous statements on this very subject.

My friends on the other side have indicated an abiding fear that something bad might happen at the U.N. in the waning 52 days of the Obama administration. I don't share that concern. What I am concerned about is the next 4 years and what Donald Trump will do to the longstanding, bipartisan support for a two-state solution that has been the cornerstone of American policy. If he pulls out of that commitment, then you are right, Middle East peace is at risk, but it is not because of what Obama is going to do over the next 52 days.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, which reiterates that longstanding, bipartisan support for a two-state solution, and help combat the unpredictability of U.S. foreign policy in these difficult days of transition.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), who chairs the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as always, I want to thank our esteemed chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), as well as our ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), who is so wonderfully represented by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN). I thank Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL for authoring this very important resolution, which I am proud to cosponsor. And while I fully support this measure and I urge all of my colleagues to back it as well, I wish that this resolution was not needed; but, sadly, we know better.

The fact that we need to bring this up for debate and pass a resolution urging a United States administration to uphold longstanding U.S. policy as it relates to the peace process is telling and also disappointing, Mr. Speaker.

These next 2 months are going to be crucial for our friend and ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel, and the U.S.-Israel alliance, which must remain ever strong. Israel is facing a constant barrage by the Palestinians and

their supporters at the United Nations, and there are indications that Abu Mazen will once again attempt to further his plan for unilateral statehood through the Security Council.

Ordinarily, any attempt to dictate a two-state solution or impose parameters on negotiations between the Israelis and the Palestinians would be summarily dismissed by the United States. However, sadly, it has become clear over the past year that this administration may be looking to take unprecedented action; and, in fact, we have heard that the administration has been actively seeking ways in which it could force the Israelis into making dangerous concessions.

I have asked Secretary Kerry, I have asked Ambassador Power, our Ambassador to the U.N., I have asked Ambassador Patterson and nearly every administration official who has come before our Foreign Affairs Committee headed by Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL if President Obama will uphold longstanding U.S. policy and will veto any Security Council resolution related to Israel. Each one has evaded the question, refusing to reaffirm this longstanding, unambiguous, noncontroversial policy.

We hear speak of one-sided resolutions, but that is slick administration talk. Who defines the one-sidedness? It should have been a resounding blanket statement—it is easy—that the President believes that the only way to a real and lasting peace between Israelis and Palestinians must come through direct bilateral negotiations between the two, and lacking that, yes, we will urge the President to veto it. It is not hard.

Peace cannot be forced. Any short-term achievement an imposed solution will bring will be far outweighed by the long-term damage that it will cause.

Mr. Speaker, this is a lameduck administration; and it should go without saying that any action, whether it be at the U.N. or undertaken unilaterally, aimed at forcing solutions to final status issues will be detrimental to the prospects of peace and would harm both Israelis and Palestinians.

I support this measure, strongly, brought forth by Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL. I urge my colleagues to support it to reaffirm longstanding U.S. policy that true peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians can only come between direct bilateral negotiations between them, and to urge the administration to not allow the Palestinian scheme of unilateral statehood to gain any legitimacy at the U.N.

□ 1800

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD), a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. DOLD. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, stand in strong support of H. Con. Res. 165.

What I find so fascinating is that we need here in the United States to respect Israel's democratically elected leadership. They are a nation, and they are our one true ally; and any efforts by the United Nations or by any other body to try to impose a two-state solution, frankly, I think, is detrimental and reckless. We should never try to force their hand. Frankly, what we find now is it is not the time to try to establish a legacy for an administration that has just a very few short days left by attempting a reckless Hail Mary pass. We here do want a two-state solution, which I think is important to note, but it must be done by direct negotiations by the two parties; and when the United States pressures Israel, all we do is weaken the chances for long-term, durable peace.

My good friend from Virginia talked about his actually being fearful of the next administration. Let me simply say that I hope this body will stand in bipartisan support to ensure that any administration does not pressure Israel. We understand that a long-lasting peace, which is what we are hoping for, comes through direct, bilateral negotiations.

I, for one, am hopeful that this body will stand united to make sure that the world knows that we stand shoulder to shoulder with our one true ally—Israel—and with the hope that the administration and the United Nations Security Council will veto any efforts by the United Nations to try to unilaterally put a statehood in there for the Palestinians. We know that true peace can only happen through direct, bilateral negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, again, I stand in strong support of Mr. ROYCE's and Mr. ENGEL's resolution, and I sincerely hope that my colleagues will stand together, in bipartisan support, to make sure that this administration does not take steps that will weaken Israel's hand in going forward. I hope, in going forward, in administration after administration, that this body will stand as we do today—in bipartisan support.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution reaffirms longstanding American policy that can be summarized in five points: talks must be direct and bilateral; a solution cannot be imposed on the parties; both sides must be willing to make important compromises; disagreements should be resolved privately; and the United States should work closely with the State of Israel. This resolution deserves the support of those on both sides of the aisle.

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

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

In the past, both Republican and Democratic administrations have recognized that efforts to internationalize the Israeli-Palestinian conflict are not a substitute for direct negotiations be-

tween the parties. In fact, such an approach can undermine these negotiations. Direct negotiations between the parties, not a U.N. dictate, are the only way, in our view, to bring about a peaceful coexistence. After all, direct negotiations mean legitimatizing the other party, which, unfortunately, is why Palestinian leaders routinely shun them.

Other past Presidents have pushed peace initiatives in the final hours of their administrations. Indeed, the Obama administration has pointedly not ruled out allowing the U.N. Security Council to dictate the terms of peace negotiations. That, in fact, is what has given rise to our bipartisan concerns about this process. In the absence of a clear answer from the administration as to whether it will continue to use that veto power at the United Nations, this bipartisan approach here, with this resolution, takes a stand.

I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the resolution so that the bipartisan policy of encouraging direct negotiations continues and is endorsed loud and clear.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the House's consideration of H. Con. Res. 165 is given special relevance by the presidential transition now underway.

The resolution sends an important message to the incoming Administration:

that the United States Congress reaffirms our nation's commitment to supporting negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians in pursuit of a just and lasting two-state solution, and

that the United States Congress reaffirms a supportive and constructive role, for our country in facilitating resolution of the conflict.

Unfortunately, the resolution also contains overly broad and negative language concerning third-party efforts to facilitate an agreement. Still, it does not preclude the United States from putting forward ideas for bridging differences between the parties, for articulating suggestions that fill in gaps, for offering a nonbinding comprehensive framework to help bring the Israelis and Palestinians to the negotiating table—just as Republican and Democrat Administrations have done in the past.

It is my hope, in fact, that the Obama administration might in the coming weeks "help provide a political horizon for ending the conflict"—I'm quoting now from House Resolution 686, introduced by Representative YARMUTH and myself and cosponsored by 64 members—"by articulating a non-binding vision of what a comprehensive final status agreement might entail that could help foster and guide revived negotiations between the parties."

The resolution also encourages the U.S. government to "firmly articulate 49 years of consistent, bipartisan United States opposition to settlement expansion."

We must be vigilant in protecting 50 years of bipartisan policy to help the Israelis and Palestinians reach as viable two-state solution in order to protect Israel as a secure, democratic, and Jewish state, and to end the cycle of violence that has plagued the region.

As a longstanding supporter of the special relationship between the United States and Israel, I believe the United States must remain steadfast in its commitment to help Israel defend itself, to ensure that Israelis and Palestinians feel that a viable political horizon to ending this conflict continues to exist despite the current absence of ongoing, productive negotiations, and to stand ready to help create better conditions for peace—so that real and achievable progress may prove viable in the months and years ahead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 165.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENCOURAGING REUNIONS OF DIVIDED KOREAN AMERICAN FAMILIES

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 40) encouraging reunions of divided Korean American families.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 40

Whereas the Republic of Korea (hereinafter in this resolution referred to as “South Korea”) and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (hereinafter in this resolution referred to as “North Korea”) remain divided since the armistice agreement was signed on July 27, 1953;

Whereas the United States, which as a signatory to the armistice agreement as representing the United Nations Forces Command, and with 28,500 of its troops currently stationed in South Korea, has a stake in peace on the Korean Peninsula and is home to more than 1,700,000 Americans of Korean descent;

Whereas the division on the Korean Peninsula separated more than 10,000,000 Korean family members, including some who are now citizens of the United States;

Whereas there have been 19 rounds of family reunions between South Koreans and North Koreans along the border since 2000;

Whereas Congress signaled its interest in family reunions between United States Citizens and their relatives in North Korea in section 1265 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181), signed into law by President George W. Bush on January 28, 2008;

Whereas the number of more than 100,000 estimated divided family members in the United States last identified in 2001 has been significantly dwindling as many of them have passed away;

Whereas many Korean Americans are waiting for a chance to meet their relatives in North Korea for the first time in more than 60 years; and

Whereas peace on the Korean Peninsula remains a long-term goal for the Governments of South Korea and the United States, and would mean greater security and stability for the region and the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) encourages North Korea to allow Korean Americans to meet with their family members from North Korea; and

(2) calls on North Korea to take concrete steps to build goodwill that is conducive to peace on the Korean Peninsula.

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 have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material for the RECORD.

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.

As the Republican coauthor of this measure, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 40—a resolution I was proud to introduce alongside my good friend, Mr. CHARLIE RANGEL. As always, I appreciate the help from the gentleman from New York, the ranking member, for his assistance in bringing it to the House floor for consideration. It has been a privilege to have worked alongside one of the true champions of peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula, Mr. CHARLIE RANGEL. He is, indeed, a true patriot.

We all know about his bravery and heroism as a young Army officer in the Korean war—spending his days literally freezing behind enemy lines. While wounded, CHARLIE courageously led 40 men from his unit out of a Chinese encirclement, undoubtedly saving many, many lives. For his bravery, CHARLIE earned the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star. Yes, CHARLIE suffered for his country, but his focus has continued to also be on the suffering of the Korean people. A nation was destroyed; millions were killed; families were brutally ripped apart. CHARLIE has never forgotten that. He didn’t leave Korea behind, which is why I was happy to work with him on the cause of bringing together the many, many Korean families that have been ripped apart by war.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, Korea remains a divided peninsula. There is a prosperous and free South Korea and a brutal, totalitarian, impoverished North Korea. This division is a calamity that is acutely felt by South Korean families that have been separated by the DMZ, but it is equally felt here by many Korean American families in the United States. In the decades since the momentous liberation of Korea, millions of Korean families have been separated from their loved ones. Today, an estimated 100,000 Korean Americans have been separated from their relatives in North Korea and have long sought an opportunity to be reunited.

Mr. Speaker, time is running out. Earlier this year, the average Korean separated by the war was 80 years old. A large number is over 90. It is far past time that these war-torn families be given one last opportunity to reunite with the family members they were separated from six decades ago. It is everyone’s hope—and, of course, of those in this body—that someday we will see Korea reunited. In the meantime, we can do what we can to encourage the reuniting of these families; so I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

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

I rise to support H. Con. Res. 40. I am pleased to support this measure that was introduced by Congressman CHARLIE RANGEL of New York, and I associate myself with the chairman’s remarks in the praise of Charlie’s service not only during the Korean war, but after that war, to focus on families that are both here and in Korea who were affected by that conflict.

A decorated veteran of the Korean war, Representative RANGEL has been a tireless advocate for peace and security on the peninsula and for the Korean American community here in the United States. His achievements are many, and as he retires after 40 decades of service here in Congress, he will, of course, be missed.

What Congressman RANGEL and the many cosponsors of H. Con. Res. 40 bring forth today—154 bipartisan cosponsors, including the chair and ranking member of the committee, myself, and so many others—is a reminder not just of the complex security situation on the peninsula, but of the human dimension of a war that has not been formally ended.

As this resolution reminds us, there are 10 million people on the Korean Peninsula and around the world who are victims of this family division, and there are some 100,000 American citizens who are still waiting to see—perhaps for one last time—family members that they have not seen for 60 years, who have remained north of the 38th parallel in the aftermath of the Korean war. There are approximately 1.7 million Korean Americans here in the United States. As I mentioned, over 100,000 of them have relatives who are north of the DMZ, and I am pleased to say that over half of those Korean Americans reside in the State of California.

