

the “best practices to calculate institutional aid awards.”

We should move quickly to adopt this legislation and ensure that this important exemption does not expire.

In closing, I thank my colleague Congressman LAMAR SMITH, the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for his steadfast leadership on this bill since the 105th Congress and during this Congress.

I also thank my Senate colleagues, Senate Judiciary Chairman LEAHY and Ranking Member GRASSLEY, for their leadership on the bill.

I encourage my colleagues to support S. 1482, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Science Committee, the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and the chief sponsor of the House version of this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my friend from Virginia, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, BOB GOODLATTE, for yielding me time and also for bringing this bill to the House floor.

I support S. 1482, the Need-Based Educational Aid Act. As the author of the identical House bill, I am pleased that we are considering it today.

The Need-Based Educational Aid Act extends the current antitrust exemptions set to expire on September 30 for another 7 years. It allows a limited number of private universities that admit students on need-blind basis to award financial aid from the schools' own funds, based entirely on students' demonstrated financial need.

This bill authorizes these institutions of higher education to use common principles to assess students' financial need, and it allows the schools to use a common financial aid application form.

It also permits multiple schools that have accepted the same student to award the same assistance. This ensures that the student selects the college that is the best fit, rather than the school that offered the most financial aid.

This issue has long been of interest to me personally, having worked on three previous extensions. Common treatment of this narrow category of educational aid makes sense. A Government Accountability Office study previously found that there has been no abuse of the antitrust exemption and that tuition has not gone up as a result.

The Need-Based Educational Aid Act helps ensure that financial aid is available to students solely on the basis of demonstrated need. Students who otherwise qualify should not be denied the opportunity to access higher education due to limited financial means. S. 1482 protects this need-based aid and need-blind admissions.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Georgia, HANK

JOHNSON, a member of the Judiciary Committee, for being the original co-author of the identical House bill and for his leadership on this particular issue.

I urge my colleagues to support the Need-Based Educational Aid Act.

Again, I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for bringing it to the House floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would, at this time, like to thank my chairman, BOB GOODLATTE, of the Judiciary Committee, for his expeditious bringing of this legislation to the committee and now to the floor.

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

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

I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia; the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH); the ranking member, Mr. CONYERS; and others for this very bipartisan legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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. 1482.

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. 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.

SECRET SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1656) to provide for additional resources for the Secret Service, and to improve protections for restricted areas, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1656

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 “Secret Service Improvements Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENT OF DIRECTOR OF THE SECRET SERVICE.

Section 3056 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end:

“(h) The Director of the Secret Service shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director of the Secret Service is the head of the Secret Service.”.

SEC. 3. RESTRICTED BUILDING OR GROUNDS.

Section 1752(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by inserting “or” at the end; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) knowingly, and with the intent to enter a restricted building or grounds, causes any object to enter any restricted building or grounds, when, or so that, such object, in fact, impedes or disrupts the orderly conduct of government business or official functions;”.

SEC. 4. THREATS AGAINST FORMER VICE PRESIDENTS.

Section 879(a)(4) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 3056(a)(6)” and inserting “paragraph (6) or (8) of section 3056(a)”.

SEC. 5. INCREASED TRAINING.

Beginning in the first full fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Secret Service shall increase the annual number of hours spent training by officers and agents of the Secret Service, including officers of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division established under section 3056A of title 18, United States Code and agents operating pursuant to section 3056 of title 18, United States Code, including joint training between the two.

SEC. 6. TRAINING FACILITIES.

The Director of the Secret Service is authorized to construct facilities at the Rowley Training Center necessary to improve the training of officers of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division established under section 3056A of title 18, United States Code and agents of the United States Secret Service, operating pursuant to section 3056 of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 7. HIRING OF ADDITIONAL OFFICERS AND AGENTS.