The Korean Americans who have been divided from their families in North Korea are now in their senior years. Time is running out for these separated families to reunite—perhaps for just one last time—with parents, siblings, children. For many, reunification will be the only contact they will have had in so many decades. As of yet, Korean Americans have not been permitted to participate in family reunions. North Korea should encourage

reunions for the sake of their own citizens who are divided family members, for Korean Americans, and for those affected by the war no matter where in the world they live.

H. Con. Res. 40 urges the North Korea regime to resume family reunification visits, which have been suspended for over a year, and to allow families that chance to get together. It also calls on North Korea to take concrete steps to build goodwill that is conducive to peace on the Korean Peninsula. This is particularly important given the nuclear weapons tests and missile tests that we have seen from the north.

The reunification of families is a goodwill gesture that can help put the world and northeast Asia on the road to peace. That is why I support this resolution and urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD).

Mr. DOLD. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a critically important humanitarian issue as we talk about families. Each and every one of us just got back from Thanksgiving—an opportunity for us to gather around the table with our families. I think that is something that, often, too many of us take for granted—the opportunity and the ability that we have to jump on a plane or to get on a train and go visit our families. Yet, for so many Korean families, that is something that is beyond the realm of possibility.

It is beyond the realm of possibility because, at the outbreak of the Korean war, many of the Koreans thought that this was just going to be a conflict that was not going to last very long; so families were literally separated at that time and were hoping to be reunited in a very short period of time. What we do know is that, decade after decade, these families have not been able to be reunited. We want to encourage this reuniting of families. There are so many Korean Americans who have family in the north who have not been able to see their families.

□ 1815

Recently, Mr. Speaker, this last year I had an opportunity to travel to Korea and actually had an opportunity to talk to some of the families. A very small few—100 families—were going to have an opportunity to see their loved ones.

Time is of the essence. This is a humanitarian issue because more and more people are passing away and the opportunities to see their loved ones perishes. For the Korean Americans and for the Korean community, their opportunity to pay respects to those who have gone before them is also something that is critical, and they don't have the opportunity to visit them.

So I want to make sure that we stand together in a bipartisan way to encourage the opportunity for families to be able to be reunited.

I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for his leadership on this issue. Again, anybody who has served any time in this body knows his love for the Korean people and his record in the Korean war, his heroism in that regard.

I do hope that we, today, will vote to make sure we send a strong signal that the reuniting of families is something we should all stand and be united behind.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the author of this resolution and a champion for the Korean American community.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman SHERMAN for giving me this time to speak on this important issue. I will also take this opportunity to thank Chairman ED ROYCE.

So many people ask: After 46 years, what do you consider your major accomplishments? It is hard to explain to those of us who serve in the Congress that you don't list friendships as an accomplishment. There is no question, in knowing ED ROYCE from the people's Republic of California, that he has shattered the wall between Republicans and Democrats, and conservatives and liberals, and he is an American who cares about this Congress and this country. Whether I have talked to him about Africa or about Korea, he has listened and has done the best he could to show what America really feels proud of, and that is seeking peace and justice where we find dictatorships and people destroying the lives of others.

I get so much credit for being a wounded hero in Korea. I volunteered for the Army, but I sure didn't volunteer for Korea. As a matter of fact, it always baffled me how we could go there without a declaration of war. It baffled me who could make a decision to take a country like Korea with such a beautiful history and have human beings just draw a line and say that this is north, this is south, this is the Soviets, this is the United Nations, and the United States and not realize that these are human beings, mothers and fathers, sons and daughters; that notwithstanding the fact that the south was attacked, notwithstanding that the war still continues technically today, that all people should want to see their families united when all it takes is that, yes, you may see them.

So today I thank Chairman ROYCE so much, Mr. Speaker, and this House for showing America what we are all about. Because it is ironic that we are now talking about Korean Americans, we are talking about divided families USA. We are talking about people who love this country, who fight for this

country, but they still have a place they love, and they have family that they want to see before they pass away or before their families are gone.

Isn't this really what makes America different, to find people who love their homeland like Korean Americans love Korea and, at the same time, love this country more and ask us to join with them for what? They ask for peace, equity, and all the things that we care about, but also to meet their family.

There is so much compassion in this. There is so much to show how a line can show you poverty above the line, democracy and progress below the line. But more than anything else, this body is saying today that people who God made of the same blood, the same background, and the same culture, let them meet.

So I would like to include tonight as one of those proudest days that I have served in this august body and, also, to include Representative ED ROYCE as one of the most decent human beings I have also met while serving in this body.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I too join the chairman and the ranking member in saluting the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

I remember him telling the story that he was a teenager at the outbreak of the war in Korea, living in Harlem, and didn't know where Korea was. He sure knows today. He is an iconic figure in the Korean community.

Representative RANGEL, we salute you for your incredible heroism.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 40 to encourage the reunion of divided Korean American families. The division of north and south along the 38th parallel offers one of the world's most striking dichotomies. Yet, on both sides of the demilitarized zone resides a shared pain. The pain is that of families ripped apart by the war and an enduring division of one people into two countries. Reunions are a welcome respite from that separation, but, in the end, they provide yet another reminder that family reunification on the Korean Peninsula is all too fleeting.

Many of these Americans—more than 100,000 according to the last estimate—have been waiting to reunite with their family members in North Korea. Too many have already passed away without ever realizing that hope.

This resolution encourages Pyongyang to allow those Korean Americans to meet with their families. It also calls on the North Korean regime to take steps to build goodwill that is conducive to peace in the peninsula.

Earlier this year, we passed the North Korean Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act, which included my

amendment conditioning sanctions relief on the promotion of family reunifications for Koreans and Korean Americans.

It is vital our North Korea policy be informed with an understanding that there are human victims of this ongoing conflict in the North Korean Peninsula.

I ask my colleagues to support the resolution, which demonstrates our commitment to efforts to seek to relieve the pain of separation felt by Korean families.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I salute the author of this resolution, Representative RANGEL, and urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I also want to recognize the staff who have been so instrumental, not only on this resolution but also in maintaining our constructive policy toward Korea, Hannah Kim on Mr. RANGEL's staff and our committee staffers, Hunter Strupp and Jennifer Hendrixson-White.

Earlier, I noted how happy I was to have worked alongside my good friend and colleague, CHARLIE RANGEL, on this measure. As he is retiring at the end of this Congress, I want to once again recognize him as a true champion of U.S.-Korea relations. He truly is. No one, whether it was fighting for his country or advocating on behalf of so many Korean Americans, has done more for this partnership.

As Charlie has often said, since he survived the battle of Kunu-ri and led those freezing soldiers out of that encirclement, he has never, not since that day, never ever had a bad day since. Mr. Speaker, let's hope this streak continues well into the future.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 40, I rise today in strong support of its passage.

Tragically, the division on the Korean Peninsula separated more than 10,000,000 Korean family members, including some who are now citizens of the United States. As a result, many Korean Americans have waited for over 60 years for a chance to meet their relatives in North Korea for the first time.

Although there have been 19 rounds of family reunions between South Koreans and North Koreans, instability has continued to impede the reunion of these divided families. As some family members reach the later years of their lives, time becomes an important factor in giving these families the opportunity to connect.

Congress first signaled its interest in family reunions between United States citizens and their relatives in North Korea in section 1265 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181), which became law on January 28, 2008. We furthered our commitment to reunification when President Barack Obama signed into law the Continuing Appropriations Act 2011 (Public Law 111-242), which urged the Special Representative on North Korea Policy to prioritize the issues involving Korean divided families.

Enabling Korean Americans to meet their family members from North Korea will help establish the goodwill to lay the foundation for peace on the Korean Peninsula. While peace on the Korean Peninsula remains a long-term goal for the United States and all stakeholders in the region, a first step towards achieving it would be to allow family members to be reunified. This would be a significant step forward for greater security and stability for the region and the world.

I urge my colleagues in the House to swiftly pass H. Con. Res. 40.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 40.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSMITTING AN ALTERNATIVE PLAN FOR PAY INCREASES FOR CIVILIAN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES COVERED BY THE GENERAL SCHEDULE AND CERTAIN OTHER PAY SYSTEMS IN JANUARY 2017—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-185)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting an alternative plan for pay increases for civilian Federal employees covered by the General Schedule and certain other pay systems in January 2017. Title 5, United States Code, authorizes me to implement alternative pay plans for pay increases for civilian Federal employees covered by the General Schedule and certain other pay systems if, because of "national emergency or serious economic conditions affecting the general welfare," I view the adjustments that would otherwise take effect as inappropriate.

Civilian Federal employees made significant sacrifices as a result of the 3-year pay freeze that ended in January 2014. Since the pay freeze ended, annual adjustments for civilian Federal employees have also been lower than private sector pay increases and statutory formulas for adjustments to the General Schedule for 2014 through 2016. However, we must maintain efforts to keep our Nation on a sustainable fiscal course. This is an effort that continues to require tough choices under current economic conditions.

Under current law, locality pay increases averaging 28.49 percent and costing \$26 billion would go into effect

in January 2017. Federal agency budgets cannot sustain such increases. In my August 31, 2016, alternative pay plan submission, I noted that the alternative plan for locality payments will be limited so that the total combined cost of the 1.0 percent across-the-board base pay increase and the varying locality pay increases will be 1.6 percent of basic payroll, consistent with the assumption in my 2017 Budget. Accordingly, I have determined that under the authority of section 5304a of title 5, United States Code, locality-based comparability payments for the locality pay areas established by the President's Pay Agent, in the amounts set forth in the attached table, shall become effective on the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning on or after January 1, 2017.

The locality-based comparability payments for the locality pay rates in the attached table are based on an allocation of 0.6 percent of payroll as indicated in my August 31, 2016, alternative pay plan for adjustments to the base General Schedule. These decisions will not materially affect our ability to attract and retain a well-qualified Federal workforce.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, November 29, 2016.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 6 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 motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 5422, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 4757, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5843, de novo.

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

FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING HOTLINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5422) to ensure funding for the National Human Trafficking Hotline, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 0, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 588]

YEAS—399

Abraham	Davidson	Hudson
Adams	Davis (CA)	Huelskamp
Aderholt	Davis, Danny	Huffman
Aguilar	DeFazio	Huizenga (MI)
Allen	DeGette	Hultgren
Amash	Delaney	Hunter
Amodei	DeLauro	Hurd (TX)
Ashford	DelBene	Israel
Babin	Denham	Issa
Barr	Dent	Jackson Lee
Barton	DeSantis	Jeffries
Bass	DeSaulnier	Jenkins (KS)
Beatty	DesJarlais	Jenkins (WV)
Becerra	Deutch	Johnson (GA)
Benishek	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (OH)
Bera	Dingell	Johnson, E. B.
Bilirakis	Doggett	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (GA)	Dold	Jordan
Bishop (MI)	Donovan	Joyce
Bishop (UT)	Doyle, Michael	Katko
Black	F.	Keating
Blackburn	Duckworth	Kelly (IL)
Blum	Duffy	Kelly (MS)
Blumenauer	Duncan (SC)	Kelly (PA)
Bonamici	Duncan (TN)	Kennedy
Bost	Edwards	Kildee
Boustany	Ellison	Kilmer
Boyle, Brendan	Ellmers (NC)	Kind
F.	Emmer (MN)	King (IA)
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	King (NY)
Brady (TX)	Esty	Kinzinger (IL)
Brat	Evans	Kline
Bridenstine	Farenthold	Knight
Brooks (AL)	Farr	Kuster
Brooks (IN)	Fleischmann	Labrador
Brownley (CA)	Fleming	LaHood
Buchanan	Flores	LaMalfa
Buck	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Bucshon	Foster	Lance
Burgess	Fox	Langevin
Bustos	Frankel (FL)	Larsen (WA)
Butterfield	Franks (AZ)	Larson (CT)
Byrne	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Calvert	Fudge	Lawrence
Capps	Gabbard	Lee
Capuano	Gallego	Levin
Cárdenas	Garamendi	Lewis
Carney	Garrett	Lieu, Ted
Carson (IN)	Gibbs	Lipinski
Carter (GA)	Gibson	LoBiondo
Carter (TX)	Gohmert	Loebsack
Cartwright	Goodlatte	Lofgren
Castor (FL)	Gowdy	Long
Castro (TX)	Graham	Loudermilk
Chabot	Granger	Love
Chaffetz	Graves (GA)	Lowenthal
Chu, Judy	Graves (LA)	Lowe
Ciçilline	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Clark (MA)	Grayson	Luetkemeyer
Clarke (NY)	Green, Al	Lujan Grisham
Clay	Green, Gene	(NM)
Cleaver	Griffith	Luján, Ben Ray
Clyburn	Grothman	(NM)
Coffman	Guthrie	Lummis
Cohen	Gutiérrez	Lynch
Cole	Hanabusa	MacArthur
Collins (GA)	Hanna	Maloney
Collins (NY)	Hardy	Carolyn
Comer	Harper	Maloney, Sean
Comstock	Harris	Marchant
Conaway	Hartzler	Marino
Connolly	Hastings	Massie
Cook	Heck (NV)	Matsui
Cooper	Heck (WA)	McCarthy
Costa	Hensarling	McClintock
Courtney	Herrera Beutler	McColum
Cramer	Hice, Jody B.	McDermott
Crawford	Higgins	McGovern
Crenshaw	Hill	McHenry
Crowley	Himes	McKinley
Cuellar	Hinojosa	McMorris
Culberson	Holder	Rodgers
Cummings	Honda	McNerney
Curbelo (FL)	Hoyer	McSally

Meadows	Reichert	Smith (WA)
Meehan	Ribble	Speier
Meeks	Rice (NY)	Stefanik
Meng	Rice (SC)	Stewart
Messer	Richmond	Stivers
Mica	Rigell	Swalwell (CA)
Miller (FL)	Roby	Takano
Moolenaar	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (CA)
Mooney (WV)	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (MS)
Moore	Rohrabacher	Thompson (PA)
Moulton	Rokita	Thornberry
Mullin	Rooney (FL)	Tiberi
Mulvaney	Ros-Lehtinen	Tipton
Murphy (FL)	Roskam	Tonko
Murphy (PA)	Ross	Torres
Nadler	Rothfus	Tsongas
Napolitano	Rouzer	Turner
Neal	Roybal-Allard	Upton
Neugebauer	Royce	Valadao
Newhouse	Ruiz	Van Hollen
Noem	Ruppersberger	Vargas
Nolan	Rush	Velázquez
Norcross	Russell	Visclosky
Nunes	Ryan (OH)	Wagner
O'Rourke	Salmon	Walberg
Olson	Sánchez, Linda	Walden
Palazzo	T.	Walker
Pallone	Sanford	Walorski
Palmer	Sarbanes	Walters, Mimi
Pascrell	Scalise	Walz
Paulsen	Schakowsky	Wasserman
Payne	Schiff	Allen
Pearce	Schrader	Amash
Pelosi	Schweikert	Amodei
Perlmutter	Scott (VA)	Amodei
Perry	Scott, Austin	Ashford
Peters	Scott, David	Babin
Peterson	Sensenbrenner	Barr
Pingree	Serrano	Barton
Pittenger	Sessions	Bass
Pitts	Sewell (AL)	Beatty
Pocan	Sherman	Becerra
Poliquin	Shimkus	Benishek
Polis	Shuster	Bera
Pompeo	Simpson	Bilirakis
Posey	Sinema	Bishop (GA)
Price (NC)	Sires	Bishop (MI)
Price, Tom	Slaughter	Bishop (UT)
Quigley	Smith (MO)	Black
Rangel	Smith (NE)	Blackburn
Ratcliffe	Smith (NJ)	Blum
Reed	Smith (TX)	Blumenauer

NOT VOTING—35

Barletta	Grijalva	Renacci
Beyer	Guinta	Roe (TN)
Brown (FL)	Hahn	Sanchez, Loretta
Clawson (FL)	Hurt (VA)	Stutzman
Conyers	Jolly	Titus
Costello (PA)	Jones	Trott
Davis, Rodney	Kaptur	Veasey
Engel	Kirkpatrick	Vela
Fincher	McCaul	Weber (TX)
Fitzpatrick	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Forbes	Nugent	Williams
Gosar	Poe (TX)	

□ 1853

Mr. PAYNE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 588, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR HEADSTONES, MARKERS, AND MEDALLIONS FOR MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4757) to amend title 38,

United States Code, to expand the eligibility for headstones, markers, and medallions furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for deceased individuals who were awarded the Medal of Honor and are buried in private cemeteries, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 0, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 589]

YEAS—401

Abraham	Cooper	Green, Gene
Adams	Costa	Griffith
Aderholt	Costello (PA)	Grothman
Aguilar	Courtney	Guthrie
Allen	Cramer	Gutiérrez
Amash	Crawford	Hanabusa
Amodei	Crenshaw	Hanna
Ashford	Crowley	Hardy
Babin	Cuellar	Harper
Barr	Culberson	Harris
Barton	Cummings	Hartzler
Bass	Curbelo (FL)	Hastings
Beatty	Davidson	Heck (NV)
Becerra	Davis (CA)	Heck (WA)
Benishek	Davis, Danny	Hensarling
Bera	Davis, Rodney	Herrera Beutler
Bilirakis	DeFazio	Hice, Jody B.
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Higgins
Bishop (MI)	Delaney	Hill
Bishop (UT)	DeLauro	Himes
Black	DelBene	Hinojosa
Blackburn	Denham	Holder
Blum	Dent	Honda
Blumenauer	DeSantis	Hoyer
Bonamici	DeSaulnier	Hudson
Bost	DesJarlais	Huelskamp
Boustany	Deutch	Huffman
Boyle, Brendan	Diaz-Balart	Huizenga (MI)
F.	Dingell	Hultgren
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Hunter
Brady (TX)	Dold	Hurd (TX)
Brat	Donovan	Israel
Bridenstine	Doyle, Michael	Issa
Brooks (AL)	F.	Jackson Lee
Brooks (IN)	Duckworth	Jeffries
Brownley (CA)	Duffy	Jenkins (KS)
Buchanan	Duncan (SC)	Jenkins (WV)
Buck	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (GA)
Bucshon	Edwards	Johnson (OH)
Burgess	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Bustos	Ellmers (NC)	Johnson, Sam
Butterfield	Emmer (MN)	Jordan
Byrne	Eshoo	Joyce
Calvert	Esty	Kaptur
Capps	Evans	Katko
Capuano	Farenthold	Keating
Cárdenas	Farr	Kelly (IL)
Carney	Fleischmann	Kelly (MS)
Carson (IN)	Fleming	Kelly (PA)
Carter (GA)	Flores	Kennedy
Carter (TX)	Fortenberry	Kildee
Cartwright	Foster	Kilmer
Castor (FL)	Fox	Kind
Castro (TX)	Frankel (FL)	King (IA)
Chabot	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Chaffetz	Frelinghuysen	Kinzinger (IL)
Chu, Judy	Fudge	Kline
Ciçilline	Gabbard	Knight
Clark (MA)	Gallego	Kuster
Clarke (NY)	Garamendi	Labrador
Clay	Garrett	LaHood
Cleaver	Gibbs	LaMalfa
Clyburn	Gibson	Lamborn
Coffman	Gohmert	Lance
Cohen	Goodlatte	Langevin
Cole	Gosar	Larsen (WA)
Collins (GA)	Gowdy	Larson (CT)
Collins (NY)	Graham	Latta
Comer	Granger	Lawrence
Comstock	Graves (GA)	Lee
Conaway	Graves (LA)	Levin
Connolly	Grayson	Lewis
Cook	Green, Al	Lieu, Ted

Lipinski	Palmer	Sherman
LoBiondo	Pascrell	Shimkus
Loeback	Paulsen	Shuster
Lofgren	Payne	Simpson
Long	Pearce	Sinema
Loudermilk	Pelosi	Sires
Love	Perlmutter	Slaughter
Lowenthal	Perry	Smith (MO)
Lowey	Peters	Smith (NE)
Lucas	Peterson	Smith (NJ)
Luetkemeyer	Pingree	Smith (TX)
Lujan Grisham	Pittenger	Smith (WA)
(NM)	Pitts	Speier
Lujan, Ben Ray	Pocan	Stefanik
(NM)	Poliquin	Stewart
Lummis	Polis	Stivers
Lynch	Pompeo	Swalwell (CA)
MacArthur	Posey	Takano
Maloney,	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Carolyn	Price, Tom	Thompson (MS)
Maloney, Sean	Quigley	Thompson (PA)
Marchant	Rangel	Thornberry
Marino	Ratcliffe	Reed
Massie	Reid	Tiberi
Matsui	Reichert	Tipton
McCarthy	Ribble	Tonko
McCintock	Rice (NY)	Torres
McCollum	Rice (SC)	Tsongas
McDermott	Richmond	Turner
McGovern	Rigell	Upton
McHenry	Roby	Valadao
McKinley	Rogers (AL)	Van Hollen
McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Vargas
Rodgers	Rohrabacher	Velázquez
McNerney	Rokita	Visclosky
McSally	Rooney (FL)	Wagner
Meadows	Ros-Lehtinen	Walberg
Meehan	Roskam	Walden
Meeks	Ross	Walker
Meng	Rothfus	Walorski
Messer	Rouzer	Walters, Mimi
Mica	Roybal-Allard	Walz
Miller (FL)	Royce	Wasserman
Moolenaar	Ruiz	Schultz
Mooney (WV)	Ruppersberger	Waters, Maxine
Moore	Rush	Watson Coleman
Moulton	Russell	Webster (FL)
Mullin	Salmon	Welch
Mulvaney	Sánchez, Linda	Wenstrup
Murphy (FL)	T.	Westerman
Murphy (PA)	Sanford	Wilson (FL)
Nadler	Sarbanes	Wilson (SC)
Napolitano	Scalise	Wittman
Neal	Schakowsky	Womack
Neugebauer	Schiff	Woodall
Newhouse	Schrader	Yarmuth
Noem	Schweikert	Yoder
Nolan	Scott (VA)	Yoho
Norcross	Scott, Austin	Young (AK)
Nunes	Scott, David	Young (IA)
O'Rourke	Sensenbrenner	Young (IN)
Olson	Serrano	Zeldin
Palazzo	Sessions	Zinke
Pallone	Sewell (AL)	

NOT VOTING—33

Barletta	Guinta	Roe (TN)
Beyer	Hahn	Ryan (OH)
Brown (FL)	Hurt (VA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Clawson (FL)	Jolly	Stutzman
Conyers	Jones	Titus
Engel	Kirkpatrick	Trott
Fincher	McCaul	Veasey
Fitzpatrick	Miller (MI)	Vela
Forbes	Nugent	Weber (TX)
Graves (MO)	Poe (TX)	Westmoreland
Grijalva	Renacci	Williams

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1901

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to expand the eligibility for headstones, markers, and medallions furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for deceased individuals who were awarded the Medal of

Honor and are buried in private cemeteries, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MCCAUL. On November 29, 2016, I missed the voting session. If present, I would have voted as follows: "Yes"—H.R. 5422—To ensure funding for the National Human Trafficking Hotline, and for other purposes.

"Yes"—H.R. 4757—To amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the eligibility for headstones, markers, and medallions furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for deceased individuals who were awarded the Medal of Honor and are buried in private cemeteries, as amended

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL CYBERSECURITY COOPERATION ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 5843) to establish a grant program at the Department of Homeland Security to promote cooperative research and development between the United States and Israel on cybersecurity, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

REPORT ON H. RES. 933, PROVIDING AMOUNTS FOR FURTHER EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE IN THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS

Mr. HARPER, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-838) providing amounts for further expenses of the Committee on Energy and Commerce in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

TREATMENT OF BUILDINGS AND OTHER AREAS WITHIN BOUNDARIES OF REAL ESTATE OR OTHER PROPERTY INTERESTS ACQUIRED BY NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5160) to amend title 40, United States Code, to include as part of the buildings and grounds of the National Gallery of Art any buildings and other areas within the boundaries of any real estate or other property interests acquired by

the National Gallery of Art, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5160

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

SECTION 1. TREATMENT OF BUILDINGS AND OTHER AREAS WITHIN BOUNDARIES OF REAL ESTATE OR OTHER PROPERTY INTERESTS ACQUIRED BY NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART.