The Director of the Secret Service is authorized to hire not fewer than—

(1) 200 additional officers for the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division established under section 3056A of title 18, United States Code; and

(2) 85 additional agents for the United States Secret Service Presidential Protective Detail, operating pursuant to section 3056 of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 8. EVALUATION OF VULNERABILITIES AND THREATS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Secret Service shall devise and adopt improved procedures for evaluating vulnerabilities in the security of the White House and threats to persons protected by the Secret Service, including threats posed by unmanned aerial systems or explosive devices.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Secret Service shall report on the implementation of subsection (a) to—

(1) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives;

(2) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

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

(5) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 9. EVALUATION OF USE OF TECHNOLOGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Secret Service, in consultation with the Under Secretary for Science and Technology of the Department of Homeland Security, and other experts, shall devise and adopt improved procedures for—

(1) evaluating the ways in which technology may be used to improve the security of the White House and the response to threats to persons protected by the Secret Service; and

(2) retaining evidence pertaining to the duties referred to in paragraph (1) for an extended period of time.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Secret Service shall report on the implementation of subsection (a) to—

(1) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives;

(2) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

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

(5) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 10. EVALUATION OF USE OF ADDITIONAL WEAPONRY.

The Director of the Secret Service shall evaluate the practicability of equipping agents and officers with weapons other than those provided to officers and agents of the Secret Service as of the date of enactment of this Act, including nonlethal weapons.

SEC. 11. SECURITY COSTS FOR SECONDARY RESIDENCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Presidential Protection Assistance Act of 1976 (18 U.S.C. 3056 note) is amended by striking section 4 and inserting the following:

“SEC. 4. NOTIFICATION REGARDING EXPENDITURES ON NON-GOVERNMENTAL PROPERTIES.

“The Secret Service shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate of any expenditures for permanent facilities, equipment, and services to secure any non-Governmental property in addition to the one non-Governmental property designated by each protectee under subsection (a) or (b) of section 3.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Presidential Protection Assistance Act of 1976 (18 U.S.C. 3056 note), as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) in section 3(b), by striking “any expenditures by the Secret Service” and all that follows through “imposed under section 4” and inserting “any expenditures by the Secret Service for permanent facilities, equipment, and services to secure the non-Governmental property previously designated under subsection (a) are subject to the requirements set forth in section 4”; and

(2) in section 5(c), by striking “within the limitations imposed under section 4”.

SEC. 12. ESTABLISHMENT OF ETHICS PROGRAM OFFICE.

Subject to the oversight of the Office of Chief Counsel of the United States Secret Service, the Director of the Secret Service shall establish an Ethics Program Office, consisting of a minimum of 2 employees, to administer the provisions of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, as amended, and to provide increased training to employees of the United States Secret Service.

SEC. 13. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that an assessment made by the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Director of the Secret Service with regard to physical security of the White House and attendant grounds, and any security-related enhancements thereto should be accorded substantial deference by the National Capital Planning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts, and any other relevant entities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) 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 to include extraneous materials on the bill 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, the Secret Service has two primary missions: criminal investigations and protection of the President, Vice President, and other dignitaries. As a result, the Secret Service is entrusted with protecting some of our most valuable assets. This is an extremely difficult, high-profile mission, in an environment with zero margin for error.

The Secret Service is comprised of many outstanding and upstanding men and women who do excellent work; however, over the last few years, a series of embarrassing scandals, security failures, and instances of poor judgment have rocked the Secret Service. These incidents range from agents' use of prostitutes while on official travel to Colombia; to an incident in the Netherlands involving intoxicated agents; to the agency's failure to initially apprehend fence jumper Omar Gonzalez, who was later arrested inside the White House.

Following these incidents, the President appointed a new director of the Secret Service, Joseph Clancy, who has implemented a number of reforms. The President also appointed a panel of experts to recommend changes to the Secret Service. Through this committee's oversight and the recommendations of the panel, it is clear that, despite Director Clancy's initiatives, legislative action is still necessary.

We must ensure that the agency's officers and agents are properly trained in order to successfully identify potential threats and prevent them from materializing, as well as to ensure that the agency has the tools it needs to carry out its mission.

H.R. 1656, the Secret Service Improvements Act of 2015, is bipartisan legislation introduced to provide much-needed resources to the agency and implement many of the U.S. Secret Service Protective Mission Panel's recommendations for improvements for the agency. I am pleased to have worked on this legislation with Judiciary Committee Ranking Member CONYERS, Crime Subcommittee Chairman SENSENBRENNER, and Ranking Member JACKSON LEE.