Section 6301(2) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "The National Gallery of Art" and inserting "(A) The National Gallery of Art";

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(B) All other buildings, service roads, walks, and other areas within the exterior boundaries of any real estate or land or interest in land (including temporary use) that the National Gallery of Art acquires and that the Director of the National Gallery of Art determines to be necessary for the adequate protection of individuals or property in the National Gallery of Art and suitable for administration as a part of the National Gallery of Art."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 34, TSUNAMI WARNING, EDUCATION, AND RESEARCH ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6392, SYSTEMIC RISK DESIGNATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2016

Mr. BURGESS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-839) on the resolution (H. Res. 934) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 34) to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6392) to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to specify when bank holding companies may be subject to certain enhanced supervision, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

VETERANS MOBILITY SAFETY ACT OF 2016

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3471) to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the provision of automobiles and adaptive equipment by the Department of Veterans Affairs, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Veterans Mobility Safety Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. PERSONAL SELECTIONS OF AUTOMOBILES AND ADAPTIVE EQUIPMENT.

Section 3903(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "Except" and inserting "(1) Except"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) The Secretary shall ensure that to the extent practicable an eligible person who is provided an automobile or other conveyance under this chapter is given the opportunity to make personal selections relating to such automobile or other conveyance."

SEC. 3. COMPREHENSIVE POLICY FOR THE AUTOMOBILES ADAPTIVE EQUIPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) **COMPREHENSIVE POLICY.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall develop a comprehensive policy regarding quality standards for providers who provide modification services to veterans under the automobile adaptive equipment program.

(b) **SCOPE.**—The policy developed under subsection (a) shall cover each of the following:

(1) The Department of Veterans Affairs-wide management of the automobile adaptive equipment program.

(2) The development of standards for safety and quality of equipment and installation of equipment through the automobile adaptive equipment program, including with respect to the defined differentiations in levels of modification complexity.

(3) The consistent application of standards for safety and quality of both equipment and installation throughout the Department.

(4) In accordance with subsection (c)(1), the certification of a provider by a manufacturer if the Secretary designates the quality standards of such manufacturer as meeting or exceeding the standards developed under this section.

(5) In accordance with subsection (c)(2), the certification of a provider by a third party, nonprofit organization if the Secretary designates the quality standards of such organization as meeting or exceeding the standards developed under this section.

(6) The education and training of personnel of the Department who administer the automobile adaptive equipment program.

(7) The compliance of the provider with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.) when furnishing automobile adaptive equipment at the facility of the provider.

(8) The allowance, where technically appropriate, for veterans to receive modifications at their residence or location of choice, including standards that ensure such receipt and notification to veterans of the availability of such receipt.

(c) **CERTIFICATION OF MANUFACTURERS AND THIRD PARTY, NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.**—

(1) **CERTIFICATION OF MANUFACTURERS.**—The Secretary shall approve a manufacturer as a

certifying manufacturer for purposes of subsection (b)(4), if the manufacturer demonstrates that its certification standards meet or exceed the quality standards developed under this section.

(2) **CERTIFICATION OF THIRD PARTY, NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may approve two or more private, nonprofit organizations as third party, nonprofit certifying organizations for purposes of subsection (b)(5).

(B) **LIMITATION.**—If at any time there is only one third party, nonprofit certifying organization approved by the Secretary for purposes of subsection (b)(5), such organization shall not be permitted to provide certifications under such subsection until such time as the Secretary approves a second third party, nonprofit certifying organization for purposes of such subsection.

(d) **UPDATES.**—

(1) **INITIAL UPDATES.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall update Veterans Health Administration Handbook 1173.4, or any successor handbook or directive, in accordance with the policy developed under subsection (a).

(2) **SUBSEQUENT UPDATES.**—Not less frequently than once every 6 years thereafter, the Secretary shall update such handbook, or any successor handbook or directive.

(e) **CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary shall develop the policy under subsection (a), and revise such policy under subsection (d), in consultation with veterans service organizations, the National Highway Transportation Administration, industry representatives, manufacturers of automobile adaptive equipment, and other entities with expertise in installing, repairing, replacing, or manufacturing mobility equipment or developing mobility accreditation standards for automobile adaptive equipment.

(f) **CONFLICTS.**—In developing and implementing the policy under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) minimize the possibility of conflicts of interest, to the extent practicable; and

(2) establish procedures that ensure against the use of a certifying organization referred to in subsection (b)(5) that has a financial conflict of interest regarding the certification of an eligible provider.

(g) **BIENNIAL REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Secretary updates Veterans Health Administration Handbook 1173.4, or any successor handbook or directive, under subsection (d), and not less frequently than once every other year thereafter through 2022, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the implementation and facility compliance with the policy developed under subsection (a).

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the implementation plan for the policy developed under subsection (a) and any revisions to such policy under subsection (d).

(B) A description of the performance measures used to determine the effectiveness of such policy in ensuring the safety of veterans enrolled in the automobile adaptive equipment program.

(C) An assessment of safety issues due to improper installations based on a survey of recipients of adaptive equipment from the Department.

(D) An assessment of the adequacy of the adaptive equipment services of the Department based on a survey of recipients of adaptive equipment from the Department.

(E) An assessment of the training provided to the personnel of the Department with respect to administering the program.

(F) An assessment of the certified providers of the Department of adaptive equipment with respect to meeting the minimum standards developed under subsection (b)(2).

(h) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AUTOMOBILE ADAPTIVE EQUIPMENT PROGRAM.**—The term "automobile adaptive equipment program" means the program administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs pursuant to chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) **VETERANS SERVICE ORGANIZATION.**—The term "veterans service organization" means any organization recognized by the Secretary for the representation of veterans under section 5902 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 4. APPOINTMENT OF LICENSED HEARING AID SPECIALISTS IN VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **LICENSED HEARING AID SPECIALISTS.**—

(1) **APPOINTMENT.**—Section 7401(3) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "licensed hearing aid specialists," after "Audiologists,"

(2) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—Section 7402(b)(14) of such title is amended by inserting ", hearing aid specialist" after "dental technologist".

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—With respect to appointing hearing aid specialists under sections 7401 and 7402 of title 38, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a), and providing services furnished by such specialists, the Secretary shall ensure that—

(1) a hearing aid specialist may only perform hearing services consistent with the hearing aid specialist's State license related to the practice of fitting and dispensing hearing aids without excluding other qualified professionals, including audiologists, from rendering services in overlapping practice areas;

(2) services provided to veterans by hearing aid specialists shall be provided as part of the non-medical treatment plan developed by an audiologist; and

(3) the medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs provide to veterans access to the full range of professional services provided by an audiologist.

(c) **CONSULTATION.**—In determining the qualifications required for hearing aid specialists and in carrying out subsection (b), the Secretary shall consult with veterans service organizations, audiologists, otolaryngologists, hearing aid specialists, and other stakeholder and industry groups as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(d) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter during the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress a report on the following:

(A) Timely access of veterans to hearing health services through the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(B) Contracting policies of the Department with respect to providing hearing health services to veterans in facilities that are not facilities of the Department.

(2) **TIMELY ACCESS TO SERVICES.**—Each report shall, with respect to the matter specified in paragraph (1)(A) for the 1-year period preceding the submittal of such report, include the following:

(A) The staffing levels of audiologists, hearing aid specialists, and health technicians in audiology in the Veterans Health Administration.

(B) A description of the metrics used by the Secretary in measuring performance with respect to appointments and care relating to hearing health.

(C) The average time that a veteran waits to receive an appointment, beginning on the date on which the veteran makes the request, for the following:

(i) A disability rating evaluation for a hearing-related disability.

(ii) A hearing aid evaluation.

(iii) Dispensing of hearing aids.

(iv) Any follow-up hearing health appointment.

(D) The percentage of veterans whose total wait time for appointments described in subparagraph (C), including an initial and follow-

up appointment, if applicable, is more than 30 days.

(3) **CONTRACTING POLICIES.**—Each report shall, with respect to the matter specified in paragraph (1)(B) for the 1-year period preceding the submittal of such report, include the following:

(A) The number of veterans that the Secretary refers to non-Department audiologists for hearing health care appointments.

(B) The number of veterans that the Secretary refers to non-Department hearing aid specialists for follow-up appointments for a hearing aid evaluation, the dispensing of hearing aids, or any other purpose relating to hearing health.

Mr. KING of New York (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST RESPONDER ANTHRAX PREPAREDNESS ACT

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1915) to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to make anthrax vaccines available to emergency response providers, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1915

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 "First Responder Anthrax Preparedness Act".

SEC. 2. VOLUNTARY PRE-EVENT ANTHRAX VACCINATION PILOT PROGRAM FOR EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROVIDERS.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall carry out a pilot program to provide eligible anthrax vaccines from the Strategic National Stockpile under section 319F-2(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-6b(a)) that will be nearing the end of their labeled dates of use at the time such vaccines are made available to States for administration to emergency response providers who would be at high risk of exposure to anthrax if such an attack should occur and who voluntarily consent to such administration.

(2) **DETERMINATION.**—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall determine whether an anthrax vaccine is eligible to be provided to the Secretary of Homeland Security for the pilot program described in paragraph (1) based on—

(A) a determination that the vaccine is not otherwise allotted for other purposes;

(B) a determination that the provision of the vaccine will not reduce, or otherwise ad-

versely affect, the capability to meet projected requirements for this product during a public health emergency, including a significant reduction of available quantities of vaccine in the Strategic National Stockpile; and

(C) such other considerations as determined appropriate by the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(3) **PRELIMINARY REQUIREMENTS.**—Before implementing the pilot program required under this subsection, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall—

(A) establish a communication platform for the pilot program;

(B) develop and deliver education and training for the pilot program;

(C) conduct economic analysis of the pilot program, including a preliminary estimate of total costs and expected benefits;

(D) create a logistical platform for the anthrax vaccine request process under the pilot program;

(E) establish goals and desired outcomes for the pilot program; and

(F) establish a mechanism to reimburse the Secretary of Health and Human Services for—

(i) the costs of shipment and transportation of such vaccines provided to the Secretary of Homeland Security from the Strategic National Stockpile under such pilot program, including staff time directly supporting such shipment and transportation; and

(ii) the amount, if any, by which the warehousing costs of the Strategic National Stockpile are increased in order to operate such pilot program.

(4) LOCATION.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out the pilot program required under this subsection, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall select not fewer than 2 nor more than 5 States for voluntary participation in the pilot program.

(B) **REQUIREMENT.**—Each State that participates in the pilot program under this subsection shall ensure that such participation is consistent with the All-Hazards Public Health Emergency Preparedness and Response Plan of the State developed under section 319C-1 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-3a).

(5) **GUIDANCE FOR SELECTION.**—To ensure that participation in the pilot program under this subsection strategically increases State and local response readiness in the event of an anthrax release, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall provide guidance to participating States and units of local government on identifying emergency response providers who are at high risk of exposure to anthrax.

(6) **DISTRIBUTION OF INFORMATION.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall require that each State that participates in the pilot program under this subsection submit a written certification to the Secretary of Homeland Security stating that each emergency response provider within the State that participates in the pilot program is provided with disclosures and educational materials designated by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, which may include—

(A) materials regarding the associated benefits and risks of any vaccine provided under the pilot program, and of exposure to anthrax;

(B) additional material consistent with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's clinical guidance; and

(C) notice that the Federal Government is not obligated to continue providing anthrax vaccine after the date on which the pilot program ends.

(7) **MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.**—Before implementing the pilot program under this subsection, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Secretary of Health and Human Services to—

(A) define the roles and responsibilities of each Department for the pilot program; and

(B) establish other performance metrics and policies for the pilot program, as appropriate.

(8) REPORT.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding subsection (c), not later than 1 year after the date on which the initial vaccines are administered under this section, and annually thereafter until 1 year after the completion of the pilot program under this section, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report on the progress and results of the pilot program, including—

(i) a detailed tabulation of the costs to administer the program, including—

(I) total costs for management and administration;

(II) total costs to ship vaccines;

(III) total number of full-time equivalents allocated to the program; and

(IV) total costs to the Strategic National Stockpile;

(ii) the number and percentage of eligible emergency response providers, as determined by each pilot location, that volunteer to participate;

(iii) the degree to which participants complete the vaccine regimen;

(iv) the total number of doses of vaccine administered; and

(v) recommendations to improve initial and recurrent participation in the pilot program.

(B) **FINAL REPORT.**—The final report required under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) consider whether the pilot program required under this subsection should continue after the date described in subsection (c); and

(ii) include—

(I) an analysis of the costs and benefits of continuing the program to provide anthrax vaccines to emergency response providers;

(II) an explanation of the economic, health, and other risks and benefits of administering vaccines through the pilot program rather than post-event treatment; and

(III) in the case of a recommendation under clause (i) to continue the pilot program after the date described in subsection (c), a plan under which the pilot program could be continued.

(b) **DEADLINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall begin implementing the pilot program under this section.

(c) **SUNSET.**—The authority to carry out the pilot program under this section shall expire on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORTHERN BORDER SECURITY REVIEW ACT

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from

the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1808) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct a Northern Border threat analysis, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1808

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 "Northern Border Security Review Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

(E) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(F) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(2) NORTHERN BORDER.—The term "Northern Border" means the land and maritime borders between the United States and Canada.

SEC. 3. NORTHERN BORDER THREAT ANALYSIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a Northern Border threat analysis to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(1) current and potential terrorism and criminal threats posed by individuals and organized groups seeking—

(A) to enter the United States through the Northern Border; or

(B) to exploit border vulnerabilities on the Northern Border;

(2) improvements needed at and between ports of entry along the Northern Border—

(A) to prevent terrorists and instruments of terrorism from entering the United States; and

(B) to reduce criminal activity, as measured by the total flow of illegal goods, illicit drugs, and smuggled and trafficked persons moved in either direction across to the Northern Border;

(3) gaps in law, policy, cooperation between State, tribal, and local law enforcement, international agreements, or tribal agreements that hinder effective and efficient border security, counter-terrorism, anti-human smuggling and trafficking efforts, and the flow of legitimate trade along the Northern Border; and

(4) whether additional U.S. Customs and Border Protection preclearance and preinspection operations at ports of entry along the Northern Border could help prevent terrorists and instruments of terror from entering the United States.

(b) ANALYSIS REQUIREMENTS.—For the threat analysis required under subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall consider and examine—

(1) technology needs and challenges;

(2) personnel needs and challenges;

(3) the role of State, tribal, and local law enforcement in general border security activities;

(4) the need for cooperation among Federal, State, tribal, local, and Canadian law enforcement entities relating to border security;

(5) the terrain, population density, and climate along the Northern Border; and

(6) the needs and challenges of Department facilities, including the physical approaches to such facilities.

(c) CLASSIFIED THREAT ANALYSIS.—To the extent possible, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit the threat analysis required under subsection (a) in unclassified form. The Secretary may submit a portion of the threat analysis in classified form if the Secretary determines that such form is appropriate for that portion.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR VICTIMS OF WOODMORE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL BUS CRASH

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to offer a moment of silence. On November 21, while many of us were preparing for the Thanksgiving holiday, tragedy once again struck my hometown of Chattanooga, Tennessee.

Woodmore Elementary School is a beautiful elementary school; young, vibrant children, all so precious. There was a tragic schoolbus crash that happened that day in Chattanooga, Tennessee. The crash took the lives of six young children: Keonte Wilson, Cor'Dayja Jones, Zyaira Mateen, D'Myunn Brown, Zoie Nash, and Zyanna Harris. In addition, several other children were severely injured. Many are still in critical condition.

I know I can speak for all of us, including my dear friends who have joined me from the Tennessee delegation, when I say that we are absolutely heartbroken over this horrific tragedy. Nothing I can say tonight can diminish the gravity of the loss that our community has suffered.

But I must thank the first responders, the Chattanooga Police Department, the local officials, and especially the staff, the doctors at Children's Hospital at Erlanger, for their immediate and compassionate response to this tragedy.

My brothers and sisters in the House, I went with our Governor to see the care and treatment that these children were getting. One young lady about to go up to surgery gave me the thumbs up.

At a time of such tragic loss, these precious lives were lost, and so many are forever hurt. Please join me now in a moment of silence for the victims, for their families, and for our Chattanooga community.

□ 1915

REMEMBERING SAN ANTONIO POLICE OFFICER DETECTIVE BENJAMIN MARCONI

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise the day after my hometown, San Antonio, laid to rest a hero who was taken from us too soon, Detective Benjamin Marconi.

The son of a San Antonio police officer, Detective Marconi was a 20-year veteran of the force whose life was tragically cut short last week while he was in the field serving our city.

Known for his big smile, his kindness, and his commitment to doing the right thing, Detective Marconi was a beloved member of our community. He leaves behind a son, a grandson, and an extended family who brought him great joy.

Our city mourns the loss of Detective Marconi, an outstanding San Antonian, whom we dearly miss. His passing is a tragic reminder of the risk all of our law enforcement officers take when they go to work each day to keep us safe. We are grateful for his service and theirs.

FIDEL CASTRO'S BRUTAL LEGACY

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the Cuban people can finally close one chapter in their 57-year nightmare of oppressive rule: Fidel Castro has died.

When I was just 8 years old, I was forced to flee my native homeland of Cuba with my family. We were not the first, nor were we the last, to leave all that we had behind in search of freedom, democracy, opportunity, and safety.

Many constituents I am so humbled to represent have had family members who did not survive their journey, yet they all risked their lives in fleeing Cuba because they felt the brutality of Fidel Castro. They witnessed firsthand the ruthlessness of the tyrant, and they felt that it was like having their human rights stripped from their very being.

Their stories and their experiences—the firing squads, the gulags, and the torture—Mr. Speaker, will be Fidel Castro's legacy.

EL PASO DREAMERS

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, in this country, there are over 700,000 DREAMERS, children and young Americans brought to this country at a young age, through no fault of their own, to improve their lives, their opportunities, and those of their families. They are

every bit as much American as you or I or our children.

Pictured next to me is Itzel Campos of El Paso, Texas, a 15-year-old sophomore at Franklin High School, who came to a townhall meeting that we had last night where 300 El Pasoans came out to either tell their stories or show support for DREAMers.

We want to make sure that the President-elect and that the Congress that we have here and the one that will be seated in January do everything within their power to keep these DREAMers in our country, who will earn more than \$4 trillion in taxable income during their lives but, more importantly, will contribute to the American Dream, will improve communities like mine, which happens to be the safest city in America in large part because of the immigrants, and especially these DREAMers who call El Paso home, and to give people like Itzel every chance to succeed, to improve their lives and the course of this country.

CONGRATULATIONS TO GOVERNOR NIKKI HALEY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President-elect Donald Trump nominated South Carolina Governor Nikki Haley to be America's Ambassador to the United Nations.

President-elect Trump has announced:

Governor Haley has a proven record of bringing people together regardless of background or party affiliation to move critical policies forward for the betterment of her State and country. She is also a proven dealmaker, and we look forward to making plenty of deals. She will be a great leader representing us on the world stage.

Governor Haley has led the people of South Carolina through trying times, such as the historic thousand-year flood last year, Hurricane Matthew flooding this year, and the tragic shooting at Mother Emanuel Church in Charleston. She has promoted a pro-business and pro-job environment by recruiting major companies such as Boeing and Volvo, along with Michelin, BMW, and Bridgestone expansions. Governor Haley will be a strong and effective voice for America, advancing freedom and democracy around the world.

Congratulations to Governor Haley and her husband, Michael, and children, Rena and Nalin, on this achievement. Your Lexington County neighbors are very proud of you.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

REDUCING RED TAPE

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House Subcommittee on Federal Lands is holding a hearing soon on H.R. 5129, the Guide and Outfitter Act—we call it the GO Act—which I have sponsored to make it easier for Americans to access and enjoy their public lands.

I began working on this legislation after an annual endurance run in my district, which had been held for years, was canceled after Federal agencies demanded a costly new study of the event's environmental impacts, a study the small, nonprofit group that held the event couldn't afford. That's right, Federal agencies were concerned that people running on existing trails could have negative impacts on the environment.

The GO Act cuts this red tape by creating a categorical exclusion to ensure activities which have already been permitted do not need duplicative studies in order to continue. It creates a one-stop joint permitting system so races and other events that might stretch across Forest Service lands, BLM, and National Park land, et cetera, don't need to repeat the permit process over and over and over with every single agency.

The bill caps fees to keep them affordable and allows existing permits to be easily extended so that public access and events can continue.

I am proud to say this bill will help get more Americans outside, Mr. Speaker, for less money and with less red tape. That is a goal every Member of this body can support.

AVOIDING TRUMP ADMINISTRATION CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those Americans who is very concerned about the conflict of interest that the President-elect faces as he assumes office. I don't think we have ever elected someone to office in this country with his vast wealth, but I must say, as ranking member on the Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, let me give you one area which causes me concern: where he will separate his private interest from the public interest.

The committee on which I rank handles the Army Corps of Engineers' budget, and we don't have enough money to deal with all the projects around the country, some of which are backed up 20 years. What happens if Mar-a-Lago in Florida faces flooding—or any of the other coastal properties that the President-elect owns—and the Army is trying to make a decision on where to place Federal funds? Will his properties take precedence over thousands of other projects around the country that have been backlogged for years?

I think it is really important that the President-elect create a blind trust and put all of his assets in there. Obviously, he will have a good life in the years ahead, but we simply must not allow the private interests of any American to pollute the public decisions that this country must make.

CLIMATE CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, as a lifelong resident of northern Michigan, I know how important it is to protect and conserve our precious natural resources. Northern Michigan's economy depends on our Great Lakes and our outdoor spaces for tourism, agriculture, and sporting activities.

Generations of people in my district have grown up experiencing the outdoors from the shores of Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore to Isle Royale National Park. However, we need to make sure that there is a balance and that we do not undertake rash and unproven regulatory policies that are almost guaranteed to negatively impact our economy in the hope of some potential—and often unquantifiable—environmental gain.

I just got back from northern Michigan. As a matter of fact, I was in Ottawa National Forest hunting. What strikes me about the regulatory nature of the Federal Government is it doesn't really take into account what is happening in the wild. The Ottawa National Forest, for example, hasn't been properly managed. The regulations as far as managing the forest make it so difficult that the forest is aging and the trees are actually falling down and rotting rather than being harvested. This is just one of the policies of this administration, and I am really hoping, now that we have a new administration coming forward, there will be a lot of change in the regulatory policies to actually develop policies that make sense for our environment and make sense for our people. That is why I wanted to speak tonight about many of these policies that affect our environment and global warming.

A lot of policies of the last administration, even the administration before that, really don't have the globe at the forefront of solving these problems. What they have been doing is just writing more and more regulations that stop whatever we are doing, and they don't have any particular effect on the global environment.

I am bringing this up for a reason. I just brought this little pollution-by-country chart, and this is the global pollution for the whole world. We know the United States is a pretty big part of that. The EU is a big part of that. India is big, and China is the biggest. The rest of the world provides, probably, the largest. But what strikes me

about this is the fact that we in America haven't done things right all the time, but we are constantly striving to make improvements.

My problem with the way that the regulations are written under this administration is the fact that we are killing our economy to improve the global environment, and yet we are a relatively small part of the problem of pollution and global warming—if you believe that it is manmade—and we are not really doing anything about the rest of this.

We are putting so many regulatory burdens on our industry, like, for example, energy production. The cost of energy production is a big part of making steel, for example. Many of the countries around the world are buying steel not so much from us but from China and India because they are polluting the planet in order to produce cheap steel, and we are really helping the environment with all our regulations and everything to the point that we are losing all of our jobs. That doesn't make any sense. If we were allowed to harvest our energy in a very environmentally friendly way, we would have more jobs here in this country. These guys would have less jobs. I want to keep jobs here in America.

This is just one of the examples. Wait until you see some of the pictures I have.

□ 1930

My district was once a huge mining area. We mine iron ore, construction sand and gravel, salt is produced in Michigan, and copper. And these are all good-paying jobs.

I am going to give you a great example of one of the weirdest regulations that have come out of this administration. And that is we do have a mine in my district that recently opened, a new nickel mine, the first nickel mine in this country, I think, in over 50 years. The road to the mine, there is no good road to the mine. There is 68 miles of road through a downtown and around a roundabout to the processing mill to process the nickel ore.