This bill makes much-needed improvements to the Secret Service. These improvements strengthen the security of the President, other protectees, and the White House complex; enhance Secret Service officers' and agents' training; and increase the agency's manpower.

This legislation also improves transparency and accountability within the agency by requiring Senate confirmation of the Director of the Secret Service. The person entrusted to not only protect the President, but to also head a \$1.5 billion Federal law enforcement agency, should be subject to the same process of advice and consent of the Senate as his counterparts at other comparable agencies.

Finally, this legislation creates an ethics office within the office of the general counsel in order to respond to rectify and help prevent misconduct at the agency.

The resources and improvements provided by this legislation will help to reform the Secret Service and to restore the trust that Congress, the President, and the American people must have in the vital tasks that the Secret Service carries out every single day.

This bill passed unanimously from the Judiciary Committee, and I urge my House colleagues to join me in support of the legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1656, the Secret Service Improvements Act, will assist the Secret Service with its critical mission of protecting the President and Vice President and other dignitaries as well as with its investigative role in protecting our Nation's financial infrastructure against criminal threats.

This important bill was introduced by the bipartisan leadership of the Judiciary Committee: Chairman BOB GOODLATTE, Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS, Crime Subcommittee Chairman JIM SENSENBRENNER, and Crime Subcommittee Ranking Member SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1656 was developed to address shortcomings related to the Secret Service that have come to light in recent years.

Unfortunately, the image of this once revered agency has been tarnished both because of the misbehavior of agents and of the performance issues that have resulted in security lapses. Last fall, the Judiciary Committee held an important oversight hearing to review the operation of this vitally important agency.

Then-Acting Director Joseph Clancy, who has since taken on the job on a more permanent basis, came before the committee to discuss the mission of the agency and issues relating to recent lapses in security that could have jeopardized the individuals the agency is sworn to protect. In particular, the committee engaged in a frank discussion about the unacceptable incident last September in which a man was able to jump over the White House's fence, run past Secret Service officers, and enter the White House.

We learned that, while there were performance errors made by some of the officers that day, the protective mission of the Secret Service has been jeopardized largely because the agency has been allowed to fall into a state of disrepair. Personnel levels are unacceptably low; the long hours on duty leave little time for training; equipment and technological systems are not upgraded or integrated sufficiently; and the culture of the agency has suffered from poor leadership.

These conclusions were confirmed and expanded upon by the review panel established by Department of Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson in the wake of the White House's intrusion last year. H.R. 1656 was introduced to address several categories of these challenges to the mission of the Secret Service: leadership, resources, training, authorities, and personal conduct: With respect to leadership, the bill requires the position of Director of the Secret Service to be confirmed by the Senate after the Presidential nomination;

With respect to resources, the bill authorizes the hiring of additional personnel and requires a review of the agency's use of technology, an area of concern based on past security lapses;

With respect to training, the bill requires more training for agents and Uniformed Division officers, and it also authorizes the construction of better training facilities;

With respect to authorities, the bill allows the agency to investigate threats against former Vice Presidents in the same way it investigates threats against former Presidents;

With respect to personal conduct, the bill establishes an Ethics Program Office that will emphasize the need for agency personnel to conduct themselves according to established ethical standards.

The goal of this bill is to prevent future security lapses similar to what the agency has experienced in recent years and to protect against even more sophisticated threats that could result in far more harm.

This is a strong, bipartisan bill that, I hope, will soon become law. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate my good friend from Georgia for yielding to me to speak on this Secret Service reform bill and on the work of the chairman of the committee, Mr. GOODLATTE from Virginia, on this bill.

Our Oversight and Government Reform Committee held several hearings on Secret Service reform, and much of the content, I am pleased to say, is reflected in H.R. 1656. There, of course, have been an increasing number of

fence jumpers in recent years, but it took a stunning penetration to the very interior of the White House by Omar Gonzalez last year to make it clear that the reform of the Secret Service was urgent.

At hearings, we learned that there had never been—not once—a top-to-bottom review of the Secret Service in its more than 100 years of existence. This was, clearly, urgently needed; so Secretary Jeh Johnson appointed the first independent review panel. What it found was, across the board, weakness and flaws in the United States Secret Service.