The local county road commission wanted to build a 22-mile road that would bypass the 68 miles of road through a downtown, but they can't get a permit to build the road because EPA blocked it. Now, the Federal Government in Washington, D.C., is telling a local county in my district that they can't build a road because it involves some wetlands. Well, there is about 5 acres of wetlands that have to be filled in order to build this road. Believe me, you can't build a road anywhere in this country without filling in some wetlands in order to have the grade be safe.

We have had environmental laws in this country that said: if you are going to fill in some wetlands to build a road, you have got to create some wetlands somewhere else to mitigate for the fact that you have taken away some habi-

tat from some species maybe and that sort of thing. Well, the road commission put up 100 times the acreage of the wetlands that they were going to use for the roadway to mitigate for that. But that wasn't good enough for the EPA. As a matter of fact, the EPA stopped the road without even listening very well to the mitigation plan.

This was bad for jobs. It makes it difficult for the mine to do business. It makes the longevity of the mine not as good because it is more expensive to process the ore. And it creates more pollution because the trucks are driving 68 miles to the ore processing plant versus the 22 miles on a new road. Besides, the new road would open up a lot of other areas for economic development as well.

Well, this is the type of rule and regulation that doesn't make any sense to the people that want to protect their environment with fewer miles on the road with diesel trucks and also provide economic opportunity in an area that needs jobs. So I am really hopeful that we will continue with a new administration to improve and stop this ridiculous rulemaking that has absolutely no effect on the environment—if anything, it makes it worse—all because people in Washington here under this administration have decided that they know better than the people in Michigan who actually live there, and they can't make a decision for themselves because you can't possibly know it would be good for the environment because you are just living on the UP and you don't really know what is what. That has been my frustration in my time here in Congress. That is a really good example of what is going on.

I want to show you a couple of pictures of some places around the world that aren't managing the environment, such as the United States is. Here we have a factory, a Chinese factory that is putting out all kinds of pollutants without any significant environmental controls on them at all. These are the kind of factories that we are competing with, with our factories, which are much better.

We just had a coal-fired power plant stopped in my district several years ago by the EPA because of this administration's war on coal. This coal plant was a state-of-the-art coal plant. It didn't even produce CO₂ because, in my district, they are able to harness the technology to capture the CO₂ and sell it and actually use it to pump in the ground to help the production of local oil wells. The CO₂ is not an issue. So we are actually competing with people that do this to our environment, and losing jobs overseas because of the tight regulations we have here, but we are not doing anything about this that is going on across the world. None of the policies that we have instituted on our industry are in effect over there. We haven't put any significant demands on the Chinese to make them stop doing this.

I was talking to some biologists from the University of Michigan. We have an environmental research station in my district. The University of Michigan has been studying the environment for the last 100 years or so. And one of the things that I found really interesting was the fact that one of the great concerns about coal mining and coal used for energy production was the mercury in the air. I was talking to these guys from the University of Michigan and they said: we solved the mercury problem in this country decades ago; that is not a problem anymore.

Most of the mercury that is in our environment here in the United States comes from China and India. Because it is over in China and India doesn't mean that it is not a global problem. That stuff goes up in the atmosphere. It takes the jet stream, and it comes all the way over here. The majority of the pollutant mercury in our country is coming from places like this. This administration has done nothing about it except for putting more stringent controls on our energy production, making our energy more expensive, and making people want to buy steel and other products from countries that do this to our environment.

This is not the right way to deal with this issue. If we are going to deal with global pollution, global production of harmful toxins, or global warming, we have to talk to people that are bad actors around the world and make them do their part and not make our industries really the joke of everyone else in the world because they are making money and we are losing our jobs and it doesn't make any sense whatsoever.

Let's see another picture here. This is a pretty good one from India. This is a river in India. This is all trash in the middle of the river in India. I went to India, and I was appalled by how filthy it was and the lack of environmental rules. This is what we are dealing with.

Now, I know the Indians and, perhaps, the Chinese are not as developed as we are, but they are competing in the same environment for industry as we are along the globe. I am hopeful that the coming Trump administration is going to take this kind of stuff seriously, unlike the Obama administration, which his only answer to global warming and global pollution is to put more and more restrictions on our industry, killing jobs in this country and giving more jobs to people around the world that do this.

This picture is a good example of the way things are done across the world. Now, I come from a timber district where we want to harvest responsibly the timber that we have in our national forests. That means cutting trees down as they mature in a logical fashion so that there are a lot of healthy trees in the forest that are not overcome by disease and fire, which is what we have seen out West over the last couple of decades because those forests are not being managed.

Originally, the national forests were developed as a place for multiple use—

for harvesting for logs, for entertainment to go hunting and fishing. I hunt and fish in a national forest. But when the trees become over mature and they are not managed in a way that allow new growth, there is a limited amount of species that can exist in that type of a forest.

This is what they do in Indonesia. This is a forest in Indonesia that was clear-cut for miles and miles and miles. This is the way it was left. Now, that is not the way it is done in Michigan, not where I live, not in my Federal forests. The problem is we are not doing enough of the select cuts, the limited clear-cuts that allow spreading of new growth. We are competing on our timber products with people that do this to their environment.

Now, in this country, private forests and State forests are managed with the stewardship program where third-party stewards of the forest, who are registered, licensed, and trained how to manage forests, are given the opportunity to manage forests over decades, over centuries, so that there is always a healthy forest with mid-term growth, long-term growth, new growth. There is a multiple of species that can live amongst that. People can hunt and enjoy that area. I just want to try to, Mr. Speaker, make sure the American people are aware of the fact that our environment is a place where we live, we want it to be good and healthy, and we want it also to be able to provide jobs for the people that live in my district and across the country.

Some of the statistics I could give you about the Chinese, for example, is that in 2012, China was responsible for over a quarter of the pollution worldwide. As you saw in that circle, the total pollution in China currently equals the pollution from the United States and the European Union combined. This is expected to only increase.

Now, China is run by a centralized government that has not traditionally respected the environment or the concerns of the locals when it comes to major decisions or projects. This is the type of policy that we can talk to the Chinese and have a discussion about what they can do to improve their behavior.

India is currently the world's fastest growing economy and already the fourth largest polluter. As the Indian economy grows, these emissions are going to continue to rise.

As you see from Indonesia, there is deforestation and clear-cutting in the rain forest. I want to have responsible and sustainable forestry practices because timber is a renewable resource.

Now, our environmental actions have been incremental in nature, but, until this last administration, they haven't been killing our industry. Now with the Obama administration's war on coal, significant areas of our economy have fallen into disrepair. I am so thankful, frankly, that we have a new administration coming in that is going

to, hopefully, put a stop to those policies that have been driving our jobs overseas and making it difficult for us here at home.

I just want to show another graph here for U.S. employment in manufacturing industries. Now, starting in 1980 into 2014, as you can see, thousands of jobs in the manufacturing industries have gone down. I am not saying that environmental regulations are the complete cause of this, but I think this should be a pretty major part of our decisionmaking process as to how we do these things.

We have a regulatory and approval process in the United States that most other countries don't even approach or even pretend to go through. Having incremental change consulting with industry and still having strict standards, I think, can all happen at once. But when the current administration has had a policy of killing our industry and not doing anything about these foreign people, we need to put a change to that and turn this manufacturing number around and bring manufacturing back to where it should be.

This slide was made up before the election, so I wasn't sure it was going to happen in the next administration.

□ 1945

Here are the economically significant regulations this government has put out all the way back to 2000. The number of regulations are expected to cost \$100 million or more to the American people. You can see that, consistently, from the beginning of the Obama administration that that number has significantly increased. I am so happy to hear that Mr. Trump has promised, for every new regulation, to cut two. Let's start with the cutting.

At the end of the day, we need to protect our environment. However, hamstringing our economy will not save our environment. The other people on the planet provide for most of the pollution and for the other things that people are afraid of in the environment—more than we are by far. All too often, the consequences of overburdening regulations here in America is the flight of manufacturing and industry to nations such as China, Indonesia, and India. I am hopeful that my colleagues here in the House and in the Senate, along with a new administration, will change that and make logical regulations. I think this will benefit our planet. It will certainly benefit the American citizens. We shouldn't be implementing expensive nonsolutions to a problem of which the extent and impact remain uncertain.

I have been criticized in the past for talking about global warming and what the future is going to bring. With anything you talk about with regard to the administration's being over-regulatory, then you are accused of being a polluter of the planet. I ran for election several times, and these are the types of arguments that people will make to try to make you look bad, to make you

look as if you want to pollute the planet. I think, really, Americans are tired of that baloney. We want to have a decent living; we want to have a clean planet; we want to make sure that the people around the world have the same values and interests that we do in that, if we are going to work hard to try to make our planet cleaner, they should, too, so that we are competing on an even scale here. With what we are doing now, we are not competing on an even scale.

It is very important that we don't allow people to intimidate us when we say: "I want to have more mining in this country. I want to be able to use coal." They just immediately say that you are an anti-environmentalist, and it is just torture. Most of the people who say this kind of stuff have never been to a community that actually does mining. They just see it from afar. They don't see the end result of a mine that has been rehabilitated and that is covered with green.

They don't have any idea what is really going on. They just use it in fear so that the American people don't really realize the truth of what is going on, and they want their vote. They are causing fear in the American people by their saying: "This guy doesn't want to protect the environment." I mean, I want to protect the environment. I come from one of the most beautiful places in the country, I think. I want it to be clean and healthy for my children as well, and it is going to be really clean and healthy if nobody lives there because there are no jobs. We need to protect our environment, have policies that allow jobs to continue to occur in this country, and have reasonable regulations that make sense and that have sound, scientific studies.

This administration has hid the scientific studies behind closed doors in many cases. I am a physician. I wrote research papers. I had to show my evidence to the world and have other people criticize what I wrote so that they could say: "You didn't do that right," or "your technique was flawed," or "the study you did didn't really show what you said it shows." That is what happens in scientific research—you have to have your research open to criticism. This administration has used science in the way that they say: "The scientists say 'this,'" but they don't want to show you the data because they don't want other people to criticize what they have done. They say that other people who might criticize them are just politicized when they, themselves, are politicized. They also don't want the other side to speak, because they will say: "You are just anti-environment."

We need to have an open discourse of scientists on both sides of issues—and consensus—before we make policies and regulations that kill millions of jobs and that cost families as their raises for the last 8 years have been meager. We need to be sure that science is open and not politicized as it has been in this administration.

I encourage my colleagues to not be afraid to stand up for what is right and for jobs in this country. I encourage the people who may be watching, too, to think about what the politicians they listen to are saying and how it affects jobs and how it really affects the environment because, although we want a clean environment, we are not going to write rules that kill jobs and that do not do anything about the real polluters on this planet, who care nothing about the environment, and who are causing the majority of the problems around the globe.

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

MAKE IT IN AMERICA: MANUFACTURING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GROTHMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, our previous speaker spoke about the need to revitalize the American economy, and he talked about the regulatory environment as being one of the impediments. Certainly, there are many, many regulations that could impede economic development, but there are also regulations that might enhance economic development. Today I want to continue with what is now a 6-year effort—oh, yes, let's get this right side up. There we go—to Make It In America. Specifically, today, it is about manufacturing because manufacturing matters.

When I first came to Congress in 2009, we were in the midst of the Great Recession, and millions of Americans had lost their jobs. We saw the Rust Belt literally collapse; we saw factories close; we saw our shipyards opened with nothing happening except in the U.S. naval yards. So here we are some 6 years later: the economy is recovering, and we can talk about regulations; but what I would like to talk about tonight are positive regulations—regulations and laws that grow the American economy, not regulations that would hinder. Specifically, as part of this Make It in America agenda, we have these fundamental policies. If we are going to rebuild the American economy, a big part of it has to be manufacturing. It does matter.

So what are those issues that are involved in rebuilding the American economy?