Although its mission has expanded greatly over the years, today, the Secret Service simply does not reflect the post-9/11 experience, much less that of today's ISIL and domestic terrorism. The fence jumpers had already shown that the Secret Service could not be expected to meet its zero failure mission.

Today's bill shows that Congress takes the reform of the Secret Service very seriously. The funding, which is usually missing from such reform these days, is authorized, and the bill adopts much of the independent review's recommendations:

Instead of blaming overworked uniformed Secret Service and agents who have been working 6 and 7 days a week for 12 hours a day because of no additional personnel, the bill authorizes the addition of 80 agents and 200 Uniformed Division personnel, which is virtually what the independent review panel recommended;

The bill increases the number of hours of training to meet the Secret Service's expanded mission;

It faces the need to make greater use of technology, and it even takes note of a post-fence jumper phenomenon, the unmanned drones that have become a new form of fence jumping.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. NORTON. I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, the space in front of the White House is a First Amendment park. I was invited down to a commemoration by citizens, who come every Monday to urge the reform of our gun laws.

To respond to fence jumping, some had talked of making it difficult for the public to come to that space in front of Pennsylvania Avenue. At hearings, I was assured that that was not necessary; and this bill backs that up. Spikes have been added for the fence jumpers, making it difficult to jump over, but Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see today that the public continues to use Pennsylvania Avenue as the First Amendment space it has always been.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the gentleman from Georgia and the ranking member of the committee, Mr. CONYERS, as well as

Mr. SENSENBRENNER and the ranking member of the subcommittee, Ms. JACKSON LEE.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1656, the "Secret Service Improvements Act of 2015."

The "Secret Service Improvements Act," is important because it will provide vital resources and strengthen protections of this important agency.

The Secret Service agency is one of the most elite law enforcement organizations in the world and has earned this reputation by providing 140 years of unparalleled service to this nation.

However, the Secret Service is facing a number of challenges, including the need for more resources, better training, better use of technology, and a better understanding of emerging threats.

This bill addresses each of these needs.

I am particularly pleased that Section 14 of this bill incorporates my amendment to create an Ethics Program Office to fully and effectively implement and administer the ethics laws, regulations, and policies governing Secret Service employees.

In recent years, the image of this once-revered agency has been tarnished—both because of misbehavior of agents and performance issues that resulted in security lapses.

Much of the negative attention on the personal behavior of Secret Service agents was initially prompted by the revelations in 2012 involving the solicitation of prostitutes by agents of the Secret Service in Cartagena, Colombia.

At the time, it was reported that a dozen Secret Service agents engaged the services of prostitutes before a presidential visit to Colombia for the Summit of the Americas.

I attended that Summit and was appalled to have learned of the behavior of some of the agents.

In my capacity as Ranking Member of the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Crime and Senior Member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I examined the Cartagena incident, and met with then-Director Mark Sullivan to express my concern and press for strong corrective action.

In fact, I have engaged in persistent oversight with respect to issues involving the Secret Service, ranging from the intrusion into the White House last year to the 2009 incident in which a couple evaded security to attend a state dinner at the White House honoring the Prime Minister of India.

I have met with Directors of the Secret Service on multiple occasions over the past several years to discuss and address performance and misconduct issues.

Agent misconduct of the sorts that have taken place in recent years is unacceptable.

It is more than offensive—it jeopardizes the ability of the agency to carry out its core mission.

To address misconduct issues and ethical lapses by Secret Service personnel, the manager's amendment includes a provision I developed, in cooperation with the Secret Service, that will help elevate the issue of ethical conduct at the agency through the creation of an Ethics Program Office.

With respect to other issues related to the protection provided by the Secret Service, it is

clear that the agency has been operating at an unacceptable level of resources.

The agency is understaffed at the agent and Uniform Division levels, resulting in shifts that are too long and which leave inadequate time for training.

The agency also needs to better use state-of-the-art technology and communications equipment.

All of these deficiencies contributed to the security breakdowns that allowed a man to climb over the White House fence, evade Secret Service officers while running across the White House lawn, and then run into the White House itself.

The goal of H.R. 1656 is to prevent future such incidents—and to protect against even more sophisticated threats that could result in far more harm.

This bill also would require that future directors of the Secret Service, after nomination by the President, be subject to Senate confirmation.