There are trade issues, and we have heard a lot about that in the recent Presidential campaign. Undoubtedly, the Congress will deal with that;

Taxes. The debate about taxes really was not very clear in the Presidential election, but we are certainly going to be dealing with tax policy here, and we should. There is no doubt that the American tax policy hinders economic growth in many, many ways for small

companies and encourages large companies to leave town—to leave America—and leave American workers and communities behind. We have seen too much of that; so tax policy becomes a very, very important part of this;

With regard to energy and labor, I am going to go specifically to those; but just quickly are the educational policies. There is a lot of jabbering around here, on the floor of Congress, and out around the world about educational policies: Are our schools good enough? They don't measure up. We need to have charter schools. We are going to go into that in a big way with our new President; but one of the most important parts of education, when we talk about rebuilding the American economy, is that we have properly trained workers whether they are in the computer field—in computer science—or whether they are in the shipyards welding the parts of a ship. A well-trained, well-prepared workforce is absolutely essential for the growth of the American economy; but education is not the subject today, nor is research;

Infrastructure. It is part of what we are going to talk about today, and I am going to try to do this in, maybe, 10 minutes, but not much longer than that.

What I want to focus on is energy policy and labor. Did you know—does America know—that the United States has become a net exporter of natural gas?

Yes. We do have a boom in the energy industry. It has slowed down a little bit with the drop in the value of crude oil and natural gas; but, nonetheless, as of today, the United States is a net exporter of natural gas. That gas is exported to Canada and Mexico and other parts of the world. When it is exported to other parts of the world, it is exported in ships in liquefied form, called liquefied natural gas, LNG. On ships, liquefied natural gas is part of that export that has turned America from an importing country to an exporting country, which is good for all of us; but let us realize that that natural gas and, for that matter, crude oil, which is also now being exported, is a strategic national asset, a strategic national resource. It is absolutely crucial to the American economy.

I will give you one example—Dow. The big chemical company is bringing back to the United States much of the manufacturing that it once did overseas of plastic and other products because of the strategic national asset called natural gas. The price of natural gas was low enough that that big, international, domestic, American company—Dow—is returning to the United States to manufacture. It is the same thing with oil. These are strategic national assets that we are now exporting.

The question for us in public policy is: Can we, in some way, use this strategic national resource to expand the American economy?

The answer is: absolutely, yes.

It is not just to the benefit of the energy companies. Maybe we could wish them well as they export our strategic national asset to places around the world and gain a healthy profit—okay—but shouldn't that be shared with the rest of America?

I believe it should, and I know it could. Here is how, and it deals with this issue of labor and manufacturing: Make It In America. Manufacturing matters.

Here is the deal. Those export facilities for LNG are big operations—lots of pipe, lots of plumbing, lots of containers, all of which are or could be made in America, creating American jobs. Now, once that natural gas is liquefied—that is, compressed into a liquid—and goes on a ship, the questions are: Where did that ship come from, and who are the sailors on the ship?

It used to be, back when the North Slope of Alaska opened up, that the steel in the Trans-Alaska Pipeline and the ships that would then take that oil to the West Coast ports would be American ships with American sailors. It was the law. It was the regulation. Here you had a situation in which the law and regulations created American jobs for mariners and for the American shipyards.

□ 2000

If we were to apply that same principle to the export of LNG, that strategic national resource, think of what would happen. This year, 2016, the first export facility in Louisiana, Cheniere, began exporting LNG on ships. They were not American ships. There were no American sailors on those ships. The policy of the North Slope oil was not extended to the export of LNG, to the detriment of American jobs.

So here is what we ought to do. There is an energy bill floating around somewhere in the Senate and the House. Nobody knows exactly where it is. But in that energy bill, there is a section that enhances and speeds up the licensing of six other LNG export facilities around the United States on various coasts—on the East Coast, the Gulf Coast, as well as the West Coast.

Why not take what we did with the North Slope oil, requiring that it be on American-built ships with American sailors, and apply that same principle, same law, to the export of LNG as these new facilities come online?

It is said that the facility on the Gulf Coast, the Cheniere facility in its first part—there are three different pieces of that that will come in over time—the first part of that facility will take 100 ships to export the liquefied natural gas from that one facility. We are probably talking about a few hundred LNG ships to export the liquefied natural gas not only from the existing facility in the Gulf Coast, but to the other facilities that will be built in the future. Perhaps as much as 12 percent of the total natural gas, that strategic national asset, will be exported, requiring hundreds of ships.

What if we passed a law called Energizing America? I like that title. In fact, we are going to introduce it tomorrow, Energizing America. It is a piece of legislation that would require that we provide 15 percent of the total export on American-built ships. Think about it.

Perhaps over the next decade, our shipyards would be building maybe as many as a hundred ships. But let's just say it is 10, 20, 30 ships. Perhaps more than 100,000 people could be employed in the construction of those ships. This would be a good regulation, wouldn't it? It would be a regulation that would put Americans back to work.

It would be a law that would say a strategic national asset of this Nation will also benefit another strategic national asset: the American shipyards.

Our U.S. Navy depends on those shipyards. Every U.S. naval ship is built in America in American shipyards. And if we were to expand those shipyards, we would find more competition for the naval ships, perhaps a lower price. Perhaps we would also be able to employ marine engineers, welders, plumbers, steamfitters, steelworkers, not only at the shipyards, but in the manufacturing of the engines here in the United States.

Make it in America. Build it in America. All it takes are a couple of paragraphs of law. That is all it would take, a couple of paragraphs of law that say between now and 2024, in the next 8 years, 15 percent of that liquefied natural gas must be on American-built ships with American sailors.

Now, it turns out that these American ships and the sailors are a strategic necessity for our U.S. military. Because it turns out that if you are going to project American power around the world, you have to be able to get there with the men, the women, and the materials—and that means ships.

So we would build the U.S. merchant marine. We would build American shipyards so that they would be competitive around the world, and we would employ tens of thousands—and perhaps even hundreds or more thousand—of American workers in our shipyards. It is possible. All it takes is a law.

So when this energy bill starts moving around—and maybe here in the lameduck session—I would propose a simple amendment: between now and 2024, 15 percent of that export of LNG would be on American-built ships with American sailors.

Oh, by the way, there are some older American LNG ships that could be reflagged for the purposes of meeting at

least part of that 15 percent in the initial years. And then after 2025, let's ramp it up to 30 percent. Let's keep our shipyards busy. Let's keep our steelworkers, our welders, our plumbers, our marine engineers, our factories busy in the future with a very simple law that would be a really good regulation.

Oh, I can hear the whining of the oil industry and of the natural gas industry, "Oh, it is going to be too expensive." It is not nearly as expensive as not having American jobs and not being able to project American power because we do not have a robust merchant marine and a robust number of American ships.

Consider this fact: after World War II, we had 1,200 American ships, American sailors on them, all American flagged. In the 1980s, we had 500. Today, we have less than 80.

We are seeing the disappearance of the American merchant marine. American sailors, American-flagged ships, American shipyards are all diminishing and very rapidly disappearing. It is up to us, your elected officials—myself, my colleagues, 434 other Members of Congress and the 100 Senators. And, I guess, the new President is interested in making America great again. Hey, here is how you can do it, President-elect Trump. Do it in policies that once again call for making it in America.

So what are my colleagues going to do? Let this opportunity slip? Let this opportunity disappear? Forget about the strategic nature of energy in the United States, the strategic necessity of being able to project American power with American sailors and American ships to go wherever we want?

Oh, yes, I heard somebody say, well, we could contract to have ships sent to move our military: Oh, yeah, hello, Mr. Xi. Oh, yeah, I am phoning. Yeah, I'm phoning from Washington, D.C., and, yeah, can you folks in Beijing send over ships so that we can send men and material to the South China Sea?

It is not likely to happen, right? We can't depend on other countries. We have to depend on our own abilities, our own shipyards, our own mariners. We can do it.

There are many bad regulations to be sure. There are some that hinder the economy. But I would propose to you that a very good law could be used to build the American economy by simply requiring that the export of liquefied natural gas be done on American ships, 15 percent between now and 2024, and thereafter, 30 percent, echoing what we did back in the 1960s when the North

Slope of Alaska opened up and that oil came south.

American steel pipe and American-made ships with American sailors, we can do it once again for the benefit of our country, for our national security, and for American workers and American businesses.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and for the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and for the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2873. An Act to require studies and reports examining the use of, and opportunities to use, technology-enabled collaborative learning and capacity building models to improve programs of the Department of Health and Human Services, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on November 28, 2016, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 4902. To amend title 5, United States Code, to expand law enforcement availability pay to employees of U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Air and Marine Operations.

H.R. 5873. To designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 511 East San Antonio Avenue in El Paso, Texas, as the "R.E. Thomason Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 30, 2016, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the second and third quarters of 2016, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Travel to Germany—June 27–July 1, 2016											
Kari Bingen	6/27	7/1	Germany		807.37		66.48				873.85
Commercial transportation							2,121.26				2,121.26
Timothy Morrison	6/27	7/1	Germany		807.37		66.48				873.85
Commercial transportation							2,121.26				2,121.26
William Spencer Johnson	6/27	7/1	Germany		807.37		66.48				873.85
Commercial transportation							2,121.26				2,121.26
Travel to Qatar, Bahrain, Iraq, Kuwait, Afghanistan—July 15–21, 2016											
Hon. William M. "Mac" Thornberry	7/16	7/17	Qatar		162.00						162.00
	7/17	7/17	Bahrain								
	7/17	7/18	Iraq		11.00						11.00
	7/18	7/19	Kuwait		432.00						432.00
	7/19	7/20	Afghanistan		7.00						7.00
	7/20	7/21	Qatar								
Hon. Seth Moulton	7/16	7/17	Qatar		162.00						162.00
	7/17	7/17	Bahrain								
	7/17	7/18	Iraq		11.00						11.00
	7/18	7/19	Kuwait		432.00						432.00
	7/19	7/20	Afghanistan		7.00						7.00
	7/20	7/21	Qatar								
Robert L. Simmons	7/16	7/17	Qatar		162.00						162.00
	7/17	7/17	Bahrain								
	7/17	7/18	Iraq		11.00						11.00
	7/18	7/19	Kuwait		432.00						432.00
	7/19	7/20	Afghanistan		7.00						7.00
	7/20	7/21	Qatar								
Paul Arcangeli	7/16	7/17	Qatar		162.00						162.00
	7/17	7/17	Bahrain								
	7/17	7/18	Iraq		11.00						11.00
	7/18	7/19	Kuwait		432.00						432.00
	7/19	7/20	Afghanistan		7.00						7.00
	7/20	7/21	Qatar								
Kari Bingen	7/16	7/17	Qatar		162.00						162.00
	7/17	7/17	Bahrain								
	7/17	7/18	Iraq		11.00						11.00
	7/18	7/19	Kuwait		432.00						432.00
	7/19	7/20	Afghanistan		7.00						7.00
	7/20	7/21	Qatar								
Delegation expenses			Iraq				7,266.00				7,266.00
Visit to Japan, South Korea, the Philippines—July 15–23, 2016 with CODEL Schatz											
Hon. John Garamendi	7/17	7/19	South Korea		371.78						371.78
	7/19	7/20	the Philippines		295.00						295.00
	7/20	7/23	Japan		599.87						599.87
Visit to United Kingdom—July 16–19, 2016											
Hon. Trent Franks	7/17	7/19	United Kingdom		1,773.39						1,773.39
Commercial transportation							2,121.26				2,121.26
Andrew Walter	7/17	7/19	United Kingdom		1,773.39						1,773.39
Commercial transportation							2,121.26				2,121.26
Visit to Nigeria, Cameroon—July 25–30, 2016 with STAFFDEL Barker											
Katherine Quinn	7/26	7/26	Nigeria								
	7/26	7/29	Cameroon		436.36						436.36
Commercial transportation							13,812.18				13,812.18
Visit to Israel, Latvia, Poland, Germany—August 19–28, 2016											
Hon. Chris Gibson	8/20	8/22	Israel		1,036.00						1,036.00
	8/22	8/24	Poland		535.87						535.87
	8/24	8/24	Latvia								
	8/24	8/25	Germany		269.15						269.15
Hon. Paul Cook	8/20	8/22	Israel		1,036.00						1,036.00
	8/22	8/24	Poland		535.87						535.87
	8/24	8/24	Latvia								
	8/24	8/25	Germany		269.15						269.15
Hon. Austin Scott	8/20	8/22	Israel		1,036.00						1,036.00
	8/22	8/24	Poland		535.87						535.87
	8/24	8/24	Latvia								
	8/24	8/25	Germany		269.15						269.15
Hon. Richard B. Nugent	8/20	8/22	Israel		1,036.00						1,036.00
	8/22	8/24	Poland		535.87						535.87
	8/24	8/24	Latvia								
	8/24	8/25	Germany		269.15						269.15
Heath Bope	8/20	8/22	Israel		1,036.00						1,036.00
	8/22	8/24	Poland		535.87						535.87
	8/24	8/24	Latvia								
	8/24	8/25	Germany		269.15						269.15
Visit to Germany, Italy—September 25–29, 2016 with STAFFDEL Barker											
Mark Morehouse	9/26	9/29	Germany		845.18						845.18
	9/27	9/28	Italy		482.77						482.77
Commercial transportation							4,005.76				4,005.76
Katherine Quinn	9/26	9/29	Germany		845.18						845.18
	9/27	9/28	Italy		482.77						482.77
Commercial transportation							4,005.76				4,005.76
Committee total					22,592.90		39,895.44				62,488.34

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MAC THORNBERRY, Chairman, Nov. 10, 2016.