The current Director, Joseph Clancy, appears to be doing a good job in reinvigorating that agency, and we do not propose this as a criticism of him, or the President's selection of him, in any way.

However, this position—as is the case with the directors of the other law enforcement components of the Department of Homeland Security—should be Senate-confirmed, reinforcing the need to appoint the most highly-qualified candidates and elevating the position in stature.

With the consideration of this legislation today, we recognize that it is unfortunately the case that the Secret Service has recently failed to live up to its high standards with respect to the protection it provides our President and others.

By adopting the "Secret Service Improvements Act," we can help restore the agency so that it will be better prepared to achieve its mission.

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. 1656, 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. 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.

BORDER SECURITY TECHNOLOGY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1634) to strengthen accountability for deployment of border security technology at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1634

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 "Border Security Technology Accountability Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. BORDER SECURITY TECHNOLOGY ACCOUNTABILITY.

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

"SEC. 434. BORDER SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.

"(a) PLANNING DOCUMENTATION.—For each border security technology acquisition program of the Department that is determined to be a major acquisition program, the Secretary shall—

"(1) ensure that each such program has a written acquisition program baseline approved by the relevant acquisition decision authority;

"(2) document that each such program is meeting cost, schedule, and performance thresholds as specified in such baseline, in compliance with relevant departmental acquisition policies and the Federal Acquisition Regulation; and

"(3) have a plan for meeting program implementation objectives by managing contractor performance.

"(b) ADHERENCE TO STANDARDS.—The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Management and the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, shall ensure border security technology acquisition program managers who are responsible for carrying out this section adhere to relevant internal control standards identified by the Comptroller General of the United States. The Commissioner shall provide information, as needed, to assist the Under Secretary in monitoring proper program management of border security technology acquisition programs under this section.

"(c) PLAN.—The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Management, in coordination with the Under Secretary for Science and Technology and the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a plan for testing and evaluation, as well as the use of independent verification and validation resources, for border security technology so that new border security technologies are evaluated through a series of assessments, processes, and audits to ensure compliance with relevant departmental acquisition policies and the Federal Acquisition Regulation, as well as the effectiveness of taxpayer dollars.

"(d) MAJOR ACQUISITION PROGRAM DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'major acquisition program' means a Department acquisition program that is estimated by the Secretary to require an eventual total expenditure of at least \$300,000,000 (based on fiscal year 2015 constant dollars) over its life cycle cost."

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

"Sec. 434. Border security technology program management."

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act. This Act and such amendments shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VELA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 1634, the Border Security Technology Accountability Act, which I introduced earlier this year.

This bill seeks to provide the improved management of border security technology projects, safeguarding taxpayer dollars and increasing accountability for some of the Department of Homeland Security's largest acquisition programs.

The constituents I represent in southern Arizona are demanding better border security, and they expect us to do it through cost-effective and efficient means. They know that wasting taxpayer dollars on poorly managed border technology projects does little to actually secure the border or to improve our strategy. That is why this bill is so important.

The GAO has repeatedly included DHS acquisition management activities on its high-risk list, demonstrating that these programs are highly susceptible to waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement. The Secure Border Initiative, also known as SBInet, is a prime example of acquisition mismanagement at DHS. Initial plans developed in 2005 and 2006 called for the SBInet to extend across the entire U.S.-Mexico land border. However, SBInet deployment in my home State of Arizona was fraught with management problems, including a failure to adequately set requirements so the system would meet the needs of its users—our border patrol agents. After spending nearly \$1 billion of the taxpayers' money with minimal results, DHS canceled SBInet in 2011.

SBInet is not the only example, as DHS does not seem to be learning its lesson. The Government Accountability Office recently reported to the Committee on Homeland Security that Customs and Border Protection's Strategic Air and Marine Plan—or StAMP—initiated in 2006, with a cost of \$1.8 billion to date, still does not have an approved acquisition program baseline. This means that, despite CBP's plans to acquire boats and aircraft through 2035, they have not yet estimated how much it would cost to operate and maintain these systems.

How can we ensure programs like StAMP are on time, on budget, and are fiscally sound if DHS fails to follow sound management procedures?

We cannot afford to waste another minute or another dollar. We must put