(AMENDMENT) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. John Kline	3/31	4/2	Philippines		605.84		(3)				605.84
	4/2	4/7	Australia		1,638.00		(3)				1,638.00
Hon. David "Phil" Roe	3/30	3/31	USA				677.70*				677.70

(AMENDMENT) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Robert C. "Bobby" Scott	3/31	4/2	Philippines		186.98*						186.98
		4/2	Australia		636.00*						636.00
		4/7	Philippines		605.84					(?)	605.84
Hon. Rubén Hinojosa	3/31	4/2	Australia		1,638.00						1,638.00
		4/7	Australia				1,168.86				1,168.86
		4/7	Philippines		605.84					(?)	605.84
Juliane Sullivan	3/31	4/2	Australia		1,638.00						1,638.00
		4/2	Philippines		605.84					(?)	605.84
		4/7	Australia		1,689.00					(?)	1,689.00
Janelle Gardner	3/31	4/2	Philippines		605.84						605.84
		4/2	Australia		1,662.00					(?)	1,662.00
		4/7	Philippines		605.84					(?)	605.84
Brian Newell	3/31	4/2	Australia		1,689.00						1,689.00
		4/2	Philippines		605.84					(?)	605.84
		4/7	Australia		1,689.00					(?)	1,689.00
Elizabeth Podgorski	3/31	4/2	Philippines		605.84						605.84
		4/2	Australia		1,478.00					(?)	1,478.00
		4/7	Philippines		605.84					(?)	605.84
Richard Miller	3/31	4/2	Australia		1,662.00						1,662.00
		4/2	Philippines		605.84					(?)	605.84
		4/7	Australia		1,662.00					(?)	1,662.00
Krisann Pearce	3/31	4/2	Philippines		605.84						605.84
		4/2	Australia		1,662.00					(?)	1,662.00
		4/7	Philippines		605.84					(?)	605.84
Hon. Frederica Wilson	6/24	6/27	Australia		1,662.00						1,662.00
			Panama		837.00					(?)	837.00
Committee total					21,868.54		1,846.56				23,715.10

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.
* Traveler departed trip state-side due to a death in the family. Post was unable to cancel rooms in Manila and Sydney.

HON. JOHN KLINE, Chairman, Nov. 7, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. <input type="checkbox"/>											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JOHN KLINE, Chairman, Nov. 7, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON BENGHAZI, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. <input type="checkbox"/>											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. TREY GOWDY, Chairman, Nov. 15, 2016.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7624. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Swap Dealer and Intermediary Oversight, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Chief Compliance Officer Annual Report Requirements for Futures Commission Merchants, Swap Dealers, and Major Swap Participants; Amendments to Filing Dates (RIN: 3038-AE49) received November 17, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7625. A letter from the Special Inspector General For The Troubled Asset Relief Program, transmitting the Office's quarterly report on the actions undertaken by the Department of the Treasury under the Troubled Asset Relief Program, for the period ending October 26, 2016; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7626. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Walking-Working Surfaces and Personal Protective Equipment (Fall Protection Systems) [Docket No.: OSHA-2007-0072] (RIN: 1218-AB80) received November 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7627. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; AK; Permitting Fees Revision [EPA-R10-OAR-2016-0591; FRL-9955-48-Region 10] received November 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7628. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality Plans; Tennessee; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0154; FRL-9955-58-Region 4] received November 22,

2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7629. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final NUREG — Seismic Classification [NUREG-0800, Revision 3] (Section 3.2.1) received November 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7630. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final NUREG — Reactor Operator Requalification Program; Reactor Operator Training [NUREG-0800, Revision 4] (Section 13.2.1) received November 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7631. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final NUREG — Operating Organization [NUREG-0800, Revision 7] (Sections 13.1.2-13.1.3) received November 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121,

Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7632. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final NUREG — System Quality Group Classification [NUREG-0800, Revision 3] (Section 3.2.2) received November 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7633. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final NUREG — Administrative Procedures — General [NUREG-0800, Revision 2] (Section 13.5.1.1) received November 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7634. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final NUREG — Management and Technical Support Organization [NUREG-0800, Revision 6] (Section 13.1.1) received November 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7635. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of New Reactors, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final NUREG — Non-Licensed Plant Staff Training; Revision 4, Sec. 13.2.2 (NUREG-0800, Chapter 3) received November 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7636. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the 2016 Annual Report on the Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2462 note; Public Law 106-309, Sec. 304; (114 Stat. 1095); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7637. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updated Statements of Legal Authority for the Export Administration Regulations [Docket No.: 161012953-6953-01] (RIN: 0694-AH15) received November 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7638. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting a proposed Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Qatar, Transmittal No. 16-58, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7639. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting a proposed Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Kuwait, Transmittal No. 16-21, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7640. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, Transmittal No. DDTC 16-060, pursuant to Public Law 110-429, Sec. 201; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7641. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, Transmittal No. DDTC 16-091, pursuant to Public Law 110-429, Sec. 201; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7642. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-

Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, Transmittal No. DDTC 16-084, pursuant to Public Law 110-429, Sec. 201; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7643. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination to waive the certification requirement in section 7044(d)(1) regarding FY 2016 Economic Support Funds, pursuant to Public Law 114-113, Div. K, Sec. 7044(d)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7644. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination and certification to waive for a period of six months the restrictions of section 1003 of Public Law 100-204, in accordance with Public Law 114-123, Div. C, Sec. 7041(j)(2)(B)(i); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7645. A letter from the Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter stating that the Department of Defense received an extension from the Office of Management and Budget to submit the Agency Financial Report by December 15, 2016, pursuant to OMB's authority under Sec. 303 of the Chief Financial Officers Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7646. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's FY 2016 Agency Financial Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7647. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's FY 2016 Agency Financial Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7648. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2016 Performance and Accountability Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7649. A letter from the Chair, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's Inspector General Semiannual Report to Congress, and Management Report, for the period April 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); (92 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7650. A letter from the Executive Director, National Mining Hall of Fame and Museum, transmitting the annual report and financial audit for the year 2015 of the National Mining Hall of Fame and Museum, pursuant to Sec. 152112 and 10101, respectively, of Title 36 of the U.S. Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7651. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31101; Amdt. No.: 3718] received November 17, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7652. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums, and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31100; Amdt. No. 3717] received November 17, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7653. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System General Permit Remand Rule [EPA-HQ-OW-2015-0671; FRL-9955-11-OW] (RIN: 2040-AF57) received November 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7654. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revision of Certain Federal Water Quality Criteria Applicable to Washington [EPA-HQ-OW-2015-0174; FRL-9955-40-OW] (RIN: 2040-AF56) received November 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7655. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of Import Restrictions Imposed on Certain Archaeological and Ethnological Material from Greece [CBP Dec. 16-21] (RIN: 1515-AE18) received November 21, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7656. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Treatment of Amounts Paid to Sec. 170(c) Organizations under Employer Leave-Based Donation Programs to Aid Victims of Hurricane Matthew (Notice 2016-69) received November 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7657. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Applicable Federal Rates — December 2016 (Rev. Rul. 2016-27) received November 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7658. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — SB/SE Fast Track Mediation—Collection (Rev. Proc. 2016-57) received November 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7659. A letter from the Commission, United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's 2016 Annual Report to the Congress with Executive Summary and Recommendations, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 7002(c)(1); Public Law 106-398, Sec. 1238(c)(1) (as amended by Public Law 110-161); (121 Stat. 2285); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Foreign Affairs, and Armed Services.

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. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1219. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land and appurtenances of the Arbuckle Project, Oklahoma, to the Arbuckle Master Conservancy District, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-834). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 5790. A bill to provide adequate protections for whistleblowers at the Federal Bureau of Investigation (Rept. 114-835). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 5920. A bill to enhance whistleblower protection for contractor and grantee employees (Rept. 114-836, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 6302. A bill to provide an increase in premium pay for United States Secret Service agents performing protective services during 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-837). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan: Committee on House Administration. H. Res. 933. A resolution providing amounts for further expenses of the Committee on Energy and Commerce in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress (Rept. 114-838). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 934. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 34) to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6392) to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to specify when bank holding companies may be subject to certain enhanced supervision, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-839). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Armed Services discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5920 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

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. MCNERNEY (for himself and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 6394. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to submit to Congress a report on promoting broadband Internet access service for veterans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 6395. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt the spouses of active duty members of the Armed Forces from the determination of whether an employer is subject to the employer health insurance mandate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. KIND, and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 6396. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the qualification requirements with respect to certain multiple employer plans with pooled plan providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 6397. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that new wind turbines located near certain military installations are ineligible for the renewable electricity production credit and the energy credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 6398. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for the inclusion of unmarried women in the criteria for awarding a grant to a women's business center; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 6399. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to create a Medicare hospital wage index metropolitan floor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 6400. A bill to revise the boundaries of certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units in New Jersey; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 6401. A bill to amend Public Law 94-241 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California (for herself and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 6402. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to avoid duplicative annual reporting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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 Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRJALVA, Mr. HONDA, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H. Res. 932. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to third-party charges on consumer telephone bills; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H. Res. 935. A resolution expressing the sense of the House that Congress should recognize the benefits of charitable giving and express support for the designation of #GivingTuesday; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. Res. 936. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that all students should have access to the digital tools necessary to further their education and compete in the 21st century economy; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 6394.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 6395.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 6396.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, sec. 8

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 6397.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 6398.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6399.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 6400.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 6401.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, 4, and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 6402.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 241: Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 449: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 592: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 604: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 729: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 846: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 855: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 994: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1116: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1171: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1202: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1211: Mr. HECK of Washington.

- H.R. 1356: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1422: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 1427: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 1457: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1526: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1552: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1559: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1608: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2050: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 2293: Mr. CLAY and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 2368: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 2411: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 2434: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 2450: Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 2903: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 3226: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 3229: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 3268: Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 3355: Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 3365: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 3381: Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 3474: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 3666: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 3706: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 3846: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 4013: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4212: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 4220: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 4275: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 4380: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 4625: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 4818: Mr. YOHO and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 4919: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 5082: Mr. WALKER.
H.R. 5167: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 5180: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 5235: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 5262: Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 5369: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 5410: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 5474: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 5489: Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 5584: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5667: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 5681: Mr. HARPER and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 5721: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. RENACCI, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 5916: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 5932: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5974: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 5999: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. YODER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 6020: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 6021: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 6030: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 6045: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 6099: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 6100: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. PERRY, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 6108: Mr. OLSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 6116: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 6117: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 6139: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 6159: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 6185: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.
H.R. 6208: Mrs. TORRES, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 6283: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
H.R. 6299: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 6316: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 6336: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 6340: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MENG, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. LEE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. POLIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 6346: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 6374: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 6382: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 6392: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. HILL, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mrs. LOVE.
H.J. Res. 102: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 145: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H. Con. Res. 159: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H. Con. Res. 161: Mr. YOHO and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H. Con. Res. 162: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. TITUS.
H. Con. Res. 165: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. MOULTON.
H. Res. 752: Mr. HUDSON, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. BLACK, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. TONKO, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. PLASKETT.
H. Res. 838: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H. Res. 854: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H. Res. 871: Mr. BARR.
H. Res. 925: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H. Res. 926: Ms. ADAMS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. PLASKETT.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

H.R. 6392 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.